

Bulgarian Turkish: The Linguistic Effects of Recent Nationality Policy*

CATHERINE RUDIN AND ALI EMINOV
Wayne State College

Abstract. Changing policies toward ethnic minorities in Bulgaria have led to dramatic changes in the sociolinguistic status of Turkish and Bulgarian in ethnically Turkish areas of the country. The major trends over the last several generations have been a shift towards more frequent and fluent use of Bulgarian by more members of the community and the emergence of significant lexical and grammatical interference from Bulgarian in the native Turkish dialect. However, the most recent policy shifts have led to increased Turkish nationalism and perhaps to a resurgence of literacy in Turkish.

Approximately one million of the roughly 9 million inhabitants of modern Bulgaria are ethnic Turks and native speakers of Turkish.¹ The social and linguistic situation of this minority group has changed considerably within the last two generations. The aim of this paper is to describe the sociolinguistic status of the Turkish community in Bulgaria at the present time, concentrating on one particular village where we have spent considerable time (Eminov is a native son, and Rudin in the role of daughter-in-law), but with some more general remarks and a brief look at how the situation has changed and is changing.

Most of the Turks now living in Bulgaria are descendants of colonists who were settled there during the Ottoman period. In spite of the centuries of separating them from their origins in Anatolia and Asia Minor, these Turks have not become assimilated into the surrounding Bulgarian culture but have preserved their own language and culture – slightly different from that of modern Turkey but nonetheless distinctly Turkish.

Until recently this cultural separateness was encouraged by the fact that many Turks had very little contact with Bulgarians: they tended to be concentrated in certain parts of the country, - for instance in remote mountain villages in the eastern Rhodopes of southeastern Bulgaria and the Dobrudja region of northeastern Bulgaria – which were almost solidly Turkish. Turks living in remote mountain villages of the Rhodopes had very little contact with Bulgarians. Men, who traveled to the city for trade or other purposes, often learned some Bulgarian; but women and children had no use for any language other than Turkish, and were in general totally monolingual.

Long established patterns of education also encouraged community isolation. During the Ottoman period the organization and management of educational and other cultural institutions was left up to each ethno-religious group to handle as it saw fit. Turkish villages and Turkish neighborhoods in towns and cities had Turkish schools, so even those members of the community who had some schooling did not necessarily know Bulgarian. As Grannes (1989) notes, prior to Bulgarian independence from Ottoman rule in 1878, Turkish was the high-status language in the country. Consequently, the influence of Turkish on Bulgarian was considerable. Bulgarians living in or near Turkish communities learned Turkish, while the Turks remained largely monolingual. Prominent Bulgarian writers used many Turkish

**Anthropological Linguistics*, 32(1-2):149-162 (1990)

words, both literary and colloquial, in their work. After Bulgarian independence, the direction of interference was reversed. Bulgarian became the high-status language and Bulgarians no longer had a strong incentive to learn Turkish. On the other hand, Turkish speakers felt a need to learn Bulgarian, and Bulgarian words slowly started to enter Turkish literary and colloquial language.

However, the patterns of education established in Bulgaria during the Ottoman period persisted until after World War II. Even though the 1879 constitution of Bulgaria had mandated compulsory education for all children and compulsory study of Bulgarian in minority schools, these provisions of the constitution were not implemented for a variety of reasons.

All this changed dramatically after World War II, as a result of the implementation and enforcement of the educational policies of the new communist government. All Muslim religious schools were closed. Turkish schools which had been private and community run for hundreds of years were nationalized. During the 1950's and increasingly thereafter, the policy of compulsory education for all children, including Bulgarian language as required subject, began to be strictly enforced. This meant that all young people - even girls - had at least some acquaintance with Bulgarian. Educational policy in Bulgaria with regard to Turks has gone through a series of twists and turns, sometimes even encouraging literacy in Turkish as well as Bulgarian, but the general trend has been greater and greater emphasis on Bulgarian as the language of the schools.

