Grammatical borrowing in Macedonian Turkish

Yaron Matras and Şirin Tufan

1. Background

The variety described here is representative of the Turkish dialects spoken in the Republic of Macedonia, especially those in the west of the country, and to a considerable extent also of Rumelian or Balkan Turkish as a whole (cf. e.g. Matras 1998, 2004; Friedman 2003). The Balkan or Rumelian dialects of Turkish descend directly from Ottoman Turkish and are generally considered mutually comprehensible with Standard Turkish (henceforth ‘Tk.’); there are even direct historical links with Anatolian Turkish (cf. Caferoğlu 1964). We draw here primarily on data from the dialect of Gostivar, a city in the western part of the Republic of Macedonia – henceforth GT for ‘Gostivar Turkish’ (for a comprehensive description see Tufan 2007).

Turkish is the native language of the Turkish ethnic minority in the various Balkan countries. It is the first language of many Muslim Romani communities, and it is also spoken by some Albanians, Macedonians, and other ethnicities as a second or third language. As the official language of the Ottoman Empire, Turkish was a lingua franca and the language of administration and trade in the Balkans for more than half a millennium (between the fourteenth and early twentieth century). With the final collapse of the Ottoman Empire (1912), Turkish became a minority language. In Macedonia, it was not until the 1950s that its status became regulated and Turkish-language education, cultural institutions, and media received state backing. The form of Turkish taught at school was Standard Turkish, while the vernacular continued to be used in the private domain. Turkish speakers in the region are generally bilingual and often trilingual, speaking, in western Macedonia, alongside the state language, also Albanian. Over the past century, and especially since the 1950s, the importance of the state language and its relevance to career progression, education, and mobility has grown immensely, and this is reflected in the amount and the nature of Macedonian lexicon that has found its way into the local varieties of Turkish. In today’s Republic of Macedonia, Turkish speakers have direct contact with Standard Turkish not only through schooling, but also through satellite television and the internet, which are present in almost every Turkish household. Successive waves of emigration to Turkey in recent
decades have further fortified personal ties with Turkey, and visits to Turkey are frequent, resulting in even greater exposure to Standard and Anatolian Turkish.

2. Phonology

Among the consonants, we find the dental-alveolar affricate /ts/, which has its source in Macedonian and Albanian. It is found not only in loanwords (Albanian-derived tsapo ‘goat’, Macedonian-derived tsevka ‘pipe’) and in borrowed affixes (Macedonian feminine-agentive -itsa), but it is also transferred occasionally into native Turkic words: tsis ‘shut up’ (cf. Tk. sus). Initial consonant clusters are permitted in GT which do not appear in Tk.: GT (also Macedonian and Albanian) Stambol ‘Istanbul’, Tk. İstanbul. There are, on the other hand, also cases of simplification. The surrounding non-Turkic languages simplify Turkish geminates in Turkish borrowings (cf. Friedman 2003: 58), and this trend is also found in GT: dükan ‘shop’, Tk. dükkân ‘shop’; akıl ‘clever’, Tk. akıllı. As in the neighbouring languages, there is a weakening of /h/, though the origins of this development in Western Rumelian Turkish are thought to be in the features carried by immigrants from northeast Anatolia (Németh 1956: 21): GT hayvan ‘animal’, Tk. hayvan/; GT paali ‘expensive’, Tk. pahalı/; GT sabal ‘morning’, Tk. sabah/. Recent contact with Standard Turkish appears to have triggered the re-introduction of /h/, and variation is commonly found, especially in grammatical function words such as /em, hem/ ‘and’, /er, her/ ‘every’, or /lep, hep/ ‘all’.

In line with the absence of vowel-length distinctions in both Macedonian and Albanian, there is a tendency in GT to shorten ‘double’ or ‘lengthened’ vowels, which appear in Turkish in loans of Persian and Arabic origin: thus /galiba/ ‘probably’ (Tk. ga-liba/), /hala/ ‘yet’ (Tk. ha-la/). The loss of /ö/ – which does not exist in the contact languages – may also be a contact-induced phenomenon. In GT historical /ö/ is usually realized as /ü/ or as /o/: GT ürenci ‘student’, Tk. örenci; GT dort ‘four’, Tk. dört.

3. Nominal structures

The feminine derivational markers -ka and -(i)tsa are borrowed from Macedonian, and are productive with Turkish word stems: arkadas ‘friend’ (gender-neutral, and by default masculine), arkadaş-ka ‘female friend’; koyşi ‘neighbour’, koyşları. The suffix -itsa identifies a minuscule form of the feminized form: Muzaffer-itsa ‘Muzaffer’s neighbour’ in the neighbor.

