# Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online

## Balkan Slavic and Balkan Turkish

(7,109 words)

Balkan Turkish and Balkan Slavic languages have been in close contact for six centuries, from the late 14th century on, resulting in extensive bidirectional lexical borrowing and grammatical influence. This article surveys the effects of Turkish influence on Balkan Slavic and of Slavic influence on Balkan Turkish.

The Balkan Peninsula has been the scene of extensive, intensive, and prolonged contact between Turkish and South Slavic languages (as well as with the other Balkan languages: Greek, Balkan Romance, and Albanian). Turkish dialects spoken in the Balkans today differ from Standard Turkish (ST), in part due to Slavic influence, and the Balkan Slavic languages show considerable influence from Turkish. From the late 14th through the 19th century, the area inhabited by Balkan Slavs, including present-day Bulgaria, North Macedonia, Bosnia, Montenegro, and Serbia, was under Turkish rule, with Ottoman control starting earlier and lasting longer in the Eastern parts of this range. Large numbers of ethnic Turks settled in the region, sometimes in isolated areas, but often in close proximity to and interaction with Slavic speakers. Even today, a century after the Ottoman Empire's demise, parts of Bulgaria have majority Turkish population. Bilingualism was pervasive in the past and remains common. In what follows, we summarize the interinfluence evident in all parts of the grammar – phonology, morphosyntax, phraseology, and especially lexicon – first in Balkan Slavic and then in Balkan Turkish.

## Turkish influences on Balkan Slavic

Turkic borrowing into Slavic took place as early as Common Slavic and pre-Ottoman Turkic influence also occurred in the Balkans, including borrowing of some Bulgar vocabulary before the 11th century (Mladenović 1962). However, by far the most important period of Turkish influence on Balkan Slavic is the Ottoman era. Ottoman Turkish contact took place at different times and in different circumstances in different parts of the Balkans, leading to varying degrees and types of linguistic influence. Regions with a higher proportion of Turkish population, such as the Rhodope Mountains, and those where larger numbers converted to Islam, for instance Bosnia, tended toward more borrowing. In general, cities were more heavily Turkish-influenced than rural areas (Mladenović 1962; Kazazis 1969; Mirčev 1952; Skok 1935). However, numerous Turkish elements were adopted into the local language everywhere in the Balkans, both because new cultural items were introduced by the Ottomans (foods, trades, artifacts, and laws) and because Turkish was the prestige language. Many non-Turks were bilingual or had some degree of familiarity with the language.

After the Ottoman period, the role of Turkish diminished. Over time, some Turkisms, especially those having to do with Ottoman institutions and archaic trades or practices, became obsolete. With the rise of Balkan Slavic nation-states (Bulgaria, Serbia, later Yugoslavia, and eventually the post-Yugoslav states) and with the codification of standard languages, attempts were made to purify each of the Balkan Slavic languages by purging Turkish loans. This occurred rather late in Macedonian, which was established as a literary language and one of the official languages of Yugoslavia only in 1944, with purism following (see Koneski 1965). Puristic campaigns took place earlier in the other languages, but continue to some extent to the present day. These efforts to scrub Turkish influence from Balkan Slavic succeeded mostly in driving Turkisms into colloquial speech, dialects, and slang (Kazazis 1969, among others). Turkisms have tended to resurface in written language when social conditions allow; for instance, Turkish vocabulary surged in Bulgarian journalistic language in the 1990s, following the fall of the communist government, as part of a move toward a more engaging and entertaining press (Krăsteva 2000; *Rudin* 2012).

The Balkan Slavic languages as a group differ from the rest of the Slavic language family in various grammatical Balkanisms, some of which may have Turkish roots. Grammatical convergence is attributable to the high degree of multilingualism and complex interinfluence among all the Balkan languages, with Turkish influence generally being at best one factor.

Examples of Turkish influence in the Balkan Slavic languages follow, organized by area of the grammar. (Excellent overviews and comprehensive bibliographies can be found in Friedman 2003 for Macedonian and Grannes 1996 for Bulgarian.)

# Phonology

Phonetic and phonological influence is slight. Introduction of new sounds into the Slavic phonetic inventories through Turkish contact has occurred, but to an extremely limited extent. Macedonian dialects in the Korča region preserve front rounded /ü/ in loanwords such as *kümür* 'coal', likely due to Albanian contact, and the Turkish /h/ is preserved in the town of Ohrid in some words (Friedman 2003: 3), likely due to the proximity of Greek. Both /ü/ and /h/ are marginal phonemes, rare and variable, in the dialects in which they occur.

A more important result of Turkish influence throughout Balkan Slavic is the increased frequency and saliency of some phonemes, especially /dž/, which existed only as an allophone of /č/ prior to the influx of Turkish borrowings, for instance in Bg/Mk *ličba* [lidʒba]) 'sign; beauty, face', Sr *otadžbina* 'fatherland, home country' (Kazazis 1969; Koneski 1965: 50). The phoneme /dž/ now occurs as a distinctive phoneme in hundreds of words in all the Balkan Slavic languages, including fully nativized loans, e.g., Bg *džob*, Mk *džeb*, BCMS *džep* 'pocket'; Bg/Mk/BCMS *tendžera* 'saucepan'; place names like *Pazardžik, Hadžidimovo,* and *Džebel*; and family names like *Bojadžiev*, *Džankov*, and *Džambazov*.

Another sound that has increased in frequency is the stressed *schwa* /ă/ (orthographic ъ) in Bulgarian, due to adoption of large numbers of words containing the Turkish /ɯ/, e.g., *čadăr* 'umbrella' < Tu *çadır*. In Macedonian, *schwa* is preserved in northern/eastern dialects but usually undergoes the same sound change as *schwa* from other sources in western dialects and in the standard language, to /a/ or /o/: *čador* 'umbrella'. The fate of *schwa* in Standard Macedonian and western Macedonian dialects is complex (see Friedman 2003: 3–4). A number of other sounds, including /f/, /lj/, and the palatal stops /ḱ,ǵ/ have also been strengthened in frequency and/or phonemic distinctiveness in Macedonian by their occurrence in Turkish loans (Friedman 2003: 4–6).

## Morphology

The clearest morphological influence of Turkish is several borrowed suffixes, which are or were quite productive in all the Balkan Slavic languages. These include the agentive noun suffix -*CI*, abstract noun suffix -*lIk*, adjective suffix -*lI*, 'without' suffix -*sIz*, diminutive suffix -*CIk*, and language name suffix -*CA*, (with their predictable vowel- and consonant-harmony variants). Reflexes of these suffixes in the Balkan Slavic languages in table 1 are from Xhanari and Satka (2014).