Between 1960 and 1970 all Turkish-language schools were merged with Bulgarian schools. After the completion of the merger of Turkish schools with Bulgarian schools, studying Turkish language became an optional subject from first through the ninth grade, and only if the parents requested such instruction. As far as we are aware no Turkish language classes have been offered in Bulgaria since 1970. Consequently, those Turkish speakers who began their educational careers in the early 1970's don't know how to read and write in their language.²

After 1970 the Bulgarian government took decisive steps to impoverish written, and indirectly spoken Turkish, by requiring native Turkish writers to substitute Bulgarian words in place of Turkish words. For that purpose an extensive list of Turkish words and their Bulgarian-Russian equivalents were drawn up as a guide to editors and writers. Special style editors were appointed to make sure that all submissions for publication adhered to the new requirements. Those native Turkish writers who continued to use the now "forbidden" words in their writings were heavily censored and reprimanded. Works submitted in the unapproved style, regardless of merit, were denied publication (Çavus 1988:67). These steps quickly led to the elimination of most native Turkish literature in Bulgaria. By January 1985 the entire question of Turkish language instruction became moot since the Bulgarian government officially declared that there were no longer any Turks in Bulgaria.³ Between the end of 1984 and November 1989 the government took additional steps against the use of Turkish language by prohibiting its use in public places. The bilingual thrice-weekly paper *Yeni Isik* and the bilingual monthly *Yeni Hayat* began to appear in Bulgarian only. Turkish language pages of regional newspapers in areas with large Turkish concentrations were eliminated. The daily Turkish language broadcasts on Radio Sofia ceased. Orders were issued to responsible authorities to

implement and enforce decrees against the speaking of Turkish in public places and against the use of Turkish names in places of work.⁴ Such repressive policies culminated in the exodus of over 300,000 Turks to Turkey during the summer months of 1989, leading to serious social and economic dislocations in Bulgaria.

On November 10, 1989 the long-time leader of Bulgaria and architect of the forced assimilation policy, Todor Zhivkov, was ousted from power in a parliamentary coup. A number of close Zhivkov loyalists were also purged from positions of power. The new leadership moved quickly to repudiate the excesses of the Zhivkov regime and promised to establish a more democratic political system. On December 29, 1989 the government announced the end of forced assimilation of Turks and other Muslims by declaring that it had been a grave political error and gave assurances that in the future all people in Bulgaria would have the freedom to choose their names, religion, and language. That decision triggered a well-organized Bulgarian nationalist backlash in early January, 1990. Demonstrations were held in Sofia, and in a number of cities with large Turkish populations. The demonstrators called on the government to rescind its decision and submit the minority issue to a national referendum. The government stood firm and was able to persuade the leaders of various factions in the country that the recognition and protection of minority rights was in the national interest. So far, enabling legislation has been approved to allow Turks and other Muslims to reclaim their Muslim names. Turkish parents can, once again, choose the names of their new born children. Various decrees against speaking Turkish in public, Muslim women wearing traditional clothes, traditional Muslim funerary practices, and the practice of Islam have been abolished. At this time, it is not clear when and if bilingual education for Turkish speakers will be reestablished.

Changes in the government's language and educational policies have had a significant impact on the language of the Turkish minority. The institution and implementation of compulsory education after World War II and the compulsory study of Bulgarian in Turkish schools during the 1950s raised the previously low rate of literacy and bilingualism among the Turkish speaking population.⁵ Another major change for most Turks has been in the degree of contact with Bulgarians and Bulgarian language in everyday life. During the period of collectivization in the Rhodope region in the early 1960s many Turks left their homes in the mountains for a easier life in the already established collective farms in the fertile plains; whole villages sometimes moved to new locations where a trip to the nearest fair-sized town meant a few minutes' train or bus ride, rather than a long day's hike. Others left for cities in search of factory jobs. Even for those who stayed behind, radio, television, and improved transportation and communication networks have increased contacts with Bulgarians to some extent. All of these changes led toward increased use of Bulgarian language by Turkish speakers. On the other hand, the forced assimilation campaign between 1984 and 1989 increased social isolation between Turks and Bulgarians, partially reversing the trend of recent decades.