The case contact. The case as in Tk., by while in Tk.

1. a. Gokmen kim ilerde? Tk. Gokmen kim ilerde?

The construal of the nominal in Macedonian

2. Maced

   a. Sadece dedi.
   b. O触发 a friend.

4. Verbal structures

The copula is not, as in Turkish, in the front order, the personal pronoun characteristics infinitive, a clause link
‘neighbour’, koyści-ka ‘female neighbour’; yalançi ‘liar’, yalanci-ansa ‘female liar’. The suffix -(i)sa is further extended to denote a female affiliated with an identified male, thus: dayo ‘maternal uncle’, day-asa ‘maternal uncle’s wife’; Muzafers-ita ‘Muzaffer’s wife’. The extended distribution of the inherited diminutive suffix -çe appears to be influenced by the presence of a similar form in the neighbouring languages: kışçe ‘little girl’, Macedonian devojče.

The case of the dependent in possessive constructions is also affected by contact. The possessor often appears in the ablative case, still accompanied, as in Tk., by possessive inflection on the object of possession (the head), while in Tk. the possessor appears in the genitive:

(1) a. Gostivar Turkish
   kiskardeş-i  gîvegi-den
   sister-3SG.POSS groom-ABL
   ‘the groom’s sister’

   b. Standard Turkish
   damad-in  kız kardeş-i
   groom-GEN sister-3SG.POSS
   ‘the groom’s sister’

The construction seems to copy the propositional marking of the possessor in Macedonian, which appears either in the ablative or dative:

(2) Macedonian
   a. sestra-ta na zet-ot
      sister-DEF to groom-DEF
      ‘the groom’s sister’

   b. od zet-ot sestra-ta
      from sister-DEF groom-DEF
      ‘the groom’s sister’

4. Verbal structures

The copula in GT appears, like in Macedonian, as an independent verb, and not, as in Tk., in an enclitic form. Since this concerns issues of constituent order, the position of the copula will be discussed further in Section 6. A characteristic feature of the verb in Rumelian Turkish is the loss of the modal infinitive, and the reduction of converbal forms in general. As a strategy of clause linkage, this issue is discussed in Section 7 on ‘Syntax’.
Gostivar Turkish continues the general Turkish pattern of forming new verbs by incorporating lexical nouns from the contact language, and integrating them with a light verb which differentiates valency. Both et- ‘do’ and yap- ‘make’ are employed with transitives, and ol- ‘become’ with intransitives: yaparsin komparaziya ‘you compare’, privatizir oldi ‘it was privatized’. Idiomatic structures are often copied as loan-blends, involving Matter replication of a Macedonian noun, accompanied by a translation of the Macedonian verb: rutina alayim ‘I shall get into the habit’, lit. ‘I shall take a routine’, Macedonian da zemam rutina.

5. Other parts of speech

A number of conjunctions and particles are borrowed from Macedonian and Albanian. Matras (2004) notes for the Turkish dialects of eastern Macedonia that the Macedonian additive conjunction i is regularly used when conjoining phrases, while Turkish ve is limited to conjoining constituents (as in example 3). Note that the adversative conjunction ama is identical in Turkish and Macedonian, Macedonian having borrowed it from Turkish. The Slavic contrastive-addition marker a indicates opposition between two phrases:

(3) İlk-okul-i ve orta-okul-i bitir-di-m Türkçe first-school-ACC and middle-school-ACC finish-PAST-1SG Turkish dil-m-de, a fakultet-i bitir-di-m language-POSS-LOC and/however university-ACC finish-PAST-1SG Makedonce dil-m-de.
Macedonian language-POSS-LOC
‘I finished primary and secondary school in Turkish, but university in Macedonian.’

Another use of a is for disjunction:

(4) Amerika a Alman yatırım-i dir.
America or German investment-poss is
‘It is an American or German investment.’

It is possible that this function results from a blend between the Macedonian contrastive-additive a, and the Albanian-derived question particle a, which is also borrowed into GT:

(5) Agi gë
‘Have’
The Albanian
(6) Gel
‘Ple-
Subordinating
thus of Turkish
contamination
Possibly, a subordinating

6. Consti-

Although Turkish is contexts, the differen
different degrees.
In the preferred construction:

(7) a.

b.

c.
(5) A git-ti-n Stambol-a?
   Q go-PAST-2SG Istanbul-DAT
   ‘Have you been/ did you go to Istanbul?’

The Albanian requestive particle lu(te)m is also borrowed:

(6) Gel benim-le lum.
    come me-INST REQ
    ‘Please come with me.’