Table 1: Turkish suffixes in Balkan Slavic

| Turkish | Bulgarian | Macedonian | BCMS | meaning |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *-ci/-cı/-cu/-cü/ -çi/-çı/-çu/-çü* | *-džija/-čija* | *-dži/-džija/-či/ -čija* | *-džija/-džije/ -čija/-ćija* | profession, orientation; '-er' |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *-lik/-lık/-luk/-lük* | *-lik/-lăk/-luk/ljuk* | *-lak/-lek/-luk/ -lok/-lik* | *-luk* | abstract noun; '-ness' |
| *-li/-lu/-lü/-lı* | *-lija* | *-li/-lija/-liv* | *-lija/-lije/-li* | possession, quality, belonging; '-like, -ish' |
| *-siz/-sız/-suz/-süz* | | *-siz/-suz/-saz* | *-suz* | 'without, -less' |
| *-cik/cık/cuk/cük/ çik/çık/çuk/çük* | | | *-šica, -čik* | diminutive |
| *- ca/ce/ça/çe* | | *-ča/-če* | | language name |

Of these, *-CI*, *-lIk*, and *-lI* are the most common and widespread. All occur with non-Turkish, native Slavic stems, e.g., Mk *gotovadžija* 'seller of ready-made clothes' (< Mk *gotov* 'ready'), *vojniklak* 'military service' (*vojnik* 'soldier'), *bradalija* 'bearded man' (*brada* 'beard'; Kazazis 1969; Markov 1955), and at least *-CI* combines with recently borrowed stems from e.g., English: Bg *čendžadžija* 'moneychanger', *lajfadžija* 'one who enjoys life, hedonist' (Grannes 1996), Mk *fudbaldžija* 'inept soccer player' (Friedman 2003: 11). Experts differ on the extent to which any of the suffixes are productive in the various contemporary standard Balkan Slavic languages, but *-CI* and *-lIk* clearly remain productive in colloquial registers (Koneski 1965: 189; Stamenov 2011; Krăsteva 2000). In particular *-CI* forms numerous newer occupation/orientation terms, e.g., Bg *taksidžija* 'taxi driver', *kompjuterdžija* 'computer geek', *tramvajdžija* 'tram worker', and *drogadžija* 'drug addict' as well as terms for traditional occupations and orientations, e.g., Bg *bojadžija* 'dyer; house painter', *xandžija* 'innkeeper', *xalvadžija* 'halvah maker; dealer in halvah', *bakărdžija* 'coppersmith', and the many family names derived from such occupation terms (Grannes 1996: 15–16). Its two main meanings, occupation and "orientation" or personality trait, can overlap in the same word: *kafedžija* 'owner/keeper of a coffeehouse', also 'coffee drinker/coffee fanatic'. Productive modern use of *-CI* often has a deprecating or ironic tone; for instance, Blaže Koneski (1965) states that words like Mk *filmadžija* and *festivaldžija* have a derisive feeling, though this connotation is absent in many established words containing *-CI* (see below on connotations of lexical Turkisms; also Kazazis 1969; Mirčev 1952; Stachowski 1961).

Grannes (1996) devotes several chapters to Bulgarian words with *-lIk*, including the form of the suffix, its combining with Turkish and non-Turkish stems, and the ongoing replacement of *-lIk* with Slavic noun-forming suffixes like *-stvo* in the standard literary language. In terms of form, /-lăk/ is overwhelmingly the most common reflex of *-lIk* in Bulgarian dictionaries, with other forms of the suffix occurring only in words borrowed as a unit from Turkish, such as *bokluk*

'garbage'. In Bulgarian dialects, the situation varies; /-lik/ is well-represented in some dialects, and /-ljuk/ very rare. In Macedonian, the usual form of the suffix is /-lak/: *javašlak* 'slowness', *asistentlak* 'assistantship (ironic)' (Friedman 2003: 11).

Another suffix that seems productive in Macedonian is *-ana*, claimed by Friedman (2003) to derive from Tu *hane* 'building', which forms Macedonian building terms: *xidroelektrana* 'hydroelectric power station'.

A different type of morphological borrowing is m-reduplication, indicating generality or lack of precision. Typical examples in Turkish are *ev-mev* 'houses and so on', *balık-malık* 'fish and stuff'. Grannes (1996: 266–280) discusses formation and usage of m-reduplication in Bulgarian and other Balkan languages: Bg *riza-mriza* 'shirts and so on', *greški-meški* 'mistakes and stuff', *jufka-mjufka* 'noodles and whatnot'; Mk *knigi-migi* 'books and stuff', *tepsii-mepsii* 'pots and pans and the like' (Jašar-Nasteva 1978: 41). Notice that /m/ may replace one or more initial consonants or simply be added; this is quite idiosyncratic and unpredictable. Friedman (2003: 13) also mentions Macedonian partial reduplication of the type *gol-goleničok* 'stark naked', which may be modeled on the Turkish pattern seen in e.g., *bambaşka* 'completely different'.

The most frequently mentioned as well as one of the least certain instances of Turkish grammatical influence in Balkan Slavic is the "evidential," "nonwitnessed," or "renarrated" verbal mood of <u>Bulgarian</u> and <u>Macedonian</u>, which resembles the Turkish *-miş* reportative. The verbal systems of these languages distinguish between events directly vouched for by the speaker and those based on hearsay or other indirect evidence; the latter form can also have a meaning of surprise/admirativity. Compare the two forms of "be" in Mk *Ne <u>beše</u> doma, na plaža <u>bil</u>* 'He wasn't home, apparently he was at the beach' (Friedman 2003: 87) with Tu *gitti* 'he went' vs. *gitmiş* 'apparently he went'. A grammatical category of evidentiality is a Balkanism, shared with Albanian. There is little evidence that it derives directly from Turkish, but its spread may have been encouraged by existence of a parallel Turkish verbal distinction (Kazazis 1969: 98–99; Friedman 2003: 84–111).

## Syntax

Friedman (2003: 8–9) points out that syntactic influence is difficult to prove, as similarities may result from accidental convergence "or at most reinforcement" of independent tendencies rather than actual borrowing. Nonetheless, several Balkan Slavic constructions have been said to be influenced by or based on Turkish models.

One possibility is Balkan possessive constructions like Mk *na carot majka mu* / Bg *na carja majka mu* 'the king's mother', literally 'of.the.king mother.his', which may be calqued from the Turkish *izafet* construction with the same word order: *sultanın annesi* (Grannes 1996: 250–258; Friedman 2003: 9). Other instances of possible syntactic borrowing or calquing include use of

verbal nouns instead of finite forms in Mk, e.g., *ne treba odenje* 'going is not necessary' (Koneski 1965; Čašule 1988), negative sentences containing present imperfect verb with future meaning, e.g., Mk *ne ti davam* 'I won't give you' (Koneski 1965), and the colloquial imperative construction with repeated verb in a *da* clause, e.g., Mk *begaj da begame* 'let's get out of here', literally 'run to we.run' (Friedman 2003: 9). Attribution of these to Turkish influence is tenuous, however, as all are plausible language-internal developments.