The village with which we are most familiar is Polyanovo, near the city of Ajtos, in the Burgas region of east-central Bulgaria. This village is inhabited almost entirely by Turks, the majority of whom migrated there from the village of Avramovo in the eastern Rhodopes some 30 years ago [1961], at the time of

collectivization. Of approximately ninety households in the village, all but ten are Turkish.⁶ The only Bulgarians in the village are older couples, widows and widowers and one middle-aged couple; there are no Bulgarian children or young people. Two Gypsy families live just outside the village, and play a marginal role in village life. The local collective is worked and administered entirely by Turks, with the exception of one Bulgarian woman who sells bread and weighs the harvested crops.

Polyanovo is thus an overwhelmingly Turkish environment and Turkish is by far the majority language. Nevertheless, Bulgarian influence is present in the village. Beside the few Bulgarians who actually live in it, native Bulgarian kindergarten teachers come in daily to supervise the young children, and during the summer young people from the nearby Pioneer work camp come in to drink and hang around the village bar and general store in the evenings. In addition, many adult male residents of the village have jobs outside, a factor that brings them into daily contact with Bulgarians; and almost everyone goes to the nearby towns and cities at least once in a while. The cities of Karnobat, Aitos, and Burgas are easily reached by train, bus or personal car from the village - easily enough to make going to the city for an afternoon of shopping or a movie perfectly reasonable. Besides, a number of villagers have relatives living in Aitos who visit them quite frequently. Since every household has a television set, young people and children spend many hours watching television. Most significantly, all school-age children attend school where instruction is entirely in Bulgarian, and Turkish students are required to speak with one another in Bulgarian while at school. As a result, nearly all the residents of Polyanovo are bilingual to some degree.

Our definition of a bilingual is "a person who is able to produce grammatical sentences in more than one language" (Lehiste 1988:1). This definition is broad enough to include a range from persons who are effectively monolingual but can produce limited number of grammatical sentences in a second language to those who show equal facility in more than one language and who can switch with ease between languages. Not all bilinguals produce equally correct grammatical sentences. Most bilinguals, in fact, frequently deviate from the norms of either language - that is, either language may interfere with the production of grammatical sentences in the other at a number of levels - phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and lexis. Moreover, bilinguals differ in the degree of interference at a given level.

Our data indicate that the changes in Bulgarian educational policy and amount of Turkish speakers' contact with Bulgarian over the past half century have resulted in quite different linguistic repertoires for Turks of different ages and genders. Older women are effectively monolingual, although even they exhibit some lexical influence from Bulgarian in their Turkish, as we shall see.⁷ Most men born before about 1935, who completed their education before Bulgarian language study became compulsory in the 1950s, speak Bulgarian very poorly. Middle-aged people - those born between approximately 1935 and the late 1940s - are usually quite fluent in Bulgarian, but at a clearly nonnative level, and make many grammatical errors. This is the group that had Bulgarian as a required subject in school but did not learn it as young children. Women of the middle-age group are generally

somewhat less fluent than their male contemporaries, partly because few girls went past primary school in the past, and partly because most women work on collective farms near the village and have less contact with Bulgarians than men do.

The younger generation - those born after about 1950 - are for the most part quite fluent in Bulgarian; many speak it essentially natively and some are actually more comfortable in Bulgarian than Turkish. In his age group the sex difference evident in older and middle-aged speakers disappears. Even though girls still tend to leave school early, this group learned the language at a young age and has had continuous opportunity to use it, unlike the preceding generation. The youngest children do not know Bulgarian, but as soon as they enter kindergarten they acquire it extremely quickly. Even in heavily Turkish settings as Polyanovo the kindergarten teachers are Bulgarians, and they require the children to speak Bulgarian even among themselves.

In addition to differences in which languages are used, the residents of Polyanovo differ in the extent and type of influence the two languages have on each other. The following linguistic examples are taken from informal conversations and letters; they are spontaneously produced and typical of normal speech within the ethnic Turkish community.⁸

Sentence (1), with its apparently random gender marking, was written by Ali's brother Raif, who was born in 1944 and is a representative of the middle-aged group of Bulgarian speakers (fluent but not natively like).

