

Raymond DETREZ & Pieter PLAS (eds.)

**Developing Cultural
Identity in the Balkans**

Convergence vs. Divergence

**"Multiple Europes"
No.34**

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photocopy, microfilm or any other means, without prior written permission from the publisher. All rights reserved.

© P.I.E.-PETER LANG S.A.
Presses Interuniversitaires Européennes
Brussels, 2005
1 avenue Maurice, 1050 Brussels, Belgium
info@peterlang.com; www.peterlang.com

Printed in Germany

ISSN 1376-0904
ISBN 90-5201-297-0
US ISBN 0-8204-6660-3
D/2005/5678/36

*CIP available from the British Library, GB
and the Library of Congress, USA.*

Bibliographic information published by "Die Deutsche Bibliothek"
"Die Deutsche Bibliothek" lists this publication in the "Deutsche Nationalbibliografie";
detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <<http://dnb.ddb.de>>.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 9

INTRODUCTION

**Convergence and Divergence in the Development
of Balkan Cultural Identity** 11

Raymond DETREZ & Pieter PLAS

PART I

LANGUAGE, SOCIETY, LOCALITY AND EVERYDAY CULTURE: MULTIOPTIONAL IDENTITY ACROSS TIME

CHAPTER 1

**From Orientalism to Democracy and Back Again.
Turkish in the Balkans and in Balkan Languages** 25

Victor A. FRIEDMAN

CHAPTER 2

**Linguistic Divergence and (Re)Convergence
within the Macedonian Standard/Dialect Continuum** 45

Christian VOSS

CHAPTER 3

**The Serbs of Bela Krajina between Local
and National Identity** 59

Tanja PETROVIĆ

CHAPTER 4

**Alien by Default. The Identity of the Turks
of Bulgaria at Home and in Immigration** 87

Magdalena ELCHINOVA

CHAPTER 5

**A Mixing of Cultural Identities.
The Croatian Borderlands in the Nineteenth Century** 111

Nada ALAICA

CHAPTER 1

**From Orientalism to Democracy
and Back Again**

**Turkish in the Balkans
and in Balkan Languages**

Victor A. FRIEDMAN

University of Chicago

Although the concept of substratum influence was crucial in the early conceptualization of the Balkan linguistic league, and, moreover, the current emphasis of contact linguistics as well as Trubetzkoy's (1923) original formulation both stress grammatical convergences as the defining phenomenon of the Balkan *Sprachbund*, it is arguable that the shared lexical component which entered the Balkan languages via Turkish – itself the result of centuries of Turkish political and social dominance in Southeastern Europe – is the more salient unifying factor in terms of the way ordinary people think about language. This was emphasized by Kazazis (1972: 89) in his classic article on the status of Turkisms in the Balkan languages, where he observes: “Turkish linguistic elements constitute a common denominator (not the only one to be sure) for the spoken form of all the Balkan languages. Turkish further reinforced the Balkan linguistic union (*Sprachbund*) in certain respects such as vocabulary and ‘phraseology’ [...]”. Kazazis’ anecdotal account of the way speakers of different Balkan languages compare Turkisms such as food names (e.g. *imam bayıldı*, Gk *imám baidí*, Blg *imam bajaldä* ‘eggplant casserole’) and obscenities (e.g. *puşt* Gk *poústis*, Blg *pušt* ‘catamite’) crystallizes the popular view of Turkish as a Balkan common denominator. At the same time, the status of Turkisms (and Turkish) has risen and fallen and risen again in response to external events. In this paper, I shall examine the symbolic deployment of Turkisms as signs in various types of linguistic ideologies, i.e. in the ideas

that people have about language and language use (cf. Silverstein 1979: 193). I shall show that Turkish continues to be a site for the exercise of lexical and symbolic power, contestation, and compromise in the Balkans even ninety years after Turkey in Europe was reduced to eastern Thrace, but that symbolism varies according to circumstances.

The penetration of Turkisms into the Balkan languages reached its zenith during the nineteenth century owing to the migration of rural populations to urban centers, where Turkish was the language of commerce and prestige (cf. Koneski 1965: 187-189). Under the Ottomans, *şehirli* 'town dweller' was a privileged tax category that required a minimum of forty years residency, and knowledge of Turkish was *de facto* a part of acquiring this desirable status (cf. Akan Ellis 2003: 2). Turkish was thus not only the language of the market place and inter-ethnic communication but also the language of urban sophistication and privilege. In Balkan Slavic, Turkish even penetrated the realm of Christian religious terminology, which, given the identification of Turkish with Islam, should have been the realm of the lexicon most impervious to such influence. Thus we find in nineteenth century Balkan Slavic texts *kurban* 'Eucharist' from Turkish *kurban* 'sacrifice', *kurtulija* 'the Savior' from Turkish *kurtul-* 'save', *sajbija* 'the Lord' from Turkish *sahib* 'master' (cf. Gołąb 1960, Koneski & Jašar-Nasteva 1989). The earliest writers of Balkan Slavic often felt it necessary to use Turkish glosses for the Slavonicisms they were attempting to introduce into the emergent literary language[s].¹ This was especially true with abstract nouns, e.g. Joakim Krčovski felt the need to gloss *gordost* 'pride' with the Turkish *fodulluk*, and even *narod* in the meaning of 'nation' was glossed with the Turkish *millet*. This reflects the position of Turkish in the vocabulary of those Balkan Slavic speakers who were in a position to acquire literacy. The prestige of Turkish in Balkan towns led to code-mixing to such an extent that Ivan Vazov described urban dialects of Bulgarian in this period as *poluturski* 'half-Turkish' (Vazov XIX: 355).²

¹ Here I use *Balkan Slavic* to refer to the nineteenth-century ancestor of both literary Bulgarian and literary Macedonian. Writers of this period generally called their language *Bulgarian*, but the term was not associated with the modern nation-state of today, hence my choice of a term with strictly linguistic nuances. Early writers like Joakim Krčovski (whose dialect was from the Kratovo-Kriva Palanka region of northeastern Macedonia) were attempting to promote a colloquially-based literary language in opposition to both Greek and Church Slavonic. From the point of view of language ideology and the development of modern standard languages, writers such as Krčovski have a place in the history of both modern Macedonian and modern Bulgarian, albeit of differing significance for the different modern standards.