## Lexicon

In contrast to the rather slight and often uncertain grammatical influence of Turkish on Balkan Slavic, lexical influence is clear, pervasive, and important. Thousands of words were borrowed during Ottoman times from Turkish into all of the Balkan languages, including all varieties of Balkan Slavic and even BCMS varieties outside the Ottoman sphere, such as Croatian. Many of these *Turkisms* have fallen out of use, either through natural attrition (especially terms for outdated practices, artifacts and technologies, and Ottoman administration) or through nationalist efforts to replace "oriental" vocabulary with Slavic or European words. More have become stylistically marked: a large proportion of the entries in dictionaries of Turkisms (e.g., Grannes et al. 2002) are labeled "colloquial," "dialectal," or the like. But there are also entirely neutral Turkisms, and the large store of non-neutral terms enlivens the vocabulary. To quote Kostas Kazazis,

> Turkisms have enriched the expressive and stylistic potential of every Balkan language…Some of them have pejorative overtones, others are labeled as ironical or derisive, some carry the epic overtones typical of certain historical words, still others are characterized as vulgar. All of those connotative shades are used for stylistic effect by Balkan speakers and writers. (Kazazis 1969: 113)

Stamenov (2011: 13) considers Turkisms central to the "theory and practice of lexicology, semantics, stylistics, pragmatics [and] social psychology" of Bulgarian. Turkisms are the subject of large numbers of scholarly studies (Mirčev 1952; Kazazis 1969; Schaller 1972; Kramer 1992; Rollet 1996; Stamenov 2011, to name just a few) and several dictionaries (Milev et al. 1978; Ilčev et al. 1982; Burov and Pexlivanova 1999; Krăsteva 2000; Grannes et al. 2002; Škaljić 1966; Ibrahimović 2012).

Vocabulary borrowed from Turkish falls into a wide range of semantic fields. Xhanari and Satka (2014) list the following as areas rich in Turkisms in all the Balkan languages: occupations, military, household furniture, food and cooking, clothing and textiles, individual qualities, religion, construction, administration, agriculture, animals, marine life, plants, music, handicrafts, jewelry, health, colors, atmospheric phenomena, games, education terminology, etc. Other experts divide the vocabulary differently; the point is that Turkisms are very broadly

distributed; indeed, as noted by Friedman (1996: 135), "Turkish vocabulary has penetrated every facet of [Balkan Slavic] life: urban and rural"; furthermore, "Turkish lexical borrowings belong to all levels of vocabulary and almost all parts of speech" (1996: 134).

Among the most neutral borrowings are some common items of daily life and many foods: e.g., Tu *çorab* 'sock, stocking' > Bg/Mk *čorap*, Sr *čarapa*; Tu *çanta* 'bag' > Bg/Mk *čanta*; Tu *cep* 'pocket' > Bg *džob/džeb-*, Mk *džeb*, Sr *džep*; Tu *kibrit* 'match' > Bg/Mk *kibrit*; Tu *patlıcan* 'eggplant' > Bg *patladžan*, Mk (*modar*) *patlidžan*. These words are so fully naturalized that they are not recognized as Turkisms by most speakers, and are not in competition with a Slavic synonym. For many, perhaps most Turkisms, a Slavic synonym exists, and in this case, the two or more ways of expressing a concept take on different connotations. For example, Bg *lovec* 'hunter' (standard, neutral) coexists with the Turkism *avdžija* 'hunter' (colloquial, more "colorful") as well as the Turkish-suffixed *lovdžija* 'hunter' (colloquial, perhaps ironic). Stamenov (2011) points out that Turkisms often have slang or jargon meanings, which tend to be overlooked by lexicographers. One of his examples is *baldăr*, defined by Grannes et al. (2002) as calf of the leg (dial.), but also having "crude and/or vulgar" slang uses that are not mentioned in the dictionary.

The majority of Turkish loans are common nouns, but there are significant numbers of proper nouns (toponyms and surnames), adjectives, verbs, and some grammatical words (particles, intensifiers, conjunctions, etc.): Mk *bare/barem*, BCMS *bar/barem* < Tu *bari* 'at least'; Bg *čak*, BCMS *čak* < Tu *çak* 'even, as far as, until', and others common across the Balkans, including (*x*)*em…*(*x*)*em* 'both…and', *ami/ama* 'but/well', *čunkim* 'because', (*x*)*ep* 'all', (*x*)*epten* 'completely', *demek* 'as if, that is', (*x*)*ič* 'not at all', (*x*)*ajde* 'come on, let's go'.

Verb roots borrowed from Turkish are commonly used with Slavic suffixes to form verbs capable of being inflected for <u>tense</u>, <u>mood</u>, <u>person</u>, and <u>number</u>: Bg *-disvam*, Mk *-iri/-disuva*, BCMS *-isati/-ovati/-ti*; e.g., Bg *bojadisvam*, Mk *bojadisuva*, BCMS *bojiti* 'to paint, dye' < Tu *boya* 'color, paint, dye'/*boyamak* 'to paint, dye'. Verbs can also be formed with various auxiliary or light verbs: Mk *faḱa* 'do', *čini* 'do', *stoi* 'stand', Bg *pravi* 'do', *dava* 'give', etc.

The vast majority of Turkisms preserve the same denotational meaning in Balkan Slavic as in the original Turkish, though the range of extended meanings and especially their connotations can differ. As previously mentioned, during the 20th century, following the end of Ottoman rule, Turkisms took on a variety of pragmatic and stylistic overtones, ranging from archaic and folksy to slang, underworld jargon, and even technical terminology (e.g., color terms used by pigeon breeders). They tend to be frequent in colloquial speech but avoided in formal registers, especially scholarly or professional writing. In fictional (and recently journalistic) prose, they convey local color, energy, and intimacy, as well as sometimes indicating that characters who use them are uneducated or boorish (Friedman 2010, among others). This "special flavor" of many Turkisms is surprisingly stable, having persisted for the past century, even as other

Turkisms dropped out of common use. (See Friedman 1996 for detailed discussion of the waxing and waning fortunes of Turkisms in Macedonian through the 19th–21st cc.; Stamenov 2011 for Bulgarian.)

Friedman (2003: 27) points out that Turkish-derived vocabulary has taken on new political significance in the context of the breakup of the former Yugoslavia and the former Serbo-Croatian language into Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian, with Bosnian tending to claim Turkish lexical items as uniquely Bosnian, Croatian tending to create neologisms based on Slavic roots, Serbian tending to choose a Slavic over a Turkish synonym, and so on. The choice of whether to emphasize or de-emphasize the Turkish-derived layer of the vocabulary has become one way of artificially increasing the distinction among the BCMS varieties.