- (1) *Minaloto ljato i tozi ljtao rabotim krastavici.*
last (f)-the(n) summer(n) and this(m) summer(n) we-work cucumbers
'Las summer and this summer we work (growing) cucumbers.'

In this sentence the neuter noun *ljato* 'summer' is modified by one feminine and one masculine adjective and a neuter article. Among Bulgarians the stereotypical view of Turkish speech is that they can never get their gender agreement right, and in fact this type of error is frequent among older and middle-aged Turkish speakers, probably reflecting the lack of grammatical gender in Turkish. Such errors are, however, not found in the speech of younger Turks.

Sentences (2) and (3) are two more examples of grammatical errors in the Bulgarian of middle-aged speakers. In (2) an impersonal construction is mistakenly treated as personal: the correct construction would be *mene me njamase v kusti*.

- (2) *Az puk njamah v kusti.*
I though I-wasn't at home
'But I wasn't home.'

Sentence (3) shows incorrect use of a definite article with another determiner.

- (3) *I tie kratkite redove te pisa ot Ajtos.*
and these short-the lines you I-write from Ajtos
'I write these short lines to you from Ajtos.'

Such examples could be multiplied ad infinitum, but the point should be clear; middle-aged Turks make errors typical of second language learners. Younger Turks in general do not make such errors.

One example of Turkish influence that does affect even younger speakers is reduplication with *m* to mean ‘and stuff’ both in Turkish and Bulgarian. Several examples are given below: (4a) is entirely Turkish, (4b) entirely Bulgarian, and (4c) contains reduplication of a Bulgarian word, *svetno*, in an otherwise Turkish sentence. This type of reduplication is also used by some Bulgarians, but is considered a turkicism (Grannes 1978).

- (4a) *Korekoma gittim pantul mantul aldim.*
 Corecom-to I-went pants RED I-got
 ‘I went to Corecom (and) got some pants and stuff.’
- (4b) *Jufka mufka varis naj-napred v tendzereto. . .*
 noodle RED you-boil first in the pot-the
 ‘First you boil the noodles and stuff in the pot. . .’
- (4c) *Svetno msvetno hepsi oluyor.*
 colored RED all it-does
 ‘Colored and everything, it makes all kinds (of pictures).’

It is not surprising, certainly, that the native Turkish of these speakers influence their nonnative Bulgarian. More interesting is the degree to which Bulgarian influence is evidence in the Turkish, of not only of younger, bilingual speakers, but to a certain extent also of older people and even monolinguals. All the Polyanovo Turks use Bulgarian loanwords frequently. Many of these are lexical borrowings of the most expected sort, that is, words for culture-linked items or concepts that have been taken over from the surrounding Bulgarian society: government bureaucracy with its alphabet soup of agency acronyms, education, jobs, and technology acquired in post-Ottoman times, like cars and refrigerators. These words are used by even monolingual speakers; they have fully entered the everyday vocabulary of the Turkish community and are used just like ordinary Turkish words, with appropriate grammatical endings and normal Turkish syntax. Some examples in context are given in (5); a few more words of this type are shown in (6). (Bulgarian lexical items and their translations appear in bold type in these and subsequent examples.)

- (5a) *Ispitlerimi basariyle kazanmami dilediler.*
 exams-my-ACC success-with passing-my-ACC they wished
 ‘They wished me success in passing my **exams**.’
- (5b) O TKZSde **glaven agronom** oldu.
 he collective farm-in head agronomist became
 ‘He became a **chief agronomist** in the **collective farm**.’

(5c) *Bu butilkayi al hladilnike koy.*
 this bottle-ACC take refrigerator-in put
 ‘Take this **bottle** (and) put it in the **refrigerator**.’