² References to Vazov are by volume number in the 1956-57 edition of his collected works.

Another indication of the dominance of Turkish during this period is that out of 155 anecdotal tales in Cepenkov's (1972) nineteenth-century Macedonian collection from the Prilep region, 24 have code switches into Turkish, 4 into Greek, 3 with Albanian, 2 with Vlah and 1 with Romani. In addition to these 34 tales with interlingual code switching, there are 11 tales with dialectal code switches, given that the frame is Prilep Macedonian. Of these, 8 have switches employing the dialect of Mariovo, an isolated region southeast of Prilep and 3 into Šop, the dialect of peasants living in the triangle formed by Niš, Kriva Palanka, and Sofia. Thus, even if we include dialectal code switching, Turkish accounts for more than half the examples, and if we exclude Slavic dialectal material, then Turkish is more than twice as frequent as all the other non-Slavic languages of Macedonia combined. Conspicuous by its absence from this corpus is Judezmo. When Jews code switch from the Macedonian matrix of the narrative, it is into Turkish. I would argue that this is symptomatic of the marginalization of Judezmo with respect to the Balkan linguistic social hierarchy, but that is the topic of a different paper (cf. Friedman 1997).

Under the Ottomans, the noun 'Turk' usually meant 'Muslim' and not necessarily 'speaker of Turkish'. Local populations in the Balkans were sensitive to this difference and deployed the discrepancy for humorous purposes. Thus, for example, one of the themes of the ethnic jokes in Cepenkov's anecdotes concerns Turks who do not speak Turkish, i.e. Macedonian-speaking or Albanian-speaking converts to Islam (Cepenkov 1972: 125-135). Some of these jokes (e.g., Cepenkov 1972: 133-135) mock the kind code-mixing among the Macedonian-speaking Muslims cited above in Vazov for Bulgarian.³ Another topos is the non-Turkish speaking Turk (i.e., Muslim) trying to impress a local Ottoman authority favorably by speaking Turkish but instead making the opposite impression, e.g. by responding to an offer of food with *ala bim belâversin* (*Allah bin belâ versin* 'May God grant [you] a thousand woes') instead of *ala bin berikâtersin* (*Allah bin beriket versin* 'May God grant [you] a thousand blessings'). The subjects of these stories are

³ In Cepenkov's tales, a Macedonian-speaking Christian is a *Bugarin*, a Macedonian-speaking Muslim is a *Pomak* or a *Turčin*, the Turkish language is called *turcki*, and the Macedonian language is called *našincki* or *bugarcki*. I have chosen *Macedonian* rather than *Bulgarian* or *Nashinski* as the label for the Slavic language in question here because this first term reflects both the local provenience of the dialect and the fact that it is non-standard. Moreover, the modern language of which Cepenkov's tales represent a dialect is Macedonian rather than Bulgarian. The problem can be compared to deciding on the temporal divide between late Gallic Latin and Old French. Cepenkov's jokes differentiate Šop from *Bugarin*. The term *Torbeš* refers to Macedonian-speaking Muslims from Mijačija, in the Debar region.

generally the Macedonian-speaking Muslims of Tikveš, a mountainous region to the northeast of the Prilep plain. Given the dominance of Turkish in the towns and the fact that Tikveš is a relatively undeveloped or agricultural region, it is arguable that part of the mockery in these jokes expresses the tension between urban and rural dwellers rather than between Turks and Christians *per se*.

Still, while Turkish functioned as a marker of urban identity in the Empire, in rural areas it also functioned as a marker of Muslim identity among groups who adopted Islam without language shift. This is especially salient in the case of Slavic-speaking Muslims (Pomaks and Torbeš) as well as Albanian-speaking Muslims.⁴ Thus, for example, in the dialects of Slavic-speaking Muslims, as well as in standard Albanian and the dialects on which it is based, certain Turkish kinship terms replaced or were added in alongside ancient Indo-European ones, e.g., in Albanian *baba* 'father', *dajë* (Turkish *dayı*) 'maternal uncle', *hallë* (Turkish *hala* or *hale*) 'paternal aunt', possibly also *xhaxha* (Turkish *am[ü]ca* 'paternal uncle', similarly, Bosnian *bäba*, *däja/dajdža*, *hala*, *ämidža*. Similarly, the Pomaks and Torbeš of Macedonia and Thrace often use Turkish numerals (cf. Vazov X: 176).

The late Ottoman period, in addition to seeing the development of nationalism and the urbanization of rural populations was also the period of "orientalism" in the West, with the Balkans constructed as a European variant on the theme of the Oriental "other" against which Western Europe could define itself (cf. Todorova 1994, Bakić-Hayden 1995; also cf. the title of Dako 1919). During this same period, Miklosich's (1884-90) path-breaking work laid the foundations for the study of Turkish lexical elements in the languages of Eastern and Southeastern Europe. It is ironic that the period that saw the largest influx of Turkish lexicon into the Balkan languages was also the beginning of organized efforts to eliminate that vocabulary.

