

ZBIGNIEW GOŁĄB

THE INFLUENCE OF TURKISH UPON THE MACEDONIAN SLAVONIC DIALECTS

It is evident that the Turkish rule which lasted for many centuries in the Balkan peninsula must have left deep traces on the culture and languages of the people living there. This problem has been dealt with many times. Let me mention a pioneer work *Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen*, Wien, 1884, in *Denkschriften der Wiener Akad. Phil.-hist. Classe*, 34—5, 37—8 by F. Miklosich, who was as usual the first in this field, and K. Sandfeld's *Linguistique balkanique*, Paris, 1930. Sandfeld discusses this interesting problem only in chapter II, 5 pp. 89—93 and III, 5 pp. 159—63, but is worth mentioning as one of the more recent publications on account of its general review of the subject. The latest paper, confined to Serbo-Croatian, is an extensive account by Abdulla Škaljić, *Turcizmi u narodnom govoru i narodnoj književnosti Bosne i Hercegovine*, in *Bilten Instituta za Proučavanje Folkloru u Sarajevu*, Dopunska Izdanja, 2, Sarajevo, 1957. This is at present only available in stencilled copies.

In my paper I should like to confine myself to only one aspect of the Turkish influence upon only one of the Balkan languages; viz. I want to deal first and foremost with certain *grammatical calques* which were taken from Ottoman by the Slavonic dialects of Macedonia. These dialects, as we know, later developed into literary Macedonian. Before discussing the

problem itself, I shall review the facts concerning the historical and social conditions in which Turkish influenced the Slavonic dialects in the region in question; generally speaking the problem also refers to the other Balkan languages¹.

Macedonia is the European country that remained under the Turkish rule from the end of the fourteenth century until 1912. During this long period the Turkish element was represented not only by the ruling class of state dignitaries in the towns, but also by the numerous class of landowners (*agas*) who lived in the country on their estates (*chifliks*).

In some regions, especially in South Macedonia (on the Lower Vardar) and in the south-east (in the region of Salonika and Serres) Turkish peasants settled in rather considerable numbers. Evidence of this is found in those village names which by their meaning clearly indicate the fact of recent Turkish settlement (cf. e. g. D. Jaranov's well-known map of Macedonia published in Sofia in 1933 by Makedonskijat Naučen Institut: *Carte de la Macédoine dans ses limites géographiques*). I shall mention here some very typical names, e. g. *Eni-kjoj* (Tur. *yeni köy* „new village“) several places lying to the north-east of Salonika, *Karga-mahala*, *Hadži-mahala*, *Džami-mahala* (Tur. *mahalle* „district (of town)“, *karga* „crow“, *haci* „pilgrim“, *cami* „mosque“) — villages more or less in the same area. The names with the Turkish plural suffix *-lar/-ler* are very characteristic, most often containing the name of a certain group of population, e. g. *Aşiklar*, *Ali-hadžilar*, *Čohalar*, *Dudular*, *Jajdžilar*, *Jundžilar*, *Kerdžilar* and the like, places on the Lower Vardar (cf. Tur. *aşik* „folk singer“ *çuha* „cloth“, *dudu* „a kind of parrot“, *yay* „bow“, *yaycı* „archer“, *yonca* „clover“ and perhaps *yuna* „felt pad under the saddle“: in the last case we may accept the original **yunacilar* „artisans making saddle-pads“ i. e. their

¹ By „Balkan languages“ I mean not only languages of the so called Balkan League i. e. Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, New Greek, Roumanian but also Serbo-Croatian, which is undoubtedly Balkan from the point of geography.

settlement, *kir* „grey“, *kirca* „greyish“ and perhaps also *karcalar* „pedlars“) ¹.

Before the Balkan War in 1912 there was a large proportion of Turkish population in Macedonia. According to the statistics given by Ofejcov in *La Macedoine au point de vue ethnographique, historique et philologique*, Philippopoli, 1887, p. 54, the ethnographical relations were as follows:

Sanjak	Bulgarians (i. e.		
	Macedonian Slavs)	Greeks	Turks
Salonika	301 626	29 644	96 446
Serres (Ser)	231 245	29 351	107 487
Skoplje	210 346		77 165
Monastir (Bitola)	381 088	818	79 522

These statistics are not accurate, because the author omits the Aroumanians mentioning them together with all the non-Slavonic population in the fourth column. Even so, however, they suffice to let us know that the Turks were the most numerous group in the non-Slavonic Macedonian population.