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------|------------------|
| (6) | <i>magaziner(ka)</i> | storekeeper (f.) |
| | <i>drugarka</i> | teacher |
| | <i>radiostancija</i> | radio station |
| | <i>deveti septemvri</i> | 9 September |
| | <i>purvi mai</i> | 1 May |
| | <i>djado mraz</i> | Santa Claus |
| | <i>detska gradina</i> | kindergarten |
| | <i>tetradka</i> | notebook |
| | <i>himikalka</i> | pen (ballpoint) |
| | <i>lenta</i> | tape, lane |
| | <i>MVR</i> | police |
| | <i>globa</i> | fine |
| | <i>castno</i> | privately owned |
| | <i>otpusk</i> | vacation |

Somewhat less expectedly, many Bulgarian words are used even when a perfectly good Turkish equivalent exists, and even though they have nothing to do with modern technology or Bulgarian society. Such words include common nouns, adjectives, and adverbs, as shown in (7):

(7a) *Babamin bratovcedinin güveysi.*
 father-my-POSS cousin-his-POSS son-in-law-his
 ‘He is my father’s **cousin**’s son-in-law.’

(7b) *Brat daha burda ya.*
 brother still here-at emphatic.
 ‘(Your) **brother** is still here.’

(7c) *Babam bir diva patka vurmus.*
 father-my a wild duck killed
 ‘My father has killed a **wild duck**.’

(7d) *Baya moderno bir sey o.*
 quite modern a thing it
 ‘It’s quite a **modern** thing.’

(7e) *Arabada bir sum cikti.*
 car-in a noise arose
 ‘A **noise** started up in the car.’

(7f) *Vinagi asagiliyor zapadi.*
 always he-puts-down West-the
 ‘He’s **always** putting down the **West**.’

Interestingly, borrowings also include conjunctions and other minor categories. In fact, one of the most frequent Bulgarian words in our Turkish data is *obace* ‘however’.

- (8a) *Resim var pak sesi yok.*
 picture there-is but voice-its there-isn't
 ‘There’s picture, **but** there isn’t any sound.’
- (8b) *Recep obace beygirleri hiç düşünmemiş.*
 Recep however horses-ACC at-all he-didn't-think
 ‘Recep **however** didn’t think about the horses at all.’
- (8c) *Bana bakma ce evde yok.*
 me look-NEG because house-in he-isn't
 ‘Don’t look at me **because** he’s not at home.’
- (8d) *Benim mastikayı daze oturmussun içmeye.*
 my mastica-ACC even you-sat to-drink
 ‘You’ve **even** sat down to drink my mastika.’
- (8e) *Uz adami aramaya gelmiş.*
 as-if man-ACC to-look she-came
 ‘**It seems** she came to look for the man.’

There are even a few candidates for possible transference of bound grammatical morphemes from Bulgarian into Turkish. The Bulgarian diminutive suffix *-co* has become quite common alongside the native Turkish diminutive *-çik/-cik*, and some young people seem to use the feminine suffix *-ka* fairly productively in Turkish, too.

- (9a) *Ademco nasildir?*
 Adem-DIM how-is
 ‘How is **little** Adem?’
- (9b) *Sarkiyi söyleyen Apti agabeyin baldizkasi.*
 song-ACC singing Apti older-brother-POSS sister-in-law-his
 ‘The one singing the song is your brother Apti’s sister-in-law.’

One particularly interesting pattern of Bulgarian loanword usage is the construction exemplified in (10). Here a Bulgarian verb, nearly always a third person singular present tense form (indicated with 3SG in the examples below) is combined with a form of the Turkish *yapmak* ‘to do’ with appropriate person, number, and tense features. Verbs, unlike nouns and other parts of speech, are not assimilated directly into the Turkish morphological system. Rather, a semantically empty Turkish verb root is employed as a carrier for the obligatory grammatical suffixes.