The rise of Balkan standard languages saw the fall of Turkisms. By recursively internalizing West European notions of the "oriental", the Balkan elites that controlled the standardization of their respective languages banished most Turkisms to colloquial and ironic registers (although a few were thoroughly integrated, while others became archaic or dialectal). This process – explicitly labeled *deorientalizacija* by

⁴ It may well have been true of Hellenophone Muslims such as the Vallahades of the Bistrica valley in Southeastern Aegean Macedonia (de Jong 1992) as well as Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian Muslims such as the Megleno-Romanians of Näte in Aegean Macedonia, who were sent to Turkey in the exchange of populations of 1923 (Atanasov 1990: 6), or the Muslim Aromanians of Dolna Belica, who are now Albanianized. Necessary data are lacking, however.

some Bulgarian scholars (Grannes 1996: 134) – was repeated in each standard as it achieved stability, and in some cases continued long after that period.⁵ In Bulgarian, for example, Ivan Vazov – whose status as a prominent writer gave him significant influence on the formation of the literary language (Grannes 1996: 85, which cites various Bulgarian sources) – for the most part opposed the use of Turkish vocabulary, especially in literature. However, he also opposed the radical purism that would have eliminated all traces of Turkish from Bulgarian and allowed for the retention of Turkisms that, in his words, *imat pravo na graždanstvo u nas* 'have citizenship with us' (Vazov XIX: 89). He criticized translations that made, in his opinion, excessive use of Turkisms saying that the implication that Bulgarian lacks equivalents *nanasja smärtna obida na narodnoto ni samoljubie* 'mortally offends our national pride' (Vazov XVIII: 696). Elsewhere, Vazov (XVIII: 373, 593, 696) refers to Turkisms as *dumi čuždi i loši* 'nasty foreign words', *bez nužda naturjani* 'unnecessarily inserted', *ulični dumi*, 'street words'. Given that Vazov was criticizing published works, it is clear that some Bulgarians either favored the use of colloquial language in writing, or, on occasion, were even unaware that a given word was of Turkish origin (Vazov XVIII: 496).

Five decades later, the same process was repeated for Macedonian, despite a current of thought among some intellectuals maintaining that Turkisms should be encouraged and preserved because they were characteristic of folk speech and also emphasized Macedonian's differentiation from the other Slavic standard languages. Using the same tone as Vazov's, Koneski (1945) criticized the use of Turkisms in a Macedonian translation of Molière's *Le Tartuffe* in the following terms: *Toa znači [...] da go snižis [...] istančeniot poetski jazik na Moliëra [...] do nivoto na našeto balkansko, kasabsko, čaršisko muabetenje [...] da go vulgariziraš do nemajkade* ("It means [...] lowering [...] the refined poetic language of Molière [...] to the level of our Balkan, small-town, marketplace chit-chat [...] vulgarizing it to the *n*th degree"). It is interesting to note that even at the beginning of the twentieth century, when the movement for a separate Macedonian literary language had no state support and was opposed by such state forces as did exist, there is

⁵ During periods of anti-Turkish sentiment in Bulgaria, for example during the 1980s, one way of erasing (cf. Gal & Irvine 1995) the impact of Turkish was by producing dictionaries of Arabic and Persian loan-words in Bulgarian, conveniently omitting the fact that these all entered via Turkish. A similarly ideologically motivated move is to be found in works claiming that proto-Bulgar (the language of the group that crossed the Danube in 681 and established a state on the territory of modern Bulgaria) was an Iranian language despite the fact that in serious scholarly circles it is well known that the language was Turkic and is related to modern Chuvash.

evidence of a policy of replacing Turkisms with Slavic formations among those who advocated standardizing Macedonian as a separate language. In this regard, Dimitrovski (1966: 162) comments on the lack of Turkisms in Mirkov's (1903) Macedonian separatist manifesto *Za makedonckite raboti* 'On Macedonian matters', observing that the book's Macedonian is a kind of *sloveniziran naroden jazik* 'Slavicized popular language'. Indeed, in my own count of Turkisms in that book, there are only 16 Turkish words in 142 pages, and this includes words pertaining to the Ottoman state such as *sultan* and *sandžak* 'district'. Of these 16, only one – *esap* 'account' – occurs more than once.

Twenty years after Koneski's criticism of Turkisms in Macedonian formal style, the campaign was still going on in Albanian, and Kranji (1965: 150, cited in Kazazis 1972: 94) wrote that the elimination of Turkisms was: "*një detyrë patriotike, një detyrë për të gjithë*" 'a patriotic duty, a duty for everyone'. A decade later, ideologies of purity and register were still being articulated for Modern Greek as seen in Dizikirikēs (1975), whose message is summarized by Kazazis (1977: 302-303):

[...] depending on their origin, loan-words differ as to the degree to which they defile a language. Thus, the Romans, the Franks ('[medieval] West Europeans'), the Venetians, all left their linguistic (read: lexical) imprint on Greek. Those were, however, civilized nations, so that their loan-words into Greek are not much of a disgrace and do not wound the 'linguistic dignity' of the Greeks as Turkish loan-words do (6ff. and *passim*). The latter are a shameful reminder of the centuries-long abject subjugation of the Greek nation to a culturally undistinguished people, the Turks.

Similar arguments can be found for Romanian (Kazazis 1972: 92-93 and references therein, cf. also Close 1974: 119, 154, 199, 214, Žugra & Kaminskaja 2003).

Even Turkish itself eliminated many of these same Balkan Turkisms in the course of its twentieth-century puristic movement, since a large number of them were ultimately of Arabic or Persian origin and were therefore considered foreign to Turkish as well (see Kazazis 1972: 93-94). We thus have the interesting situation in which the same terms are considered archaic in both Turkish and in the Balkan languages. For example Turkish *münasip* (< Arabic *munāsib*), Macedonian and Bulgarian *munasip*, Albanian *mynasip* 'suitable' has been replaced, by *uygun*, *zgoden*, *umesten*, and *përshatshëm*, respectively.