Taking this fact into consideration, and on the other hand the fact that Turkish was an official language, we may easily understand the historical and social conditions of its influence on the Slavonic inhabitants of Macedonia. One social and linguistic phenomenon should be stressed here at once. It is of basic importance in our problem of the Turkish grammatical calques in the Slavonic dialects of Macedonia. It is the phenomenon of Turkish-Slavonic *bilingualism*. This phenomenon

¹ Turkish *i* as a rule became accepted as *z* in the Macedonian dialects of that region; on account of the confusion between *z* and *a* in an unstressed position, and of the frequent loss of the vowels directly following the stress, the Turkish *yunacılar* might have been taken by the local Slavonic population as *jündžalar*, like *kircalar* understood as *kirdžalar*. In these dialects there is also a tendency to confuse unstressed *o* with *u*. This phenomenon may explain the form *čohalar* instead of *čuhalar*, although on the other hand in Serbian and Bulgarian there is a form with *o* (Ser. *čoha*, Bulg. *čohá*), possibly referring to a dialectical Turkish form.

has frequently been emphasized by the workers on the Macedonian dialects, e. g. M. Małecki, who in the preface to his *Dwie gwary macedońskie (Suche i Wysoka w Soluńskim)*, I, Kraków, 1934, p. X. distinctly states: „The Turkish language had a strong influence, particularly on the vocabulary of these two dialects, which is not strange, since until recently these were villages with a mixed Turkish and Bulgarian population, and so all the older people, especially the men, can make themselves understood in Turkish as well“. Similar conditions undoubtedly prevailed in many other parts of Macedonia (e. g. on the Lower Vardar, as may be indicated by some phenomena of the Kulakia dialect; see below).

Bilingualism in a population, i. e. the everyday use of two different languages by a particular ethnic group, caused by the mixed character of the population of the given area, eventually results in a more profound influence of one language on the other. This influence is not limited only to the appearance of loan-words, which might happen independently of the bilingualism, but leads to *structural loans*, i. e. *grammatical calques*. This phenomenon consists in the transference from language A to language B only of a *structure* (i. e. the *grammatical scheme* of the structure of a word, a group of words, or a sentence). This structure is complemented with the morphological (lexical) material of language B; in this way there appears grammatical calques of language A in language B. This process may be represented by the following formula:

$$Aa \text{ } \times \text{ } Bb \Rightarrow Ba$$

A = morphological and lexical material of language A;
a = grammatical scheme of language A etc.

There were provinces in Macedonia where on account of a considerable number of Turks, especially in the villages and small manufacturing towns, Turko-Slavonic bilingualism appeared, i. e. the Slavonic population used Turkish in their everyday relations with their Turkish neighbours. We may

therefore assume a priori the existence of grammatical Turkish calques in the local Slavonic dialects.

But before we come to discuss this problem, it is worth while to have a look at the character of the loan-words, i. e. „material“ loans from Turkish in the Slavonic dialects of Macedonia. One fact is especially striking here: the Turkish loan-words are not confined to any definite semantic sphere but they penetrate the whole vocabulary, beginning from the terminology connected with the State and social organization (this is obvious) through the tradesman's and artisan's terminology, they even reach the sphere of psychology, religion and morals of the Christian population; this is perhaps the most surprising fact. Of course, Turkish words may be found in all the other spheres of life, especially when they denote concrete things. Here are some examples to confirm this statement¹:

agalak „dignity, property of an aga“ (Tur. *agalık*)
apsana „prison“ (Tur. from Arab. and Pers. *hapisane*)
asker „soldier, army“ (Tur. from Arab. *asker*)
čiflik „farmstead“ (Tur. from Pers. *čif(t)lik*)
čorbadžija „rich man“ (Tur, *çorbacı* 'lord, captain of janizaries')
džade „highway“ (Tur. from Arab. *cadde*)
fukar „poor man“ (Tur. from Arab. *fukara*)
kadija „judge“ (Tur. from Arab. *kadī*)
kale „castle, fortress“ (Tur. from Arab. *kale*)
zaptija „(Turkish) policeman“ (Tur. from Arab. *zaptiye*) etc.