## Phraseology and semantics

Alongside lexical borrowing, Balkan Slavic languages have also engaged in loan translation or calquing of Turkish expressions. Kazazis (1969: 97–98) gives several examples, citing the work of Jašar-Nasteva: Mk *od kade na kade?* | Bg *ot kăde nakăde?* 'why?, for what reason?, apropos of what?' (lit. 'from where to where?') is modeled on Tu *nereden nereye* with the same meaning and structure; Mk *pie cigari* 'smoke' (lit. 'drink cigarettes') < Tu *sigara içmek* 'drink cigarette'. The semantic extension of 'eat' to mean 'undergo, be subjected to' is another clear calque, in phrases like Mk *jade kjotek*, Bg *jam kjutek* or *jam boj* 'get a beating' (lit. 'eat a blow') < Tu *kötek jemek*, Mk *jade dožd* 'get soaked' (lit. 'eat rain') < *yağmur yemek* (Friedman 1996: 241). Semantic extension under the influence of Turkish is seen also in Mk *pat*, Bg *păt*, BCMS *put* 'road, path', which have all taken on the additional meaning of 'time' on the model of Turkish *yol* (Kazazis 1969).

Outside of a few idiomatic expressions and extended meanings, the clearest phraseological influence from Turkish is seen in Balkan Slavic proverbs, which are sometimes almost identical to Turkish proverbs in content, and may also to some extent reflect Turkish word order. Friedman (2003: 9) points out that proverbs are often verb final in Macedonian and Bulgarian, a word order typical of Turkish but not common in Balkan Slavic outside of proverbial sayings. Friedman's examples include Bg *Na măžăt xubost ne se gleda* 'One does not pay attention to a man's looks' (lit. 'of the man beauty is not looked at'), Mk *Na komšijata kokošata po dve jajca mu nosit* 'The neighbor's chicken lays him two eggs at a time' (lit. 'of the neighbor the chicken apiece two eggs for him lays'); compare Tu *Komşunun tavuğu komşuya kaz görünür* 'The neighbor's chicken appears to be a goose' (lit. 'of neighbor his chicken to neighbor goose appears'); both of the latter meaning roughly 'the grass is greener on the other side'.

## Balkan Turkish

We turn now to effects of Balkan Slavic contact on Turkish and differences between Balkan and Standard Turkish. The Turkish presence on the Balkans started with the conquest of Gallipoli (Tu *Gelibolu*) by Ottoman troops in 1354 and the expansion of the Ottoman Empire up to the Danube River through the late 14th century. From the mid-15th century onward, the Balkan Peninsula was under control of the empire for several centuries. Large parts of Rumelia, especially the territories of today's Bulgaria, North Macedonia, Kosovo (Ks), and Greece, became the home of sizable numbers of Turkish settlers. Even after the gradual collapse of the Ottoman Empire in the aftermath of the second siege of Vienna (1683) and the establishment of the Turkish Republic (1923), a significant Turkish-speaking population remained in Bulgaria (590,000), Greece (ca. 80,000–100,000), North Macedonia (78,000), Kosovo (19,000), and Romania (especially Dobruja, 32,000). Numbers are unreliable due to unclear or shifting ethnic self-identification – Slavic-speaking <u>Gorani</u>, Torbeshi, and <u>Pomaks</u> occasionally identify or declare themselves as Turks – and ongoing emigration. Language use is not always identical to ethnic affiliation. Turkish is frequently used as a prestige language of non-Turks, especially Muslims. Many Balkan Roma, especially those in Bulgaria, speak Turkish as well. Virtually all Turkish-speaking individuals living in the Balkans, except those within the borders of Turkey, are at least bilingual.

During more than six centuries of Turkish presence in the Balkans, the local Turkish varieties have been in intensive contact with neighboring Slavic, Romance, Albanian, Roma, and Greek varieties. Slavic and other contact influence manifests itself in Balkan Turkish in the domains of lexicon, morphology, syntax, semantics, and phraseology. In some cases, it cannot be established with certainty which contact language triggered a given phenomenon. Some Balkan features arguably result from an intricate, multilingual interaction. Moreover, not all differences between Balkan Turkish (BT) and Anatolian Turkish (AT) necessarily result from contact-induced change. In some cases, Balkan Turkish preserves old features that have been lost or changed in the standard language, or some or all Turkish dialects of Anatolia. We must also reckon with internal language change in Balkan Turkish independently from other Turkish varieties that cannot be directly related to contact influence. During the last decades, Balkan Turkish has been subject to increasing influence of Standard Turkish due to mass media and the communication and mobility possibilities of globalization.

The Balkan Turkish dialects as a whole distinguish themselves from the Anatolian dialects by several features, especially in the domains of phonology, morphology, and lexicon. Internally, the Balkan Turkish dialects are divided into Eastern Rumelian Turkish (ERT) and Western Rumelian Turkish (WRT). This classification, introduced by Németh (1956), uses a bundle of eight criteria that distinguish Western Rumelian Turkish from Eastern Rumelian Turkish: representation of high vowels in open final syllables by /i/ (*kuyi, kızi* for ERT *kuyu* 'well', *kızı* 'her daughter'), invariable perfect marker -*miş* (*almiş, olmiş* for ERT *almış* 'has taken', *olmuş* 'has become'), representation of /i/ by /ı/ in all environments except first syllables and open final

syllables (*evınun* for ERT *evinin* 'of her house'; exception: *-miş*), velarization of /ö/ and /ü/ (*uç, dort* vs. ERT *üç* 'three', *dört* 'four'), abandonment of the rules of palatal harmony with some suffixes (*tutar-ler, alır-se, yolumız-e* vs. ERT *tutar-lar* 'they hold', *alır-sa* 'if s/he takes', *yolumuz-a* 'to our way'), shift of /ö/ to /ü/ or /u/ in about forty lexemes (*kupri* vs. ERT *köprü* 'bridge'), preservation of /g/ (*agaç, begenmek* vs. ST *ağaç* [aː tʃ] 'tree', *beğenmek* [bejɛnmɛk] 'to like'), and present tense in -(*i*)*y* (*söyley, gʲetiriy* vs. ST *söylüyor* 'says', *getiriyor* 'brings'; cf. Németh 1956: 12–20). Although Németh's classification relies on a very small number of informants from only a few locations and certainly needs revision in detail, the rough outlines continue to be accepted to this day, grouping the Turkish dialects of western Bulgaria, North Macedonia, Kosovo, and western Thrace together as Western Rumelian Turkish, the rest of the Balkan Turkish dialects as Eastern Rumelian Turkish. Both Gagauz, the language of a small Christian minority in Moldova and Ukraine with a written standard (roughly 150,000 speakers), and Istanbul Turkish, a variety not identical to but essential in the formation of Standard Turkish, linguistically belong to the Eastern Rumelian Turkish dialect area.