- (10a) *Ben öyle obestava yaptım.*
 I thus promise-3SG I-did
 ‘I **promised** (to do) that.’
- (10b) *Aksam sabah putuva yapacak.*
 evening morning travel-3SG she-will-do
 ‘She will **travel** evening and morning.’
- (10c) *Ben izpolzva yapıyorum.*
 I use-3SG I-am-doing
 ‘I am **using** it.’
- (10d) *Nerede otklanjava yaptık?*
 where turn-off-3SG we-did
 ‘Where did we **turn off**?’
- (10e) *Onu prehvurlja yapcaz, onun yerine seni alcaz.*
 him transfer-3SG we-will-do his place-in you we-will-tak
 ‘We will **transfer** him, we’ll take you in his place.’
- (10f) *Ama osvobodava yapmıyorlar daha.*
 but liberate-3SG they-don’t-do anymore
 ‘But they aren’t **liberating** anymore.’

All of the above patterns of fitting a Bulgarian lexical item into a basically Turkish sentence contrast with intrasentential code switching (changing the apparent matrix language in the middle of a sentence), which is comparatively rare in our data. One example is shown in (11).

- (11) *Sende voenna knizka varmi imas pravo za upravljenje na kola.*
 you-at military booklet is-if you-have right to driving of car
 ‘If you have a **military ID, you are allowed to drive a car.**’

Code switching in the larger sense of choosing the language of each conversation to fit the situation or participants obviously is common; we do not attempt to provide examples of it here. Such situation-based code-switching may be contributing to the actual loss of some Turkish vocabulary and its replacement with Bulgarian words, particularly among the very young, in semantic spheres that would tend to be associated with school or work. Our fifteen-year-old nephew does not know the Turkish names for the months and the days of the week, for instance. His thirty-five-year-old parents normally use the Bulgarian forms, but if asked they can sometimes (but not always) come up with the Turkish word as well (*eylül* for *septemvri* ‘September’; *persembe* for *cetvurtuk* ‘Thursday’). Both teenagers and middle-aged people consistently use the Bulgarian names for most countries, continents, and other geographical features: *Ungarija* rather than *Macaristan* ‘Hungary’, to give just one example. Combined with the overwhelming use of Bulgarian rather than Turkish technological and social terminology of the sort

discussed in (5) and (6), this lack of knowledge of Turkish vocabulary can lead to significant difficulty in communicating with Turks from Turkey – especially since young people are sometimes unaware of which words are Turkish and which are not.

For the most part, speakers are aware of the differences between the two languages, however; in fact, code switching is sometimes used for rhetorical effect.⁹ This is particularly prevalent in songs, as in the two examples in (12). The first example shows two lines differing in a single word; the second is a popular song about the army, whose chorus consists of one line in Turkish and a nearly identical one in Bulgarian.

(12a) *Geldi zor zaman. Dojde zor zaman.*
came hard time came hard time
'Hard times have come, hard times **have come.**'

(12b) *Yakti bütin gençleri. Izjade vsickite mladezi.*
it-burned all youth it-ate all youth
'It burned up all the youth. **It ate up all the youth.**'

Even in everyday speech language switching is sometimes used consciously for comic effect. Ali's sister Durdugül said the sentence in (13) to her husband, who had just finished helping her chop cabbage for dinner, and both laughed at the unexpected predicate.

(12) *Senin simdi baska isin njama.*
yours now other work there-isn't
'Now **there isn't** any more work for you.'

Although fluency in spoken Turkish is essentially universal in Polyanovo and among Bulgarian Turks in general, literacy in Turkish is far from universal. As we have already mentioned, Turkish-language instruction in the schools were eliminated by 1970, so those who began school after 1970 were taught to read and write only in Bulgarian. Turkish-language publications became unavailable at the same time. Many Turks who are now over twenty-five can write both Bulgarian and Turkish, although those between twenty-five and thirty years old, who were beginning their schooling during the years when Turkish instruction was being phased out, have minimal reading and writing skills in Turkish. For most of those under twenty-five, literacy is exclusively in Bulgarian. Thus our fifteen-year-old nephew, who has recently immigrated to the United State, writes to and receives letters from his friends back in Polyanovo in Bulgarian, although they would normally speak to each other in Turkish. This is true in spite of the fact that they do know the Roman alphabet (having studied French in school, and now English) and in spite of their anti-Bulgarian feelings resulting from the recent wave of official repression of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria.