It is possible to quote dozens of such words connected with the political and social structure of the Ottoman State. These examples were taken from the contemporary literary Macedonian. A historical novel of manners *Tole Paša* by the contemporary Macedonian writer Stale Popov is very characteristic

¹ Cf. the extensive list of Turkish loan-words, semantically arranged in Mazon's, *Documents contes et chansons slaves de l'Albanie du Sud*, Paris, 1936, pp. 104—5 (dealing with one of the Macedonian dialects).

as regards this phenomenon. The novel is on the awakening of the movement for independence in Macedonia at the beginning of the twentieth century, and the dialect of the people and to a certain extent their living vocabulary are introduced into the dialogue and narrative. Here is a specimen of the language of the novel, characteristic as regards its vocabulary:

„*Mudurot i juzbašijata* vo Vitolište posedoa edna-dve, tri nedeli otkako se krena *askerot*, takareči, bez rabota, čekajki da dojdut luže na *ukumatot* od drugite sela na *muaurlakot*, no za golemo čudo nikoj ne stapna. Raspratiija ponekoj od selanite so zadača da proverat što ima — što nema po selata, no ovie se vrakaa so izveštai deka ništo osobeno ni videle, ni čule, osven tragite od zimošnite *zulumi*“ (p. 509).

It is evident that the Macedonian Slavs could not have a native terminology in this sphere at the beginning of the present century, as they had been deprived of their own State since the end of the fourteenth century and they were subject to the Turkish State organization.

Let us pass over to the words connected with economic life.

čaršija „commercial street or market place“ (Tur. from Pers. *čarši*)
dukan „shop“ (Tur. from Arab. *dükkan*)
dukandžija „shopkeeper“ (Tur. *dükkančī*)
esnaf „guild“ (Tur. from Arab. 'artisan, pedlar')
esap „bill“ (Tur. from Arab. *hesap*)
esnaflija „member of a guild, artisan“ (Tur. *esnaflī*)
mušterija „customer“ (Tur. from Arab. *müşteri*)
pari „money“ (Tur. from Pers. *para*)
pazar „market place“ (Tur. from Pers. *pazar*)
pazardžija „trader“ (Tur. *pazarčī*)
pazarlık „bargain“ (Tur. *pazarlık*) a word from the Suho dialect
sermija „capital“ (Tur. from Pers. *sermaye*)
zanaet „trade“ (Tur. from Arab. *sanaat* || *zanaat*)
zanaetčija „artisan“ (Tur. *sanaatçı* || *zanaatçı*) etc.

All these words were taken from the literary Macedonian (except *pazarlık*).

The words from the psychological, religious and moral spheres are undoubtedly the most interesting. The following examples may be quoted:

gajle „care“ (Tur. from Arab. *gaile*)

inaet || dialect. *inat* „stubbornness“ (Tur. from Arab. *inat*)

kabaet || dialect. *kabāt* „guilt, sin“ (Tur. from Arab. *kabāhat*)

kabaetlija || dialect. *kabatlīja* „guilty man, sinner“ (Tur. *kaba-hatli*)

kef „cheerfulness“ (Tur. from Arab. *keyif*)

keflija „good-humoured man, cheerful man“ (Tur. *keyifli*)

merak „delight, desire (usually erotic)“ (Tur. *merak* inquisitiveness, passion, unrest)

meraklija „lover“ (Tur. *merakli*)

sevda „love, desire“ (Tur. from Arab. *sevda*) etc.

All these words were taken from the literary Macedonian (except *kabaetlija* recorded from dialects).