The treatment of Turkisms in the former Serbo-Croatian represents a special and interesting case. Both during the formative period of the nineteenth century and in modern times, a characteristic distinguishing Croatian from Serbian language attitudes has been that Croatian has

followed the German and Hungarian model of creating neologisms whereas Serbian has been more tolerant of foreign loans already in the language and receptive to new ones. To be sure, this does not mean that there was a complete absence of purism in Serbian language planning. As Koljević (1980: 344) notes, Vuk Karadžić intervened lexically in his first (1814) collection of folk poetry, replacing Turkisms with Slavic forms. In his second collection (1815), however, Vuk left such words alone. Jašar-Nasteva (1988) points out that although in the preface of his 1818 dictionary Vuk distinguished among Turkisms that should be replaced, Turkisms that are rare (archaic), and Turkisms that ought to be retained, his attitude towards Turkisms was in general tolerant, especially *vis-à-vis* competing vocabularies such as Church Slavonicisms. Herrity (1980) also documents Serbian purism – including negative attitudes towards Turkisms – during the second half of the nineteenth century.⁶ Nonetheless, as Kazazis (1972: 88) notes, on the whole Serbian has not focused on Turkisms as an object of extirpation with the same vigor as found in other languages in the Balkans. There are two explanations for this. The first is that Vuk's explicit ideology of *piši kako govoriš* 'write as you speak' favored basing the standard on colloquial speech, and throughout the ex-Ottoman Balkans Turkisms have been (and to a certain extent remain) characteristic of the vernacular. The second reason is that, in the case of Serbian, an ideology of basing the standard on the colloquial would perceive greater threats from German and Russian. German was the language of Austria, which was the conduit of modernization but also a hegemon competing with Serbia over filling the vacuum left by the retreating Turks. Russian (which includes here Church Slavonic as a major source of vocabulary in the literary language) was implicated in Slaveno-Serbian, the literary standard of Serbian elites against whom Vuk was struggling for the acceptance of a standard based on the colloquial. Nonetheless, the Eastern Variant of post-World War II Serbo-Croatian did not appear to differ significantly from other languages to the south in the number and position of Turkisms in its vocabulary. Thus, for example, Škaljić's (1966) dictionary of Turkisms in Serbo-Croatian contains 6,878 headwords while Grannes, Rå Hauge & Süleymanoğlu's (2002) dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian contains 7,427 headwords. Works such as Jašar-Nasteva (2001) for Macedonian and Boretzky (1976) for Albanian have smaller totals of words (between 3,000 and 4,000 each), but the literary and dialectological corpora as well as secondary sources that they had to draw upon were also considerably more limited in both quantity and

⁶ See also Cooper 1989 on Vuk's use of neologisms in his 1847 translation of the New Testament.

time span. It is thus not unreasonable to hypothesize that if equivalent bodies of work were available, the totals would be fairly similar.

A manifestation of the hostility that both contributed to and is reflected by the delegation of many Turkisms to a lower register is the phenomenon that can be called 'say it in Turkish jokes'. The joke consists in rhetorically asking the listener how to say a given word or phrase in Turkish and then supplying a collocation of Turkisms which renders the concept in an approximate way that implies an imperfect grasp of a modern concept. Thus for example, *radio* 'radio' is *gurulti kuti* (Turkish *gürültü kutu*) literally 'noise box', *lična karta* 'state-issued personal photo-identification card' is *surat tapija* (Turkish *surat tapu*) 'face legal-document', and passport is *džen surat tapija* (Turkish *cihan* 'world') 'world face document'.⁷ It is worth noting that in the West Rumelian dialect of Turkish spoken in Macedonia, high vowels in final open syllables all become front and unrounded (*u, ü, i, ı > i*). Since high vowels in general are excluded from final position in the nominative singular in Macedonian (and other Slavic languages), except in the most recent loan-words, Macedonian integrated local Turkish words ending in /i/ by adding suffixal /-ja/. Thus, for example original *tapu* becomes dialectal *tapi* and is integrated into Macedonian as *tapija*. Of the Turkish items employed in the given examples, *gurulti* and *kuti* are thus dialectal Turkisms while *tapija* is a Macedonian form.⁸ This phenomenon is similar to what Hill (1993, 2001) has called 'Mock Spanish' or 'Junk Spanish', i.e. a humorous use of Spanish lexical items, grammatical or derivational affixes, and collocations in English as a humorous means of signaling the subordination of Mexican-Americans. As Hill (2001: 84) observes: "Mock Spanish, and elite racist discourse in general, seems to oscillate along the boundary between 'public' and 'private' talk, making the public reproduction of racism possible even where racist discourse is supposedly excluded from public discussion". The genre of 'say it in Turkish' jokes also reproduces a subordinating discourse, but it is aimed at a language that was itself the subordinator less than a century ago and one that still carries prestige, especially among Muslims and the oldest generation in general. The 'say it in Turkish' jokes, however, by targeting relatively modern concepts, also seek to position Macedonian as

⁷ It is worth noting that Macedonian *lična* is derived from *lice* which means both 'face' and 'person', while Turkish *surat* has only the first of those two meanings.

⁸ *Surat* is not distinctive, since it ends in a consonant and does not involve any changes, while *džen < cihan* involves a loss of intervocalic /h/ which is both Macedonian and dialectal Turkish. The fronting on /a/ to /e/ under the influence of the /i/, however, looks like a Turkish dialectism rather than a Macedonian adaptation. In any case, these two words do not carry the same clear markings of provenance as those cited in the main body of the text.

more modern *vis-à-vis* Turkish. A related phenomenon is noted by Kazazis (1975), who describes the reactions of speakers of Modern Greek to a textbook of Ancient Greek for Turkish-speakers. Because Ancient Greek vocabulary is associated with the highest register of puristic Greek (*katharevousa*) on the one hand, while words of Turkish origin are associated with the lowest register of demotic Greek (*dhimotiki*) on the other, the use of Turkish glosses for Ancient Greek vocabulary – quite unmarked in the Turkish-speaking context for which the book is intended – produces an effect much like that of the 'say it in Turkish' jokes in Macedonian.