As the Balkan Turkish dialects are becoming increasingly documented, our knowledge about the dialectological map becomes more detailed and fine grained, and it turns out that some of Németh's findings and classification criteria need revision. Unfortunately, many varieties are still unexplored, and many studies are difficult to access or even completely inaccessible. Valuable data is found in master's and doctoral theses prepared in situ, which are often only locally available (some key works for Kosovo are Hafız 1985; Jable 2010; İğci 2010; for Macedonia, Eckmann 1941; 1960; 1962; Katona 1969; Jašar-Nasteva 1970; Kakuk 1972; İbrahim 1997; Axmed 2001; 2004; for Bulgaria, Kakuk 1958a; 1958b; 1961a; 1961b; Hazai 1959; 1960; Németh 1965; Karaşinik 2011; for eastern Thrace, Olcay 1966; Kalay 1998; Tosun 2003; for western Thrace, Elçin 1964; Benli 2012); the extinct Western Rumelian Turkish dialect of Adakale (henceforth abbreviated to Adk) is extensively documented in Kúnos 1907; important reference works on Gagauz are Doerfer 1959; Pokrovskaja 1964; 1978; and Menz 1999).

Selected Balkan Turkish linguistic features from various levels of grammar and lexicon are as follows.

## Phonology

Rumelian Turkish (including Standard Turkish) has abandoned the opposition of closed /ė/ vs. open /e/. Etymological /ė/ is represented either as /e/ or as /i/, e.g., *ver-* 'to give', *git-* 'to go' (Old Turkic *bėr-, kėt-*). Many Anatolian dialects preserve this opposition (Caferoğlu 1959: 246). The Turkic phoneme /ŋ/, preserved in many Anatolian dialects, has been lost in Balkan Turkish. It is most commonly represented by /n/, e.g., *anla-* 'to understand' (AT *aŋla-*; Caferoğlu 1959: 254).

Initial /k/ in velar environments is preserved in Balkan Turkish (except the dialects of the eastern Rhodopes; Mollova 1962), while it has been shifted to /g/ in most Anatolian dialects (*kardeş* vs. AT *gardaş* 'younger sibling').

Some Western Rumelian Turkish dialects display partial or full velarization of front vowels, e.g., *uti* 'flatiron' (Bg/Vidin; ST *ütü*), *gʲál-* 'to come' (Bg/Vidin; ST *gel-*), *col-* 'to come' (Ks/Mitrovica; ST *gel-*). The opposition /i/ vs. /ı/ is blurred in Western Rumelian Turkish, in which /i/ often surfaces as /ı/ except in initial syllables and in final open syllables (see above). Conversely, there are cases of original /ı/ surfacing as /i/, e.g., *çikmiş* 'has climbed' (Ks/Prizren; ST *çıkmış*).

In front vowel environments, /k/ and /g/ are palatalized. This is most extremely implemented in the dialects of Kosovo, where /k/ and /g/ are shifted to /ç/ and /c/, respectively: *cenç* 'young' (ST *genç*), *çüpek* 'dog' (ST *köpek*), *içi çeret* 'two times' (ST *iki kere*).

Palatal harmony is often disturbed in Balkan Turkish, e.g., *anne* 'mother', *kardeş* 'younger sibling' (=ST), *kıyamayler* 'they do not have the heart to' (Bg/Kyustendil; ST *kıyamıyorlar*), *çikarameyecēmizi* 'that we shall not be able to bring it out' (Tu/Tekirdağ; ST *çıkaramayacağımızı*).

Initial /h/ is often lost, e.g., *amam* 'bath' (Bg/Kyustendil; ST *hamam*), *ayvanlarımız* 'our animals' (Tu/Tekirdağ; ST *hayvanlarımız*), *aydukluk* 'brigandage' (Bg/Vidin; ST *haydutluk*), *astalansın* 'may s/he become sick' (Bg/Kyustendil; ST *hastalansın*). Conversely, there are cases in which a nonetymological /h/ is added, as in *holta* 'fishing line' (Adk; ST *olta*), *hambar* 'granary' (Adk; ST *ambar*), *hurmuş* 's/he has beaten' (Bg/Rhodopes; ST *vurmuş*). The problem of initial /h/ is highly complicated throughout Oghuz Turkic and the Turkic languages as a whole (cf. Doerfer 1981; 1982).

There are cases of metathesis such as *çölmek* 'pot' (Adk; ST *çömlek*), *adbes* 'ablution' (Bg/Vidin; ST *aptes*), *olgum* 'my son' (Ks/Peja; ST *oğlum*), *sorna* 'after' (Bg/Kyustendil; ST *sonra*), *ilmonata* 'lemonade' (Bg/Silistra; ST *limonata*), and *urba* 'robe' (Bg/Kardzhali; ST *roba*). The last two instances at the same time typify vowel prothesis, which is also found in examples such as *urum* 'Greek' (Bg/Vidin; ST *Rum*) and *ürüyamda* 'in my dream' (Tu/Edirne; ST *rüyamda*) and implemented in order to avoid certain word-initial consonants. Similar phenomena are also found in Anatolian dialects; they are partly systematic, partly idiolectal or situational.

Some Eastern Rumelian Turkish varieties display a tendency toward contraction, e.g., *sān* 'your' (Bg/Rhodopes; ST *senin*), *güllāni* 'their roses (ACC)' (Bg/Kazanlak; ST *güllerini*), *ütmē* 'in order to grind' (Tu/Edirne; ST *öğütmeye*), *büttü* 's/he raised' (Tu/Edirne; ST *büyüttü*).

The Western Rumelian Turkish dialect of Peja (Sr Peć, Tu İpek) frequently represents noninitial illabial high vowels as labial low back vowels: *alōdok* 'we would take' (ST *alırdık*), *celmisok* 'we have come' (ST *gelmişiz*), *celōçe* 'while coming' (ST *gelirken*; Jable 2010: 157).

Many Turkish dialects in North Macedonia have stress on the antepenult (like Macedonian).

The causative marker *-t-* frequently undergoes lenition in Balkan Turkish, e.g., *uzadır* 's/he prolongs' (Bg/Vidin; ST *uzatır*), *kokudur* 'to cause to smell' (Bg/Vidin; ST *kokutur*), *kurudarak* 'dryingly' (Adk; ST *kurutarak*), *uyudamadım* 'I could not put to sleep' (Adk; ST *uyutamadım*).

## Morphology

Rumelian Turkish dialects have a propensity to extensive use of the diminutive suffixes *-CAK*, *-CAz*, and *-CIK*, e.g., *balıcak* 'little fish', *kuşças* 'little bird', *adamcik* 'little man' (cf. Németh 1965: 78–79). These morphemes exist in Standard Turkish as well (*-CAK*, *-CAğIz*, *-CIK*) but are less frequently used. Besides diminution, the use of these suffixes can also express affection.

Due to substantial changes in syntax, including the syntax of subordinate clauses (see below), verbal nouns and participles such as *-DIK* and *-(y)An* are less frequent in Balkan Turkish, especially Western Rumelian Turkish, than in Standard Turkish.