The Turkish loan-words in the Christian religious vocabulary are striking. Mazon and Vaillant noticed them in their elaboration of the Gospel in the South-Macedonian village Kulakia (see bibliography) viz. the usage of the verb *ki kurtulisa* „will save, will save oneself“ from Tur. *kurtulmak* „save oneself, free oneself“, which is in any case very widespread in the Balkans (cf. lit. Mac. *da kurtuli* „be saved“, Suho and Visoka (*sā*) *kurtalīsuam*, Serb. *kurtalīsati* (*se*) — these two last forms from the Turkish transitive *kurtarmak*) — with a special religious meaning „save“; that made it possible to form the term *Kurtūlja*, „the Saviour (of Christ), redemption“, generally used in the translation of the Gospel in the dialect of the village Bobošćica (cf. Mazon's book, p. 417). It is evidence that the undoubtedly deep influence of Turkish reaches even to such a conservative sphere as the religious vocabulary, usually based on Old Church Slavonic.

A considerable number of the loan-words from Turkish is so-called „grammar terms“, i. e. in the first place the different kinds of conjunction, among which the hypotactic conjunctions

are especially worth notice, as they give unambiguous evidence of Slavonic-Turkish bilingualism in at least certain districts of Macedonia. The most important examples are: *čunki(m)* Kulakia, *čunki* Lerin, *čunki* Bobošćica, *čunki* Suho and Visoka „because“ (except in S-V, where it means „it is, that means, unless, very likely“), Tur. *çünkü*, *çünküm*; *dīlmi* Bobošćica, *dīrmu* || *dīlmu* Suho and Visoka „because“ from Tur. *değilmi* „isn't it? (in the sense of Fr. n'est-ce pas? Ger. nicht wahr?)“; *zīrīm* Visoka, *zer* Kulakia „because, since“, from Tur. *zīrā(m)*.

It is evident that the problem of the words or rather the morphology of the words borrowed from Turkish in the Slavonic dialects of Macedonia has not been fully discussed. We have omitted the problem of adjectives, which were taken from Turkish in an uninflected form, usually in phrases like *hazīr etmek*, *hazīr olmak* (cf. Kul., p. 106), which were preserved in the Slavonic dialects without change; neither have we included the phraseological semi-calques of the type of Turkish *teslim etmek* „give back“ in which the noun was borrowed from Turkish and the basic verb was turned into Slavonic while the whole has the normal syntax of a transitive verb, e. g. *imame storeno kletja megu nas š'o čupinstfoto moje na nego da go stora teslim* „we promised ourselves that I would give him my maidenhead“ (Sandfeld, p. 160). Also we only mention the phenomenon of the expansion of the Turkish nominal suffixes *-ci* || *-çi*, *-lik* || *-līk* || *-li* || *-lī* which have taken on the Slavonic form *-džija* || *-čija*, *-lak* || *-lāk* || *-lok* || *-luk*, *-lija* in Macedonian dialects. This expansion consisted in forming with their help derivatives of the native stems (cf. e. g. lit. Mac. *lovđija* „hunter“ from *lov*, Low-Vardar *korapčija* „sailor“ from *korap*, lit. Mac. *domakinlak* „houswifery“ from *domakin* „landlord“, Low-Vardar *oračlzk* „farming“ from *orač*, lit. Mac. *čarolija* „sorcerer“ from *čar* etc. A rich material on this subject has been gathered by S. Stachowski in an M. A. thesis *Przyrostki obce w języku serbo-chorwackim* which is now being prepared for print)¹.

¹ Cf. also B. Markov, *Nekoi hibridni tvorbi vo makedonskiot jazik*, in *Makedonski Jazik*, VI, 2, 1955.

All these phenomena have often been discussed in papers on the Balkan languages, because they appear with a greater or lesser intensity in all the Balkan languages (cf. Sandfeld, l. c.), Mazon and Vaillant also noticed these phenomena and discussed them fairly extensively in their publications on the Macedonian dialects. Hence I think that the sketch given above is sufficient to give the idea of the scope and character of the material, vocabulary and morphological influence of Turkish upon the Slavonic dialects of Macedonia. I should now like to discuss the main problem of this article, i. e. the Turkish grammatical calques in Macedonian dialects.