Nonetheless, in Macedonia, Turkish continued as the language of prestige among urban Muslims, as well as older urban families in general, well into the twentieth century, and to some extent continues in this role even today. In 1973, the Turkish consul in Skopje, who spoke excellent English, told me that he had no need to learn Macedonian, because if he should become lost or need help he would simply find someone over the age of fifty, and they would be sure to know Turkish. This was at a time when rural immigration to the cities was significant, but the older generation tended to remain in the villages, and thus the oldest generation in the towns still represented the urban population for whom knowledge of Turkish was a part of city life.⁹ Although Albanian supplanted Turkish among some urban Muslims in Macedonia in the last decades of the twentieth century (it had always been strong among the rural Muslim population), the prestige of Turkish has been regaining ground to some extent, and thanks to programs from Turkey available via satellite television, many urban Muslims in Macedonia can control standard Turkish in addition to the local West Rumelian dialect. It is also the case that during the Yugoslav Wars of Succession, when Macedonia was suffering under the double burden of sanctions against Serbia (its erstwhile chief trading partner) and the illegal Greek embargo, Turkey played an important role as a major trading partner, a fact of which Macedonians were cognizant and for which they were grateful. This combined with a perceived threat from Albanian contributed to a positive attitude toward Turkish among many Macedonians.

Turkisms manifested a significant expansion in the national languages of those Balkan countries that experienced the political transitions of the 1990s. Since the inception of those changes in Albania, Bulgaria, Macedonia, and Romania, Turkisms have been deployed in more formal contexts, especially the press – and in particular the tabloid press – as an index of oppositional democracy. This deployment is

⁹ See Akan Ellis (2003) for an excellent account of *şehirli* and Ottoman identity in Modern Macedonia; see also Fraenkel 1993.

associated with earlier debates on the position of Turkisms in the norm. Under the communists, Turkisms were discouraged in formal contexts and politics was characterized by a one-party system. Thus the use of Turkisms in formal contexts becomes a marker of “democracy”. Krāsteva (2000: 8-9), writing about the Bulgarian daily press – especially the yellow press – offers a different but related explanation, arguing that the use of Turkisms, especially in headlines, has the effect of rendering the news “hot”, shocking, vital; in effect – newsworthy. She compares the 1990s to the 1880s and 1890s, when Bulgaria was going through the transition to autonomy and independence after the Russo-Turkish War. During this period, too, she argues, there was a rise in the frequency of Turkisms in the press. According to her argument, Turkisms have exactly the same valency today that they had a century ago – emotional-affective, familiar, intimate, colloquial – but that the use of such vocabulary in the press expresses a negative attitude to the object of the news report, the intent being to influence public opinion and manipulate facts during a period of uncertainty and crisis. Herbert’s (1906: 152) observations of the prevalence of Turkish in Bulgaria can also be seen in this light. By contrast, Rå Hauge (personal communication, 10 October 2003), notes that after 1991 Russisms took the place of Turkisms as low register items, and Turkisms were concomitantly raised. These arguments are not unrelated, however, given that the rise of a yellow or tabloid press is associated with the freedom of information characteristic of a democracy and forbidden under the communists, while Russian is associated with the communist period.¹⁰

It is worth noting that language institutions which received state support under the communists and that continue to depend on government subsidies have been remarkably conservative in continuing the linguistic ideologies of the earlier period. Thus, for example, the entry for the Turkism *kavarma* ‘a kind of meat stew’ in volume VII of the most recent Academy dictionary of Bulgarian (1993) labels the word ‘dialectal’, although, as Grannes, Rå Hauge & Süleymanoğlu (2002: ix) point out: “the word is found on the menus of fine restaurants in the capital and all over Bulgaria”.¹¹ They treat the word as neutral, and point out

¹⁰ Moreover, it is worth noting that at the end of the nineteenth century, Russian political and territorial aspirations in Southeastern Europe also engendered ambivalent Bulgarian popular attitudes toward Russian, which was seen as the language of liberators who were not always reliable and who were also potential colonizers.

¹¹ In fact, even in the Academy dictionary, the example sentence for *kavarma* is *V restorana porāchahme supa, kavarma, i desert* (p. 20). “In the restaurant we ordered soup, kavarma, and dessert”. Not only is this sentence not dialectal, but all the other nouns in it are obvious Western borrowings.

that the labeling on the Academy’s part is more prescriptive than descriptive.

The most salient exception to this new rise of Turkisms, however, has been on the territory of the former Serbo-Croatian (now Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, or BCS), where Turkisms have taken on a different significance as a positive marker for Bosnian and a negative one for Croatian. Even before the Wars of Succession, however, in a manifestation of recursiveness (Gal & Irvine 1995), Turkisms were associated with Serbian in Croatian and with Macedonian in Serbian. Speakers were aware of the ironies of this semiotic process, as illustrated by a Serbian joke from former Yugoslavia in which a Serb tells a Macedonian: *Vi Makedonci upotrebljavate mnogo turcizama, a mi Srbi, jok!* “You Macedonians use a lot of Turkisms, but we Serbs, *yok* (a Turkism meaning ‘no, not at all, no way’, perceived as especially common in colloquial Serbian usage)”. At the same time, this humor points to the fact that Serbs see themselves as using Turkisms. This is in contrast to Croatian, which, even during the Second Yugoslavia, produced an anti-Turkish discourse (e.g., Jonke 1965), which in turn can be taken as an encoding of Turkisms as “Serbian”.¹²

If anti-Turkish rhetoric was a manifestation of Croatian resistance to Serbian, Turkisms have become symbolic in the breakdown of BCS into at least three literary languages since 1991. This breakdown helps reflect and reify the disintegration of the former Yugoslav society. Language planners and others on BCS-speaking territory utilize the encouragement or discouragement of BCS Turkisms as one of the means of increasing the differentiation of the codified norms or literary languages currently developing out of BCS. These attempts are directly connected with the political will to establish the separateness and identity of the nation and state via language. Bosniac nationalists utilize Islam as the religion of national identity, and Bosniac language planners are attempting to reinstate as much as possible of the Turko-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 BCS, which Serbian is accused of having dominated, there is pressure to avoid lexical items that have become identified with other variants of BCS. 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 *kaiš*, while the Croatian is told to use the neologistic *okolopasni pantalođržac*

¹² For a nuanced analysis of the position of Serbia *vis-à-vis* Turkish, see Živković (2000: 284-291).