Turkish varieties in North Macedonia and Bulgaria feature a denominal derivation marker for female sex in *-ka*, which has been borrowed from Slavic: *itiyarka* 'old woman' (Mk/Resen; cf. ST *ihtiyar* 'old person'), *köyka* 'woman from the village' (Bg/Vidin; cf. ST *köy* 'village'; Axmed 2004: 103–104; Németh 1965: 80).

Some dialects (or idiolects) display a tendency to overuse the causative, e.g., Adk *anna-t-tır-iy* 'he tells' (double causative, ST *anla-t-ır*), *al-dır-t-tır-ır* 'he makes them take' (triple causative, ST *al-dır-ır*). The first person plural personal ending surfaces as *-sık* in some Western Rumelian Turkish varieties instead of common *-(V)z*, e.g., *tutarsık*, *tutarız* 'we hold' (Ks/Vushtrria; İğci 2010: 203, 138).

There are various forms corresponding to the Standard Turkish present-tense marker *-Iyor*. In Western Rumelian Turkish, forms in *-(i)y* prevail: Adk *uyantıriyler* 'they are wakening him/her up' (ST *uyandırıyorlar*), *işidiyiz* 'we are listening' (ST *işitiyoruz*), *isteyniz* 'you want' (ST *istiyorsunuz*). Toward the east, the picture becomes more diverse, with variants such as *-(I)yo*, *-(I)yI*, *-(I)yU*, *-yvArI/-IvArI*, etc.: Bg/Kazanlak *istāyo* 's/he wants' (ST *istiyor*), Tu/Tekirdağ *istiyom* 'I want' (ST *istiyorum*), *isteyi* 'he wants' (ST *istiyor*), *istiyüz* 'we want' (ST *istiyoruz*), *biliyüsün* 'you know' (ST *biliyorsun*), *oturuyu* 's/he is sitting' (ST *oturuyor*), *çalışıyız* 'we are trying' (ST *çalışıyoruz*), *çalışıyular* 'they are trying' (ST *çalışıyorlar*), Tu/Edirne *isteyem* 'I want' (ST *istiyorum*), *isteyverü* 'he wants' (ST *istiyor*), *başlayvarı* 's/he begins' (ST *başlıyor*), *merak idiveri*

's/he gives importance' (ST *merak ediyor*), *oynayarı* 's/he is dancing' (ST *oynuyor*). The morphological variation is partly idiolectal, partly microdialectal. The dialect of Ohrid does not contain a renewed present-tense form; here, the aorist in *-(V)r* covers both focal and nonfocal present-tense uses (Axmed 2004: 88). This may apply to some other Balkan Turkish dialects as well.

There is a free-copula verb *i-* with a much broader morphological combinability and scope of use in Western Rumelian Turkish than in other Turkish varieties, including present tense and perfect forms: *Eşte benim Haci Kurtiş üçüncü kuşak ıım ben* 'And now I, I am Hadji Kurtiş, I am the third generation' (Mk/Vrapčište; İbrahim 1997: 157); *İdrizle Zekir adlari imiştır onların* 'Their names were İdriz and Zekir' (Mk/Vrapčište; İbrahim 1997: 151).

The question particle *mI* is missing in the dialects of the Ohrid Prespa region; instead, sentence questions are distinguished from assertive sentences by intonation (Axmed 2004: 98–99).

## Syntax

Turkish is usually classified as an SOV (subject-object-verb) language. This word order is often violated in Balkan Turkish, with especially striking deviations in Western Rumelian Turkish. The predicate often appears in the first or second position in the sentence *İkarlar ellerıni yesınler akşamlık* 'They wash their hands in order to eat dinner' (Mk/Resen; Axmed 2001: 160). The negation particle *dil* (ST *değil*) is often mentioned sentence initially: *Dil ısık memnun hükümetten* 'We are not satisfied with the government' (Mk/Vrapčište; İbrahim 1997: 143).

Unlike Standard Turkish, subordinate clauses are often postposed in Balkan Turkish. Complement clauses, which are mostly formed with verbal nouns in Standard Turkish, are frequently realized with finite strategies in Balkan Turkish, including subjunctive constructions as in the following example: *Anası gene istēyi güreşsin* 'But his mother wants him to wrestle' (Tu/Tekirdağ; Tosun 2003: 238). The subjunctive function is performed by finite mood forms such as voluntatives and the optative. Constructions involving the verbal noun in *-mAK* occur as well, but they often appear in the dative, resulting in a marker *-mAGA*, *-mAA*, or *-mA*, which assumes functions comparable to Standard Average European infinitives: *Bir arap gelmiş kapıya, içeri girmā istāyo* 'There is a slave at the door, he wants to come in' (Bg/Kazanlak; Kakuk 1958b: 243). This bias in favor of the dative is stronger in the western varieties than in the eastern ones. While in the Turkish varieties in Bulgaria, Kosovo, and Turkey, subjunctive and nominal/infinitive strategies occur side by side with partly predictable distributional patterns, some Western Rumelian Turkish varieties in North Macedonia have by and large abandoned the verbal noun in *-mAK* and the infinitive in *-mA(GA)*, using subjunctive constructions in practically all SoA (state of affairs)-type complement clauses: *Lākin at korkay yaklaşsın, su içsın* 'But the horse is afraid to come closer and drink the water' (Mk/Kumanovo; Eckmann 1962: 130).

Proposition-type complement clauses also prefer finite complementation strategies over those with verbal nouns. Such constructions often feature a free complementizer *ki*, an item borrowed from Persian in the Middle Turkic era: *Ama çöcük sonadan anlar ki o kız idır ne yapti boyle ona* 'But afterward the boy understands that it is that girl who did it to him' (Mk/Struga; Axmed 2004: 267). This example also features a relative clause introduced by the question word *ne* 'what', a phenomenon frequently encountered both in Eastern Rumelian Turkish and Western Rumelian Turkish.

Many Balkan Turkish varieties liberally use borrowed conjunctions and particles in sentence building. The Albanian question particle *a* is used to form a whether-or construction in the following example: *İstemiş em o ikinci muabet bu şindi anlasın a dır gerçek a yok* 'He wanted to understand by this second conversation whether it is true or not' (Mk/Zdunje; İbrahim 1997: 116). The Albanian particle *se* appears in the meaning 'lest, otherwise' in the following example: *Sen o fuçilara dokonmayasın se olorson taş* 'You shall not touch these barrels, otherwise you will turn into stone' (Ks/Prizren; Hafız 1985: 212).