The problem of morphological and semantic opposition of the perceptive and imperceptive forms certainly comes to the foreground, since this is a characteristic trait of both the Macedonian and Bulgarian conjugations. There are two parallel columns of tenses which can be distinguished both in Macedonian and Bulgarian (I take as a model the literary Macedonian, based on the central dialects). These two columns of tenses oppose a synthetic construction and the significance of a process which is directly perceived by the speaker to the analytic construction and the sense of a process which is not directly perceived by the speaker. In Macedonian grammar the first column is named *vreminja na direktno kažuvanje*, the other *vreminja na prekažuvanje* (cf. B. Koneski, *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturnen jazik*, Del II, Skoplje, 1954, pp. 192—3). In Bulgarian grammar the corresponding terms *preki vremena* and *preizkazani vremena* or *perceptivus* and *imperceptivus* are used (cf. L. Andrejčin, *Osnovna bŕlgarska gramatika*, Sofia, 1944, pp. 158, 263 et seq.).

We give a complete table of the two columns of tenses in the literary Macedonian language.

direktno kažuvanje	prekažuvanje
Present	
učam	sum učel
učiš	si učel

uči	učel
učime	sme učele
učite	ste učele
učat	učele
Imperfect	
učev	sum učel
učeše	si učel
učeše	učel
učevmе	sme učele
učevte	ste učele
učea	učele
Aorist	
učiv	sum učil
uči	si učil
uči	učil
učivme	sme učile
učivte	ste učile
učija	učile

It is quite obvious that in practice the difference between perceptive and imperceptive will appear with reference to the 2nd and 3rd person, though the use of the imperceptive in the 1st person is also possible e. g. *Mi kažuvala majka mi—koga sum bil mal, sum padnal ednaš od čardak* (Koneski II, p. 202) „My mother used to tell me that when I was a child, I fell once from the balcony“ (here it is stressed that the event is known from the mother's talk, and not as a remembered experience). The problem of perceptive and imperceptive is rather intricate: this opposition cuts across the whole system of conjugation and consequently all the tenses. We have shown only the classical distinction, undoubtedly central for the whole phenomenon, of these two categories with reference to the three basic tenses, present, durative past and momentary past, leaving aside the other tenses especially those composed with *imam* (perfect) and *ke* (future).

Now let us try to compare the diagram of the three tenses on the basis of which the perceptive is opposed to the imperceptive, with the corresponding diagram of the Turkish conjugation; we shall take the verb *öğrenmek* corresponding in meaning to the Macedonian *učam*.

öğreniyorum	
öğreniyorsun	
öğreniyor	
öğreniyoruz	öğreniyormuşum
öğreniyorsunuz	öğreniyormuşsun
öğreniyor(lar)	öğreniyormuş
öğreniyordum	öğreniyormuşuz
öğreniyordun	öğreniyormuşsunuz
öğreniyordu	öğreniyormuş(lar)
öğreniyorduk	
öğreniyordunuz	
öğreniyordu(lar)	
öğrendim	öğrenmişim
öğrendin	öğrenmişsin
öğrendi	öğrenmiş
öğrendik	öğrenmişiz
öğrendiniz	öğrenmişsiniz
öğrendi(ler)	öğrenmiş(ler)

These two diagrams correspond to each other precisely as regards their functions. In Turkish, however, the starting point for the opposition of the two tense-columns (the perceptive and the imperceptive-auditive) is the basic morphological and semantic opposition of the so-called *past definite tense* with the suffix *-di* (e. g. *öğrendi* he learned) and the so-called *past indefinite tense* with the suffix *-miş* (e. g. *öğrenmiş* strictly speaking „he who has learned“). The *past definite tense* expresses a single past state or a single past action directly perceived by the speaker and so certain. The *past indefinite tense* expresses

a single past state or action not directly perceived by the speaker, and so in some way doubtful, (cf. Weil, p. 108 § 117). The fact of a present development of a given state or action is expressed in Turkish by the stem of the so-called *present definite tense* with the suffix *-iyor* (e. g. *öğreniyor* „he is learning“, cf. Weil, p. 113 § 120). When combining the stem of the *present definite tense* with the two basic past tenses of the auxiliary verb (*idi* „was“ in a perceptive sense, *imiş* „was“ in an imperceptive sense) we get the actual perceptive past tense (e. g. *öğreniyordu* „he was learning“ at the moment when the action of an actual story was going on) and the actual imperceptive past tense (e. g. *öğreniyormuş* „he was learning“ at the moment when the action was going on in a related story). This last tense may be used to express a general and uncertain present (cf. Weil, p. 139 § 141 b and p. 140 § 141 c).