'circumwaistal pantholder'.¹³ Moreover, Bosnian is attempting to lay exclusive claim to the entire Turkish vocabulary of BCS. Thus, for example, Pirić (1994) writes that the (common BCS) Turkism *komšiluk* 'neighborliness, neighborhood' 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 BCS not found in any of the other languages of the Balkans.

The 1990s have also seen a new rise in Turkisms associated with the increasing standardization of languages that until recently were absent from the realm of public discourse, namely Romani and Aromanian in Macedonia, where both languages were recognized as official in the Macedonian constitution of 1991. This rise is illustrated by 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.¹⁴ In the case of Romani and Aromanian, the fact that their literary norms are 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, VI questions 8 and 9): Macedonian *banja*, *klozet*, Albanian *banjo*, *nevojtoje*, Turkish *banyo*, *banyo-ayakyolu*, 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 'necessarium' and 'bath-footplace', respectively. The Romani documents, however, used the Turkisms *hamami* and *kenefi*, respectively.¹⁵ *Hamam* is the standard Turkish word for 'bath' but has come to mean 'Turkish bath' or 'public bath', while *kenef* 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. For Aromanian,

¹³ Actually, Croatian also uses a Slavic form, *remen* 'strap' in the meaning 'belt'. The neologism is usually cited in humorous contexts, but in fact it was proposed in all seriousness.

¹⁴ The other languages were Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, and Serbian.

¹⁵ In the 2002 census (Form PPI-3, section 2, questions 6 and 7), the variants *amami* and *khenefti* were used for Romani. These forms reflect variants that are still in competition as the process of standardization continues. The 2002 Turkish replaced *banyo-ayakyolu* with *tualet*, reflecting changes in Turkish linguistic practice.

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 Aromanian. While this was implicit in the case of Romani, it was explicit in the case of Aromanian instructions to enumerators, which included a special last page with a 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 Aromanian.¹⁶ Like Romani, Aromanian used Turkisms for 'bath' and 'toilet' in census instructions and forms, viz. *hàmami* and *hale*, respectively. The latter, from Turkish *helâ* appears in Albanian as *hale*, where it is considered colloquial and would never be used in a formal government document. Thus we see a parallel process in Romani and Aromanian in which the closeness of the emerging norm to current speech favors retention of Turkisms without stylistic lowering or marginalization.

Among the Romani elites of Macedonia – as occurred in Balkan languages that underwent standardization earlier – a debate has emerged between nativizers and colloquializers who favor Indic and Turkish, respectively, as sources of vocabulary enrichment. The discussion reproduces the competing discourses in the standardization of Macedonian sixty years ago. As I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1989), however, Romani has fewer extralinguistic reasons for eliminating words of Turkish origin. Many of these words are ultimately of Persian origin and therefore more closely related to Romani than to the other Indo-European languages of the Balkans (since Indic and Iranian share a common dialectal origin within Indo-European), and some of these words were borrowed directly from Persian during the early history of the Romani people. Moreover, the elimination of Turkisms from the other Balkan languages was in part motivated by an ideology of separation from the political and social dominance of the Ottoman past. In the case of Romani, the Turkish language does not occupy the same socio-political position, since Roms are marginalized regardless of who controls the state, and this in turn eliminates one of the motivations for changing the status of Turkisms. Also, Turkish is the first language of a significant number of Roms in the Balkans, and an even larger number of Roms are Muslim (in Macedonia, for example, over 90%), which,

¹⁶ It is worth noting that the Aromanian instructions for the 2002 census did not contain such notices but rather took for granted that users of the document would be familiar with the orthography.

given the association of Turkish with Islam in the Balkans, can also favor the retention of vocabulary of Turkish origin.¹⁷

It is also worth noting that while Iglja (1996: 4) writes that 'only a couple of hundred' Turkisms survive in the dialect of the Christian Roms of Agia Varvara seventy years after the group moved from Turkey to Greece in connection with the exchange of populations following World War I, her vocabulary (pp. 277-305), which has about twice as many main entries as Messing's (1980) glossary of the same dialect, includes many Turkisms in addition to those given by him. In my comparison of the Turkisms in Messing (1980) with Škaljić (1966), I found that almost a third of the entries in the former were not in the latter (Friedman 1989). This figure is also reflected in the comparison of Škaljić (1966) with Grannes, Rå Hauge & Süleymanoğlu (2002) published in the latter work (pp. 305-528). In a similar comparison of the parallel columns, the two works share only somewhere between a half and two thirds of the total number of Turkish lexical items. The remainders occur only in one dictionary or the other. Thus, while in raw numbers of head words Grannes, Rå Hauge & Süleymanoğlu (2002) surpasses Škaljić (1966) by only 549 headwords, it would appear that the number of Turkish words in one not attested in the other numbers in the thousands. This comparison, however, is misleading. In many instances, both languages will have the word that would constitute the main entry and differ only in which derivatives are attested. Thus, for example, both Bulgarian and BCS have *abdal* 'fool' (Turkish *abdal*), but only Bulgarian has the derivative *abdaläk* 'foolishness' (Turkish *abdallik*) while, conversely, both have borrowed Turkish *akraba* 'relatives' (Bulgarian *akraba*, BCS *akreba*), but only BCS attests *akrebaluk* (Turkish *akrabalik*) 'kinship'. Similarly both *abdest* 'ablution' and *abdestlik* 'place of ablution' are borrowed into both languages, but the derived noun is listed separately for each, while *hoş bulduk* 'well have we found [you]' (i.e., 'well met', the answer to 'welcome') occurs in both languages but is listed separately because in Škaljić (1966) it occurs in the same entry after the first singular *hoş buldum* whereas in Grannes, Rå Hauge & Süleymanoğlu it occurs alone. To this can be added Belyavski-Frank's (2004: 161) observation that even these excellent dictionaries are not