Subordinating conjunctions are mainly grammaticalized interrogatives and thus of Turkish origin, but the presence of kose ‘as if’ seems to indicate a contamination of Macedonian kako ‘as if’ and Albanian kinse ‘as if’, possibly reinforced by the similarity to the Turkish conditional verbal augment -se. Possibly, an Albanian model sepse ‘because’ is also behind the use of se as a subordinator of cause (‘because’).

6. Constituent order

Although on the whole still an SOV language, flexibility of word order in Turkish is exploited in GT to extend pragmatically restricted variants to wider contexts, thereby increasing harmony between GT and its contact languages in the organization of utterance structures. Word order shift has acquired different degrees of stability with different constructions.

In the possessive construction, the order head–modifier has become the preferred order in GT, mirroring the order in the Macedonian and Albanian constructions:

(7) a. Gostivar Turkish
   ruba-lar-i damad-in
   clothes-PL-3SG.POSS groom-GEN
b. Macedonian
   ališta-ta na zet-ot
   clothes-DEF to groom-DEF
c. Albanian
   teshat e dhandrit
   clothes ATT groom
d. Standard Turkish
   \texttt{damad-un eyya-lar-i}
   groom-GEN clothes-PL-3SG.POSS
   'the groom’s clothes'

The object of comparison is expressed in GT with the help of a preposition
\textit{neka} 'like', grammaticalized from the interrogative \textit{ne kadar} 'how much',
copying the Macedonian preposition \textit{kolku} 'as much'. It is positioned, as in
Macedonian, between the attribute and the object of comparison:

(8) \begin{itemize}
\item a. Gostivar Turkish
   \texttt{güzəl neka Meryem}
   beautiful like Meryem
\item b. Macedonian
   \texttt{ubava kolku Merjem}
   beautiful like Meryem
\item c. Standard Turkish
   \texttt{Merye kadar güzel}
   Meryem as.much beautiful
   'as beautiful as Meryem'
\end{itemize}

This is the only obvious indication of a shift, in any construction, from the
postpositional structure of Turkish, to prepositions.

In verb phrases, the most stable case of word-order convergence with the
neighbouring languages concerns the position of the copula. Whereas the
Turkish copula is enclitic, GT tends to preserve a more conservative inde-
dependent copula stem in \textit{i}-, which, however, occupies the position between the
subject and the predicate noun, as in the contact languages:

(9) \begin{itemize}
\item a. Gostivar Turkish
   \texttt{Sen (i)-sim kiçik bir kış-će.}
   you COP-2SG small INDEF girl-DIM
\item b. Macedonian
   \texttt{Ti si edno malo devoj-će.}
   you COP.2SG INDEF small girl-DIM
\item c. Albanian
   \texttt{Ti je nji vajz e vogël.}
   you COP.2SG INDEF small ATT girl
\end{itemize}
d. Standard Turkish

\[
\text{Sen küçük bir kız-sın.}
\]
\[\text{you small INDEF girl-2SG}
\]
\[\text{‘You are a small girl.’}
\]

This is the general rule in the copula construction, irrespective of the word class or case of the predicate (e.g. adjective, locative noun, etc.);

(10) \[\text{Siz-i-di-nüz ev-de.}
\]
\[\text{you COP-PAST-2PL house-LOC}
\]
\[\text{‘You were at home.’}
\]

In other constructions, deviation from verb-final order is much less pragmatically marked, and much more frequent, than in colloquial Tk., indicating a drive toward harmonization of the utterance planning procedures with those of the contact languages. Consider the following sentences, in which direct and indirect objects follow the verb without any inference of de-focusing or de-topicalization (which would be the reading accompanying such constructions in Tk.):

(11) \[\text{Ben gür dü-m korkula rüya.}
\]
\[\text{I see-PAST-1SG scary dream}
\]
\[\text{‘I saw a scary dream.’}
\]

(12) \[\text{Ben ver-di-m bikate ekmek sızın dort tene}
\]
\[\text{I give-PAST-1SG little bread 2PL.POSS four item}
\]
\[\text{beygir-imiz-e.}
\]
\[\text{horse-2PL.POSS-DAT}
\]
\[\text{‘I gave your four horses some bread.’}
\]

(13) \[\text{Onlar gid-ecek-ler dügün-e benim-le.}
\]
\[\text{they go-FUT-3.PL wedding-DAT me-INST}
\]
\[\text{‘They will go with me to the wedding.’}
\]

The default position for objects that constitute new topical information in lexical predications remains, however, the pre-verbal position:
7. Syntax

Some of the most remarkable changes that have affected Rumelian Turkish – a characteristic feature of this group of Turkish dialects – is the adoption of clause combining strategies that are similar to those employed in the surrounding Indo-European languages. Essentially, these are based on the juxtaposition of finite clauses, linked through independent semantic markers that introduce the subordinate clause (subordinating conjunctions). This system replaces almost entirely the Turkic system of conversbs and nominal embedding.