## Lexicon

Balkan Turkish displays lexical peculiarities that distinguish it from either Standard Turkish or Anatolian Turkish, or both. Many cases concern loanwords, which differ locally according to the dominant contact language(s). Examples are *çıbır* 'bucket' (Bg/Vidin; Sr *čabar*), *guska* 'goose' (Bg/Vidin; Sr *guska*; ST *kaz*), *kokoroz* (Adk), *kukuruz* (Bg/Vidin), *kolomoç* (Ks/Mamusha) 'corn' (Sr *kukuruz*; ST *mısır*), *koliba* 'hut' (Bg/Vidin; Bg *koliba*; ST *kulübe*), *maçka* 'cat' (Ks, Mk; Sr *mačka*; ST *kedi*), *pakos* 'malice' (Adk; Sr *pakost*; ST *fenalık*), *praznik* 'festival' (Bg/Vidin; Bg *praznik*; ST *bayram*), *puyka* 'Turkey' (Adk, BG/Vidin; Bg *pujka*; ST *hindi*), *şporet* 'stove' (Ks/Deçan; Sr *šporet*; ST *ocak*), *struya* 'electricity' (Mk/Vrapčište; Mk *struja*; ST *elektrik*), *yasla* 'manger' (Adk; Sr *jasle*; ST *yemlik*). Occasionally, there are also peculiar lexemes without any obvious borrowing background, such as *öftermek* 'to push' (Ks/Vushtrria; ST *itmek*).

Both borrowed nouns and verbs can be converted into Turkish verbs by light verbs such as *et-* 'to do' and *yap-* 'to make', e.g., *komanda et-* 'to order' (Bg/Silistra; Bg *komanda* 'command'), *zametsva yap-* 'to replace' (Bg/Silistra; Bg *zamestvam* 'to replace'). The productive derivation marker *-lA-*, which is normally a denominal verb suffix, can also be used to integrate foreign nouns and verbs into the language, e.g., *bırkala-* 'to rummage' (Bg/Vidin; Bg *bărkam* 'to rummage'), *pipla-* 'to touch' (Bg/Vidin; Bg *pipam* 'to touch'), *poplavale-* 'to flood' (Mk/Ohrid; Mk *poplava* 'flood'), *polagale-* 'to take an exam' (Mk/Ohrid; Mk *polaga* 'to take [an exam]').

Some lexemes display a semantic shift, such as *patlican* 'tomato' (Mk/Vrapčište; ST 'eggplant'), *maksım* 'child' (Bg/Vidin; ST *masum* 'innocent' < Arabic *ma'ṣūm*), *kusur* 'small change' (WRT; ST *küsur* 'fractions, fragments' < Arabic *kusūr*), and *çimmek* 'to swim' (Mk/Ohrid; AT 'to bathe').

Some lexemes are shared by Balkan Turkish and some Anatolian dialects but absent from Standard Turkish, such as *kızan* 'child, boy' (Tu/Tekirdağ, Edirne).

## Phraseology

Phraseology has been influenced by contact languages, a phenomenon best investigated for Macedonian Turkish, where we find *ders tutmak* 'to give (hold) a class' (Mk *drži čas*; ST *ders yapmak*), *öyle denilen* 'so-called' (Mk *taka narečen*), *maaşlar buzlandırıldı* 'the wages were frozen' (Mk *platite se zamrznaa*; ST *maaşlar donduruldu*), *televizyon bakmak* 'to watch TV' (Mk *gleda televizija*; ST *televizyon seyretmek*), etc. (Axmed 1997).

Julian Rentzsch
Catherine *Rudin*

---

## Bibliography

Axmed, Oktaj 1997. Nekoi kalki vo jazikot na turcite vo Republika Makedonija navlezeni preku makedonskiot jazik. In: Cvetkovski, Živko et al. (eds.), *Tret naučen sobir na mladi makedonisti: Zbornik na trudovi.* Skopje, 389–398.

Axmed, Oktaj 2001. *Fonetski i leksički karakteristiki na turskiot govor vo Resen i Resensko.* Unpublished MA thesis, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje.

Axmed, Oktaj 2004. *Morfosintaksa na turskite govori od ohridsko-prespanskiot region.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje.

Benli, Derya Yeşim 2012. *Gümülcine Bulat Köyü Örneğinde Batı Trakya Ağzı* (The dialect of western Thrace typified by the village of Bulat near Komotini). Yüksek Lisans thesis, Ordu University, Ordu.

Burov, Stojan, and Penka Pexlivanova 1999. *Malăk rečnik na čuždite dumi v bălgarskija ezik.* Veliko Tarnovo.

Caferoğlu, Ahmet 1959. Die anatolischen und rumelischen Dialekte. In: Deny, Jean et al. (eds.), *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*, vol. I. Wiesbaden, 239–260.

Čašule, Ilija. 1988. The development of the Macedonian verbal noun in the context of the loss of the infinitive. *International journal of Slavic linguistics and poetics* 37, 61–71.

Doerfer, Gerhard 1959. Das Gagausische. In: Deny, Jean et al. (eds.), *Philologiae turcicae fundamenta*, vol. I. Wiesbaden, 260–271.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1981. Materialien zu türk. *h-* (I). *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, N.F. 1, 93–141.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1982. Materialien zu türk. *h-* (II). *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, N.F. 2, 138–168.

Doerfer, Gerhard. 1990. Die Stellung des Osmanischen im Kreise des Oghusischen und seine Vorgeschichte. In: Hazai, György (ed.), *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. I. Budapest, 13–34.

Eckmann, János. 1941. Die türkische Mundart von Warna. *Körösi Csoma Archívum* 3, 144–214.

Eckmann, János. 1960. Dinler (Makedonya) Türk Ağzı (The Turkish dialect of Dinler [Macedonia]). *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı – Belleten* 8, 189–204.

Eckmann, János 1962. Kumanova (Makedonya) Türk Ağzı (The Turkish dialect of Kumanovo [Macedonia]). In: Eckmann, János et al. (eds.), *Németh Armağanı* (Festschrift Németh). Ankara, 111–144.

Elçin, Şükrü. 1964. Florina Ağzı (The dialect of Florina). *Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları* 1/2, 244–253.

Friedman, Victor A. 1996. Turkish influence in modern Macedonian and the Turkish lexical element in the languages of the Republic of Macedonia. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 32/2, 133–150.

Friedman, Victor A. 2003. *Turkish in Macedonia and beyond: Studies in contact, typology and other phenomena in the Balkans and the Caucasus*. Wiesbaden.

Friedman, Victor A. 2006. West Rumelian Turkish in Macedonia and adjacent areas. In: Boeschoten, Hendrik, and Lars Johanson (eds.), *Turkic languages in contact*. Wiesbaden, 27–45.

Friedman, Victor A. 2010. Introduction. In: Friedman, Victor A. (ed.), *Bai Ganyo: Incredible tales of a modern Bulgarian: Aleko Konstantinov*. Madison.

Grannes, Alf 1996. *Turco-Bulgarica: Articles in English and French concerning Turkish influence on Bulgarian.* Wiesbaden.

Grannes, Alf et al. 2002. *A dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian*. Oslo.

Hafız, Nimetullah 1985. *Kosova Türk Halk Edebiyatı Metinleri* (Turkish folklore texts from Kosovo). Prishtina.

Hazai, György. 1959. Les dialectes Turcs du Rhodope. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 9/2, 205–229.