¹⁷ The problem of Romani identity among groups that do not speak Romani is beyond the scope of this paper. See Marushiakova *et al.* (2001) for relevant discussion. It is worth noting that Roms are not the only group who speak Turkish without necessarily identifying as Turks. Aside from the documentation in Akan (2003: 1), the following quotation from Lippman (1999) is illustrative: "In Prizren most of the Albanians speak Turkish as a second, often as a first, language". On the other hand, many Macedonian-speaking Muslims in the Župa region near Debar, insist on declaring themselves as Turks but do not know Turkish.

exhaustive of Turkisms that can occur in various corpora. The question of lexical or phrasal code-switching versus borrowing is also unaddressed and in need of greater elucidation.¹⁸

In addition to serving as a marker of prestige and of differentiation (both positive and negative), Turkish can function as a kind of secular mediator. In the Southwestern corner of Kosovo, just across Mount Shar from Macedonia, is a region called Gora. Many of the villages in this region are inhabited by Slavic-speaking Muslims, who have a distinct *Goran* identity and whose dialect, *Goranski* or *Goranche*, is closer to standard Macedonian than it is to standard Serbian. Some Gorans identify with Serbia, some with Macedonia, and some with neither. Brod is a large, mixed Albanian-Goran village where there is significant tension between the two groups, especially since the 1999 war. There are two mosques in the village, one Goran closer to the center and one Albanian further up the hill. When walking in a village it is normal to say hello whenever you pass anyone on the road, and rude to pass by without speaking, especially if you are a man and the others are also men. In a village where there are ethnic tensions and where neither Goran nor Albanian men dress in a distinctively identifiable way, you are faced with a problem. You do not want to use the Albanian *Mirëdita* to a Goran or the Goranski *Dobar den* to an Albanian, and as a non-Muslim it is not really appropriate to use the religious *salam alejkum*. And thus, in such a context, the neutral greeting is the Turkish *Merhaba*.

As the foregoing material has shown, in any discussion of convergence and divergence in the development of Balkan cultural identities, Turkish and the lexicon that entered the Balkan languages through it continue to occupy a significant place almost a century after the end of Turkish hegemony in Southeastern Europe. From functioning as a marker of both Islam and of non-sectarian urban sophistication, Turkish vocabulary was pushed to lower and archaic registers in the Balkans, and, insofar as it was of Arabo-Persian origin, even in Turkey itself. And yet today this lexicon is still deployed (or decried) in signaling political resistance, in building national identity, in recursively inscribing orientalization, and as a neutral ground for negotiating social relations. Attitudes towards Turkisms in the Balkans can still index conservative or radical (transitional) political stances, and the ability to speak Turkish is still an asset that draws on the cultural capital of the Ottoman past, as well as the capitalist present. At the same time, the details of the roles specific lexical items still raise questions of geolinguistic distribution that require further investigation. As we saw in the discussion of Turkish itself, much of the vocabulary that entered the Balkans via

¹⁸ See Sobolev's (2003) examination of the distribution of Turkisms in Balkan dialects.

Turkish entered Turkish from Arabic and Persian. In this way, the Balkans are lexically linked to the broader world of Arabo-Persian influence. I shall close this article with a striking example of such linkage, as illustrated by an anecdote concerning Morris Goodman, Professor emeritus of African linguistics at Northwestern University. While attending the International Congress of Linguists in Bucharest in 1967, Professor Goodman attempted to buy some matches at 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, Russian, and Dutch. Finally, as he was leaving in frustration, he flung the Swahili word at her: "Kiberiti". The proprietor beamed understanding and exclaimed: "Ah, chibrit!"

References

- Akan Ellis, Burcu. 2003. *Shadow Genealogies: Memory and Identity among Urban Muslims in Macedonia*. Boulder, CO: East European Monographs.
- Atanasov, P. 1990. *Le mégléno-roumain de nos jours*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- Bakić-Hayden, Milica. 1995. "Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia". *Slavic Review* 54: 917-931.
- Belyavski-Frank, Masha. 2004. "Review of Grannes, Rå Hauge & Süleymanoğlu's 2002". *Balkanistica* 17: 160-161.
- Boretzky, N. 1976. *Der türkische Einfluss auf das Albanische, Teil 2: Wörterbuch der albanischen Turzismen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Cepenkov, Marko. 1972. *Makedonski narodni umotvorbi, Vol. 6: Narodni prikazni*. In Kiril Penušliski (ed.). Skopje: Makedonska Kniga.
- Close, Elizabeth 1974. *The Development of Modern Rumanian*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cooper, Henry. 1989. "Vuk Karadžić's Serbian New Testament (1847) and the Paradigm of Modern Slavic Vernacular Bible Translations". *Serbian Studies* 5(1): 25-4.
- Dako, Christo A. 1919. *Albania: The Master Key to the Near East*. Boston: Grimes.
- de Jong, Frederick. 1992. "The Greek Speaking Muslims of Macedonia: Reflections on Conversion and Ethnicity". In Boeschoten, Hendrik (ed.). *De Turcicis Aliisque Rebus: Commentarii Henry Hofman dedicati*. Utrecht: Instituut voor Oosterse Talen en Culturen, 141-148.
- Dizikirikēs, G. S. 1975. *Na Ksetourkepsoume tē glōssa mas*. Athens: Angyra.
- Dimitrovski, Todor. 1966. *Za literturnata leksika na Misirkov*. In X. Andonov-Poljanski, B. Ristovski, T. Stamoski (eds.). *Krste Misirkov: Naučen sobir posveten na 40-godišnjinata od smrtta*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik, 161-169.