A few of the Polyanovo children have learned to write Turkish recently, probably as a direct result of the anti-Turkish policies. When Turkish language became an overt political issue, some parents were motivated to teach their children

to read and write at home. Our niece Sevinç, who was about eleven at the time, wrote the message in (14) in a 1986 postcard; the few errors are not surprising, considering that she was just learning to write Turkish at the time.

- (14). *Yaz mevsiminda bir hatra.*
'A souvenir of the summer.'
(correct: **Yaz mevsiminden bir hatira.**)

A different approach to Turkish literacy is exemplified in (15), the text of a card in Cyrillic handwriting sent to us in 1987 by our then nine-year-old niece Selime. With the exception of the first line, a formulaic greeting in Bulgarian, the original note is in Turkish, but written in the Cyrillic alphabet (Turkish is normally written in roman letters). The transcription is phonemically correct except for instead of the more accurate (j) in (yengecim 'my auntie').

- (15) 1987 [In Cyrillic!]

1987 **godina da vi cestita**. Selam Sizlere. Yeni yiliniz kutlu olsun abeyim ve yengecim. gjonderen Selime. Hoşakalin.
'**Happy New Year 1987**. Greetings to you. May your new year be happy, Uncle and Auntie. Sent be Selime. Goodbye.'

Since children know both spoken Turkish and the Cyrillic alphabet, such phonetic spelling was probably felt to be relatively easy to learn. The efforts at teaching the children to write Turkish by either method may have been short-lived, though; these same nieces have since reverted to writing to us in Bulgarian.

The difference in orthography between the two languages is a frequent source of errors in written Turkish, even for adults who write both languages. We often notice spelling errors clearly resulting from Cyrillic interference. A few representative examples from letters written by people between twenty and forty years old are shown in (16). Especially typical is the spelling *dc* instead of *c* for /dz/, presumably as a calque on the Cyrillic form *дц*. Confusion of *d* and *g*, *c* and *s*, and *p* and *r*, and so on is also common, for similar reasons.

- (16) *Güldcan* for *Gülcan* (a girl's name)
deredceyle for *dereceyle* 'by degrees'
gerhal for *derhal* 'immediately'
gakika for *dakika* 'minute'
bykadarla for *bukadarla* 'with this much'
ceviyorum for *seviyorum* 'I love'

We conclude by briefly surveying current trends and future prospects for the linguistic situation of Bulgarian Turks. Over the past half century, as outlined at the beginning of this paper, the general trend has been toward greater facility in Bulgarian by an ever larger proportion of the ethnic Turkish population. However, even though most residents of Polyanyovo (and most Turks elsewhere in the country)

speaking Bulgarian quite comfortably, Turkish is still the primary language, and is used almost exclusively at home. Many Turks, especially young ones, switch between the two languages many times each day, speaking Bulgarian in a large number of public situations and even sometimes in private among themselves. Bulgarian is increasingly the only language used in writing. In addition, as we have seen, Bulgarian loanwords pervade the spoken language, particularly of the young, and some minor grammatical effects of bilingualism are begging to be evident in the Turkish spoken in Polyanovo. Some other, more isolated Turkish communities have less Bulgarian influence, while Turks in larger cities such as Kurdzhali have more. But to the best of our knowledge all Turkish communities in Bulgaria show similar linguistic effects, differing only in degree.

As little as seven or eight years ago it appeared that the increasing use of Bulgarian, erosion of Turkish vocabulary, loss of Turkish literacy, and social advantages of speaking the majority language and being able to pass as Bulgarian would lead inexorably to accelerated changes in the Turkish spoken in Bulgaria, and perhaps even to significant numbers of Turks abandoning their ancestral language altogether within the next generation or two. The recent nationality policy zigzags have probably made these changes less likely, although one hesitates to predict anything in contemporary Eastern Europe.