Modal complements are not introduced by a conjunction, but make use of the historical optative, which, now expressing dependency on the main verb, serves as a subjunctive, with the complement clause generally following the main clause (see also Matras 1998, 2004):

(15) a. Gostivar Turkish
    Yarin ist-er-un oyna-(ya)-im düzün-de.
    tomorrow want-AOR-1SG play-SUBJ.1SG wedding-LOC

b. Macedonian
    Ut re saka-m da igr a-m na svadba-ta.
    tomorrow want-1SG COMP play-1SG at wedding-DEF

The finite forms of the infinitive in options (modal complements) are:

(16) Da nečem nevidel
     ‘I didn’t see anything’

Factual or non-factual inferentially linked either finite or infinitive clauses, in

(17) Hispr jedan pogled
     ‘He looked once’

In this respect of the Rumelian Turkish, the other and non-Rumelian Turkish Bulgarian dialects are also expressed by infinitive complements, and by modal complements.

Related to other Rumelian Turkish, the interrogative mood is also postposed, and Rumelian Turkish is different from other dialects where the

c. Albanian
\[ Nesër\ \text{dua\ te\ luj\ nê\ darsëm.}\]
tomorrow want.1SG COMP play.1SG in wedding

d. Standard Turkish
\[ Yarın\ \text{düğün-de\ oyna-mak\ isti-yor-um.}\]
tomorrow wedding-LOC play-INF want-PROG-1SG
‘I want to dance at the wedding tomorrow.’

The finite embedded predicate in the subjunctive replaces the historical Turkish infinitive. The same type of construction is used in manipulation clauses (modal complements with different subjects):

(16) \[ \text{Daa çok\ \text{sev-er-um\ anlat-tr-sun\ \text{kimse.}}} \]
more much like-AOR-1.sg tell-AOR-SUBJ.3sg somebody
‘I prefer somebody to narrate it [to me].’

Factual or epistemic complements, which in Tk. may be expressed through either finite clauses, or nominalizations, always appear as postposed finite clauses, introduced by the subordinator \textit{ki}, which is also common in Tk.:

(17) \[ \text{Hised-il-mes\ \text{ki\ vardir\ sonbaar.}} \]
feel-PASS-NEG.AOR COMP exist.COP.3SG autumn
‘It does not feel like autumn.’

In this manner, GT aligns itself with the other Balkan languages also in respect of the distinction between factual and non-factual complements. While the other languages have complements that specialize for factual/epistemic and non-factual/subjunctive (e.g. Macedonian \textit{deka} vs. \textit{da}, Greek \textit{oī} vs. \textit{na}, Bulgarian \textit{če} vs. \textit{da}, Romani \textit{kaj} vs. \textit{te}, and so on), in GT the opposition is expressed by using the inflected subjunctive on the verb in modal complements, and the \textit{ki} complementizer (and indicative mood) in epistemic complements.

Relative clauses also undergo re-structuring in Rumelian Turkish. Like the other Rumelian Turkish dialects, GT shows a relativizer \textit{ne}, derived from the interrogative ‘what’, which mediates between the head noun and the finite, postposed relative clause (see Matras 1998, 2004). This replaces both the Turkish gerundial relative clause, and its finite counterpart in \textit{ki}. The formation once again matches that of the principal contact language Macedonian, where the relativizer is equally derived from the interrogative ‘what’:
Like relative clauses, embedded clauses in GT are finite, usually postposed to the main clause, and introduced by an interrogative, functioning as a conjunction; Turkish-type nominalizations of embedded propositions are not found.

Adverbial clauses show a mixed pattern in relation to convergence tendencies. One type of adverbial clause shows an overwhelming tendency to copy the Indo-European subordination type: postposed finite subordinate clauses introduced by a conjunctions. To this end, a series of grammaticalization processes take place giving rise to new subordinating conjunctions. The semantic relations involved in clause combinations of this type are those of time (introduced by acin ‘when’ in GT, or by ne zaman ‘when’ in other dialects of Macedonian Turkish), location (introduced by nerde ne ‘where’ < lit. ‘where what’, cf. Macedonian kade sto lit. ‘where what’), reason (introduced by nicin ‘because’ < ‘what-for’, cf. Macedonian zo sto lit. ‘for-what’), manner (introduced by kose ‘as if’, possibly a contamination of Macedonian kako ‘how’, Albanian kinse ‘as if’, and Turkish -se ‘if’; see above), and comparison (introduced by neka ne ‘as much as’ < ne kadar ne ‘how much what’, cf. Macedonian koku sto). Purpose clauses and final clauses are equally finite, and show the verb of the subordinated clauses in the subjunctive. They are introduced respectively by the complementizer ki, directly reinforcing the subjunctive (cf. Macedonian prepositional reinforcer za da), and the conjunction çaki ‘until’.