It is obvious that the distinction between the perceptive and imperceptive columns in the Balkan Slavonic languages, i. e. in Macedonian and Bulgarian, is a more recent phenomenon, and that it was unknown in the older periods, i. e. before the Turkish conquest. This phenomenon is unknown in Greek or in the Romance languages in the Balkan peninsula. The structural influence of Turkish seems to be indubitable here. This influence, conditioned by the bilingualism in at least some districts of Macedonia and Bulgaria, came about in a very characteristic way. In the first place, the Old Slavonic morphological opposition of *aorist* (e. g. *učixъ*, Mac. *učiv*) and *perfect* (e. g. *učilъ jesmъ*, Mac. *sum učil*) was preserved in Macedonian and Bulgarian because, under the influence of the Turkish model, it took over the new semantic functions of the *perceptive* and *imperceptive*. This opposition was given up in most Slavonic languages (e. g. in the majority of the Serbian dialects and in the standard spoken language) in favour of the perfect (e. g. *učio sam*). The Turkish model had not only a semantic effect, but this calque could be based on the structural (morphological) identity, viz. the Turkish *öğrendi-m* is a synthetic form, where to the stem ending in *-di* the personal

endings are added, i. e. identical to the Mac. *učiv* (*učī, učī, učiv-me, učiv-te, učij-a*), the Turkish *öğrenmiş-im*, however, is to be interpreted as a form fundamentally analytical, composed of the participle of the past indefinite tense and of the personal ending representing the copula „to be“, so it is again identical with the Macedonian *sum učil* (in place of the older *učilz jesmz*). The influence of the Turkish model was possible only because of the structural identity of the corresponding constructions. The semantic calque came into being on account of the structural identity. The appearance of the imperceptive formation of the type *sum učel* (Bulg. *učel szm*) in Macedonian under the influence of the Turkish pattern occurred otherwise. Here we are dealing with a classical morphological calque. The morphological relation of the type *öğreniyordum : öğreniyormuş-um*, where in the first case we have a form fundamentally synthetic, and in the other an analytic form (the form ending in *-muş* + personal endings should be interpreted in such a way by analogy with the forms of the *öğrenmiş-im*-type) was calqued in Macedonian (and Bulgarian) in the following way. The first form was replaced by the old imperfect (*učev*), the other form was replaced by a morphological neologism. This neologism was constructed according to the Turkish pattern, i. e. it contained the imperfect stem (or present-imperfect stem) enlarged by a participial suffix *-l* and supplemented with a personal index in the form of the auxiliary verb *sum* etc., established in a proclitic position (*učel sum* $\Rightarrow$ *sum učel*, Bulg. *učel szm*). The new form of the *učel*-type is an important proof of the structural influence of Turkish. We see then that the Turkish influence was shown in two particular processes, with regard to the sphere of our interests: 1) in endowing the old Slavonic opposition *Aorist: Perfectum* (*učiaz : učilz jesmz*) with a new semantic function; 2) in the appearance of a neologism *sum učel*, which enabled the creation of a complete imperceptive column, when opposed to the old present and imperfect.

It is interesting that not all the Macedonian dialects show a logical opposition between the *perceptive* and *imperceptive*

columns. This distinction, however, is a characteristic trait of the central dialects which are a basis for the literary language. Here we shall discuss more minutely the Suho and Visoka dialects and the Kulakia dialect, on account of the particularly strong Turkish influence. The problem of the opposition of the perceptive and imperceptive is not presented so clearly in these. This could be maintained, at least according to Mazon and Vaillant, Kul., p. 228, who in discussing the function of the preterite in *-l* and the Aorist in the Kulakia dialect state, distinctly: „La distinction entre le fait passé qu'on énonce et celui qu'on rapporte, bien que souvent facultative, peut rester nette, ainsi en bulgare littéraire...; *dans notre texte elle n'est plus guère reconnaissable* (my italics). And further: „L'état du parler de Kulakia est celui d'un parler du macédonien central à préterit usuel (i. e. the type *sgm dal* — my addition), mais qui ne sait plus bien différencier le préterit de l'aoriste et l'imparfait parce qu'il est au contact du grec: contrairement à la tendance ordinaire des langues slaves à généraliser l'emploi du préterit, le macédonien méridional, sous l'influence du grec, a fait triompher l'aoriste et l'imparfait, et le préterit a disparu à peu près complètement à Bobošćica..., et est devenu rare à Suho (O., p. 120)“.