The extreme anti-Turkish policies of 1984-1990 had the unintended effect of strengthening Turkish ethnic identity. Speaking and writing Turkish became acts of political defiance. When speaking Turkish in public became an offense punishable by fines or imprisonment, parents were motivated to make the effort to teach their children to read and write the language, and children themselves became conscious of its importance to their cultural identity. Many people seem to have become more militantly Turkish than they had been before.

On the other hand, the liberalizing trend since the ouster of Zhivkov, if it continues, may lead to a revival of native-language or bilingual education programs and access to Turkish periodicals, books, and radio and television broadcasts, as well as opportunities to travel to visit relatives in Turkey. The deputies representing the Movement for Rights and Freedoms in the national Assembly have called for all these and more. Restrictions on speaking Turkish have been lifted. Muslims have been permitted to publish an occasional bilingual newspaper, in Turkish and Bulgarian, dealing with religious issues. The first issue of a regular bilingual newspaper under the title *Rights and Freedoms* appeared on 12 February 1991. For the first time since the early 1970s serious efforts are being made to reintroduce limited Turkish language instruction in schools with a significant proportion of Turkish-speaking students.¹⁰ Such measures may slow, although probably not halt, the trend toward increased Bulgarian influence and reduced Turkish fluency.

¹ Official statistics on national origin and native language of the population of Bulgaria have not been provided by the Bulgarian government since the 1965 census. Reliable estimates put the number of Turkish speakers in Bulgaria between 1 and 1.5 million.

² For a more detailed discussion of this topic see Eminov (1983, 1989a, 1989b).

³ For several months before this announcement the government had undertaken a wide-ranging campaign to force all Turks living in Bulgaria to replace their Turkish-Muslim names with conventional Bulgarian names.

⁴ For a discussion of the government's campaign against the Turks see Amnesty International (1986), Baest (1985), and Eminov (1989a, 1989b).

⁵ However, the members of the current younger generation of Turkish speakers are again largely illiterate in Turkish, as we discuss below.

⁶ Some seventy households emigrated to Turkey during the general exodus between June and August 1989. All but three households have returned to the village.

⁷ While there are a number of studies on the influence of Turkish on Bulgarian, as far as we are aware, little or nothing has been done on the influence of Bulgarian on Turkish. For a good summary of the influence of Turkish on Bulgarian see Grannes (1989).

⁸ The linguistic data for this paper derive from observations in the village of Polyanovo and the town of Aitos during the summers of 1982, 1984, and 1990 and from letters written by Turkish speaking relatives to the authors.

⁹ This is a traditionally popular device in Bulgarian folk songs as well, where phrases like *ovcarce mlado çobançe* ‘shepherd, young shepherd’ are not uncommon (*ovcarce* is Bulgarian, and *çobançe* Turkish for ‘shepherd’).

¹⁰ All these efforts have met with considerable resistance on the part of Bulgarian nationalists, who see such efforts as undermining the integrity of the Bulgarian state and nation.

Reference

- Amnesty International
1986 Bulgaria, Imprisonment of Ethnic Turks: Human Rights Abuses during the Forced Assimilation of the Ethnic Turkish Minority.
- Baest, Torsten F.
1985 Bulgaria’s War at Home: The People’s Republic and Its Turkish Minority, 1944-1985. *Across Frontiers* 1:18-26
- Çavus, Mehmet
1987 20. Yüzyıl Bulgaristan Türkleri Siiri. Istanbul
- Eminov, Ali
1983 The Education of Turkish Speakers in Bulgaria. *Ethnic Groups* 5:129-50.
1989a The Elimination of Turkish Language in Bulgaria. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth European Studies Conference, 1989*, edited by Karl Odwarka, p1-98. Cedar Falls: University of Northern Iowa.
1989b “There Are No Turks in Bulgaria”: Rewriting History by Administrative Fiat. *International Journal of Turkish Studies*, 4:203-22.
- Grannes, Alf
1978 Le redoublemen Turk a m-initial en Bulgare. *Linguistique Balkanique* 21:37-50.
1989 Turkish Influence on Bulgarian. *International journal of Turkish Studies* 4:223-39.
- Lehiste, Ilse
1988 *Lectures on Language Contact*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.