Hazai, György. 1960. Textes Turcs du Rhodope. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 10/2, 185–229.

İbrahim, Nazim 1997. *Vrapçişte ve Çevresi Türk Ağzı* (*Makedonya*) (The Turkish dialect of Vrapčište and its surroundings [Macedonia]). Yüksek Lisans thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.

Ibrahimović, Faruk 2012. *Rječnik turcizama u bosanskom jeziku za tumačenjem i prevodom na engleski jezik*. Tuzla.

İğci, Alpay 2010. *Vıçıtırın-Kosova Türk Ağzı* (The Kosovo Turkish dialect of Vushtrria). Yüksek Lisans thesis, Ege University, Izmir.

Ilčev, Stefan et al. 1982. *Rečnik na čuždite dumi v bǎlgarskija ezik*. Sofia.

Jable, Ergin 2010. *Kosova Türk Ağızları. İnceleme–Metin–Sözlük* (The Turkish dialects of Kosovo: Analysis, texts, vocabulary). Unpublished PhD dissertation, Sakarya University, Serdivan.

Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera 1970. Gostivarskiot turski govor: Prilog kon izučavanjeto na turskite dijalekti vo Makedonija. In: Panov, Mitko (ed.), *Gostivarskiot Kraj*, vol. II: *Makedonskiot, albanskiot i turskiot govor*. Gostivar, 275–396.

Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera. 1978. Za formalnite i funkcionalnite osobenosti na reduplikacijata vo makedonskiot jazik. *Makedonski jazik* 29, 25–60.

Kakuk, Suzanne. 1958a. Le dialecte Turc de Kazanlyk I. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 8/2, 169–187.

Kakuk, Suzanne. 1958b. Textes Turcs de Kazanlyk II. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 8/3, 241–311.

Kakuk, Suzanne. 1961a. Die türkische Mundart von Küstendil und Michailovgrad. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 11/3–4, 301–386.

Kakuk, Susanne. 1961b. Türkische Volksmärchen aus Küstendil. *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 1961, 90–94.

Kakuk, Suzanne. 1972. Le dialecte Turc d'Ohrid en Macédoine. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 26/2–3, 227–282.

Kalay, Emin 1998. *Edirne İli Ağızları* (The dialects of Edirne province). Ankara.

Karaşinik, Bahtışen 2011. *Silistre* (*Silistra*) *İli ve Yöresi Ağızları* (The dialects of Silistra province and its surroundings). Yüksek Lisans thesis, Trakya University, Edirne.

Katona, Louis K. 1969. Le dialecte turc de la Macédoine de l'Ouest. *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı – Belleten* 17, 57–194.

Kazazis, Kostas 1969. The status of Turkisms in the present-day Balkan languages. In: Birnbaum, Henrik, and Speros Vryonis (eds.), *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and change: Contributions to the International Balkan Conferences held at UCLA, October 23–28, 1969*. The Hague, 87–116.

Koneski, Blaže 1965. *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje.

Kramer, Christina. 1992. The use of Turkisms in Balkan languages as reflected in Konstantinov's novel *Baj Ganjo*. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 28/1–2, 44–60.

Krăsteva, Vesela 2000. *Rečnik na turskite dumi v săvremennija bălgarski pečat.* Sofia.

Kúnos, Ignaz 1907. *Materialien zur Kenntnis des rumelischen Türkisch*, vol. I: *Türkische Volksmärchen aus Adakale, gesammelt, in Transkription herausgegeben und mit Einleitung versehen*. Leipzig.

Markov, B. 1955. Nekoi xibridni tvorbi vo makedonskiot jazik. *Makedonski Jazik* 6/2, 152–164.

Matras, Yaron 1990. On the emergence of finite subordination in Balkan Turkish. In: Rona, Bengsiu (ed.), *Current issues in Turkish linguistics: Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Ankara, 120–133.

Matras, Yaron 2006. Layers of convergent syntax in Macedonian Turkish. In: Boeschoten, Hendrik, and Lars Johanson (eds.), *Turkic languages in contact*. Wiesbaden, 46–62.

Menz, Astrid 1999. *Gagausische Syntax. Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden.

Milev, Aleksandăr et al. 1978. *Rečnik na čuždite dumi v bălgarskija ezik*. Sofia.

Mirčev, Kiril. 1952. Za sădbata na turcizmite v bălgarski ezik. *Izvestija na Instituta za bălgarski ezik* 2, 117–127.

Mladenović, Miloš. 1962. Turkish language influence upon the Balkan Slavs. *Études slaves et Est-Européennes / Slavic and East-European studies* 7/1–2, 13–22.

Mollova, Mefküre. 1962. Les *ga*-dialectes turcs dans les Balkans et leur rapport avec les autres langues turques. *Balkansko jezikoznanie* 4, 107–130.

Németh, Julius 1956. *Zur Einteilung der türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens*. Sofia.

Németh, Julius 1965. *Die Türken von Vidin. Sprache, Folklore, Religion*. Budapest.

Olcay, Selâhattin 1966. *Doğu Trakya Yerli Ağzı: İnceleme–Derleme–Dizin* (The local dialect of Eastern Thrace: Analysis, collected materials, index). Ankara.

Pokrovskaja, Ljudmila A. 1964. *Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka: Fonetika i morfologija.* Moscow.

Pokrovskaja, Ljudmila A. 1978. *Sintaksis gagauzskogo jazyka v sravnitel´nom osveščenii.* Moscow.

Rollet, Jacques 1996. *Les turcismes en serbo-croate, bulgare, grec, roumain et hongrois*. Istanbul.

*Rudin*, Catherine 2012. Bai Ganyo's revenge: The persistence of Turkisms in modern Bulgarian. *Balkanistica* 25/1, 275–290.

Schaller, Helmut 1972. Die türkischen Lehnwörter in der bulgarischen Sprache. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 9/1–2: 174–186.

Škaljić, Abdulah 1966. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo.

Skok, Petar 1935. Restes de la langue turque dans les Balkans. *Revue internationale des études balkaniques* 2, 247–260.

Stachowski, Stanisław 1961. *Przyrostki obcego pochodzenia w języku serbochorwackim*. Cracow.

Stamenov, Maksim 2011. *Sădbata na turcizmite v bălgarskija ezik i v bălgarskata kultura*. Sofia.

Tosun, İlker 2003. *Tekirdağ Merkez İlçe ve Köyleri Ağızları* (The dialects of the central district of Tekirdağ and its villages). Yüksek Lisans thesis, Trakya University, Edirne.

Tryjarski, Edward 1990. Balkan dialects. In: Hazai, György (ed.), *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. I. Budapest, 414–453.

Tufan, Şirin 2010. *Language convergence in Gostivar Turkish – Macedonia: Grammar and language contact phenomena*. Saarbrücken.

Xhanari, Lindita, and Kledi Satka. 2014. "Balkan Turkisms" and their lexical and grammatical features. *Palaver* 3/2: 175–196.