A second type of clause linkage remains largely unaffected by contact-induced restructuring. This involves conditional clauses (‘If I pass my exam my dad will buy me a bicycle’), and concessive clauses (‘Although I want to go to Antalya, I won’t be able to go’). Both are marked by the conditional marker -se (on its own for conditional clauses, with addition of de or hem ‘too’ for concessive clauses), which is added to a finite subordinated clause.

Thus, whereas the language appears to be:

8. Lexico-Propositional


9. Conclusion

It is interesting to note that the language in the Matter is, indeed, a mixed and convergent language. The lexicographical and syntactic structure of the language is basically that of a Romance type, and the phonological structure is that of a Slav type.
Thus, where Turkish already operates with finite subordinations, there appears to be no motivation to re-organize the structure of clause linking.

8. Lexicon


9. Conclusion

It is interesting to note once again that Turkish has only been a minority language in Macedonia for some three to four generations now. The fact that Matter borrowing is limited to a rather small number of discourse particles and conjunctions, may be a reflection of this recent retreat of Turkish from public life, and its replacement, to a considerable degree, by Macedonian. The lexicon, of course, reflects the recent dominance of Macedonian-speaking society in the public domain, employment, technology, and so on. Nevertheless, the restructuring of clause combining strategies based largely on a Macedonian model constitutes a radical departure from the Turkic syntactic type, and it is most certainly much older than the retreat of Turkish as the language of the public domain. Rather, the changes in this domain reflect
century-old multilingualism. It appears that in daily communication, speakers were under pressure to organize complex utterances in a compatible way across the various languages that constituted their linguistic repertoire.

What is essentially an economy-driven motivation – reducing multiple pattern types across the linguistic repertoire to just one – might be understood as a harmonization of utterance-organization strategies (Matras 2004). The two areas that are most obviously affected are clause combining strategies, and to a somewhat lesser extent, word order. With the former, it is the packaging of supplementary information through finite subordinations that prevails, and to this end a series of grammaticalization processes are triggered, exploiting elements of the inherited lexicon, often following the Macedonian model (‘replica grammaticalization’ in the terms of Heine and Kuteva 2005). The latter, word order, involves harmonization of strategies of mapping information status at the level of the linear organization of the utterance. Here, some constructions, such as possessive noun phrases and existential (copula) predications, appear more vulnerable to the pressure toward harmonization than others. Nevertheless, even word order in the basic verb phrase shows a partial relaxation of the pragmatic constraints on the appearance of post-verbal objects. This in turn provides an extended scope to employ such constructions, which resemble the word order rules of the contact language.

We may speculate that it was possible for pattern-replication of this type to emerge in the vernacular language long before Turkish retreated as the official language of the public sphere: it exploited constructions that pre-existed, to some extent at least, in colloquial usage, such as semi-embedded finite optative constructions (see discussion in Matras 1998 and 2004), or finite subordinations introduced with ki, or pragmatically-marked constructions involving de-topicalization of direct and indirect objects (in post-verbal position). Pattern replication was thus a kind of compromise, allowing speakers to maintain language loyalty while assisting the levelling of certain language processing strategies within the multilingual repertoire. We suggest that this latter aspect is a crucial component of the history of linguistic areas, for which the Balkans have long served as a prototype example.

**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABL</th>
<th>ablative</th>
<th>ATT</th>
<th>attributive marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

1. Example partly
2. Figure cult to 70,000

**References**

Caferoğlu, 1964

Friedman, 2003

Heine, Ber 2005.

Matras, Ya 1998

2004

Németh, C 1956.

Tufan, Šir 2007
DEF definite article
DIM diminutive
FUT future
GEN genitive
INDEF indefinite marker
INF infinitive
INST instrumental
LOC locative
NEG negation
PAST past tense marker
PL plural
POSS possessive
PROG progressive
Q interrogative particle
REL relative particle
REQ requestive
SG singular
SUBJ subjunctive

Notes

1. Examples are taken from Tufan’s fieldwork in Gostivar; observations are based partly on fieldwork data collected by Matras among speakers from Stip.
2. Figures or even estimates of numbers of speakers in the entire region are difficult to obtain. Ethnic Turks in the Republic of Macedonia itself number around 70,000.
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