- Fraenkel, Eran. 1993. "Urban Muslim Identity in Macedonia: The Interplay of Ottomanism and Multilingual Nationalism". In Eran Fraenkel and Christina Kramer (eds.). *Language Contact, Language Conflict*, New York: Peter Lang, 27-41.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1989. "Toward Defining the Position of Turkisms in Romani". In Milan Šipka (ed.). *Jezik i kultura Roma*. Sarajevo: Institut za proučavanje nacionalnih odnosa, 251-267.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1997. "One Grammar, Three Lexicons: Ideological Overtones and Underpinnings in the Balkan Sprachbund". In Kora Singer, Randall Eggert, Gregory Anderson (eds.). *CLS 33: Papers from the Panels on Linguistic Ideologies in Contact, Universal Grammar, Parameters and Typology, The Perception of Speech and other Acoustic Signals*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 23-44.
- Gal, Susan & Judith T. Irvine. 1995. "The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference". *Social Research* 62(4): 967-1001.
- Goļab, Z. 1960. "The influence of Turkish upon the Macedonian Slavonic dialects". *Folia orientalia* 1: 26-45.
- Grannes, Alf. 1996. *Turco-Bulgarica*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Grannes, Alf, Kjetil Rå Hauge, & Hayriye Süleymanoğlu. 2002. *A Dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian*. Oslo: Norvus Forlag.
- Herbert, Capt. Frederick William von. 1906. *By-Paths in the Balkans*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Herrity, Peter. 1978. "Purist Attitudes in Serbia in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century". *Slavonic and East European Review* 36(2): 201-223.
- Hill, Jane 1993: "Is It Really 'No problemo'? Junk Spanish and Anglo racism". *SALSA* 1: 1-12
- Hill, Jane H. 2001. "Mock Spanish, Covert Racism, and the (Leaky) Boundary between Public and Private Spheres". In Susan Gal & Kathryn A. Woolard (eds.). *Language and Publics: The Making of Authority*. Northampton, MA: St. Jerome, 82-102.
- Igla, B. 1996. *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara. Deskriptive und historisch-vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerndialekts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jašar-Nasteva, O. 1988. "Odnosot na Vuk kon turcizmite". *Prilozi, Oddelenie za lingvistika i literaturna nauka, Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnosti*, 13/2: 47-85.
- Jašar-Nasteva, O. 2001. *Turski leksički elementi vo makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.
- Jonke, Lj. 1965. "Turcizmi se šire". In *Književni jezik u teoriji i praksi*. Zagreb: Znanje, 405-407.
- Kazazis, K. 1972. "The Status of Turkisms in Present-day Balkan Languages". In H. Birnbaum & S. Vryonis (eds.). *Aspects of the Balkans*. The Hague: Mouton, 87-116.

- Kazazis, K. 1975. "Greek Reactions to an Ancient Greek Primer for Turks". *Journal of Modern Philology* 73/2: 162-165.
- Kazazis, K. 1977. Review of (Dizikirikēs 1975). *Folia Slavica* 1/2: 301-306.
- Koljević, Svetozar. 1980. *The Epic in the Making*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koneski, Blaže. 1945. "Odživenite rečnički elementi vo našiot jazik". *Nov den*, No. 3 (Dec. 1945). [Reprinted in: 1952. *Za makedonskiot literaturni jazik*, 11-18, Skopje: Kočo Racin and 1967. *Izbrani dela vo 7 knigi*, Vol. 5, 11-17. Skopje: Kultura.]
- Koneski, Blaže. 1965 *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Kočo Racin.
- Koneski, B. & O. Jašar-Nasteva. 1989. "Les formes linguistiques écrites en Macédoine au XIXe siècle dans le contexte Balkanique". *Prilozi* 14/1: 75-90. Skopje.
- Kranji, Anton. 1965. "Hymja e turqizimave në shqipen dhe përpjeket për zëvendësimin e tyre". *Studime filologjike* 19(2)/1: 143-151.
- Krāsteva, V. 2000. *Rečnik na turškite dumi v sāvrennija bālgarski pečat*. Sofia: Lakov Press.
- Lippman, Peter. 1999. Letter from Kosovo (#2 of 3) 13 July 1999. <http://www.glypx.com/balkanwitness/kos99-2.htm> (Accessed 25 April 2004).
- Marushiakova, Elena, et al. 2001. *Identity Formation among Minorities in the Balkans: The Cases of Roma, Egyptians and Ashkali in Kosovo*. Sofia: Studii Romani.
- Messing, Gordon M. 1987. *A Glossary of Greek Romany as Spoken in Agia Varvara (Athens)*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Miklosich, F. 1884-90. *Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen*. Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse, 34, 35, 37, 38.
- Misirkov, Krste P. 1903. *Za makdonckite raboti*. Sofia: Liberalnij Klub. [photo-edition 1974, Skopje: Institut za Makedonski jazik.]
- Silverstein, Michael. 1979. "Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology". In Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.). *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 193-247.
- Škaljić, A. 1966. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Sobolev, A. 2003. "Ob areal'nom raspredelenii i sistemnom statuse tjurkizmov v balkanskich dialektach". In I. A. Sedakova & T. V. Civ'jan (eds.). *V poiskach "oriental'nogo" na Balkanach (Balkanskie Čtenija 7) – Tezisy i materialy*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 75-81.
- Todorova, Maria. 1994. "The Balkans: From Discovery to Invention". *Slavic Review* 53: 453-482.
- Vazov, Ivan. 1956-57. *Sābrani sāčinenija v dvadeset toma*. Sofia: Bālgarski pisatel.
- Živković, Marko. 2000. "Stories the Serbs Tell Themselves about Themselves". Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago (Anthropology).

- Žurga, A. V. & L. N. Kaminskaja. 2003. "K voprosu o meste turcizmov v albanskom jazyke". In I. A. Sedakova & T. V. Civ'jan (eds.). *V poiskach "oriental'nogo" na Balkanach (Balkanskie Čtenija 7) – Tezisy i materialy*. Moscow: Russian Academy of Arts and Sciences, 81-85.