This conception is correct only as regard the Kulakia dialect which, by the way, is known only from a free translation of the Gospel and the Bobošćica-dialect, which was extremely well elaborated by Mazon himself. This opinion, however, cannot be accepted unreservedly as regards the dialect of Suho from the vicinity of Salonika. Mazon and Vaillant founded their opinion on the pioneer and rather scanty material of Oblak's publication and made little use of Malecki's work, especially of the rich collection of texts. After a careful analysis of these texts the imperceptive function of the Preterite or Perfect of the type *sā zēl* „I took“ in S-V can be clearly seen. I quote some examples:

Pujnō vr'am'a imāl idin cār' inā cārica S30, Idnō vr'am'a idin čurēlja i učel V77, Idnō wr'am'a sā bēli tri brāt'a sirumāsi,

n'āsā im'āli rābuta V80 etc. These are the beginnings of stories and fairy-tales, showing an introductory scheme typical of folklore tradition and using the imperceptive form. Of course the imperceptive is not used here logically, but rather facultatively, though we have enough distinct examples of its use, e. g. *Na ūtrināta stānuva cār'u i gl'ēda čuv'āk i učēl na mumāta* S22, *jās imam pulvin sāt', štu izl'āzuχ ut manastīru i za puluvīn sāt' n'ētr'a šīčku sā im'gnīlu* S45, „*mīlata sfitā Bugurdica. u gurāta t'a vid'āχ i kādurtu ti gu sā klāli na klājancu udgōr'a*“ S25, „*mīlata sfitā Bugurdica, u gurāta ja vid'āχmi, ja sā kurdīsali i na vrēχ klājancu udgōr'g*“ S25 etc. In these last two examples we see clearly the difference between the action done by the speaker (*vid'gχ, vid'gχmi* „I saw, we saw“) and an imperceptive-action, conjectured on the ground of its result, observed by the speaker (*sā klāli* „they laid“ *sā kurdīsali* „they set“). There is here only no differentiation between the imperceptive for the Present — Imperfect (Lit. Mac. of the type *sum nosel*) and the imperceptive for the Aorist (Lit. Mac. of the type *sum nosil*). The difference between these two imperceptives is based rather on the opposition of the imperfective and perfective forms (e. g. *i šētal* „he wandered“: *sā i naučīl* „he learned“ S 37). In addition, the use of the imperceptive is not consequent, as was already noticed. The imperceptive appears, for instance, very often only at the beginning of a fairy-tale, but later on in the course of a lively narrative it gives way to the perceptive, i. e. the normal Present, Imperfect or Aorist. On the other hand, the imperceptive appears again, when the story-teller wants to stress the fact that he himself or the actualized hero of his story did not experience the event described.

Let us turn to the syntactic or morphological and syntactical calques. Two of these are conspicuous. The first, in the Suho and Visoka dialect, is an additional determination of the name of the possessed thing by an enclitic pronoun having a possessive function besides the main determination by the owner's name. The other, in the Kulakia dialect, is a certain

agglutinative construction of the owner's name. Let us look at the first phenomenon. Here are examples:

Na nōs sirumāχ žinātamū S15, *na cār'u mājkamū* S19, *na tuzi d'āt'a mājkamū* S47, *na bōlin dujičēn s'ēstramū* S51, *brātmū na sarāfinū* S56, *žinātamū na čufčijata* V77 and with a pronoun as the owner's name *na m'ēn'g... kōn'umī* S36.

Everywhere here in the group *an owner — a thing owned* the name of the thing is endowed with an additional qualification in the form of an enclitic personal pronoun with a possessive function. This pronoun refers to the owner, i. e. *-mu* „his“, *-mi* „my“. A syntax of this kind is unknown either in the Slavonic languages or in the other Balkan languages such as Modern Greek or Roumanian which, as we know, might also have influenced the Balkan Slavonic languages to a certain degree. Such a syntax is normal in Turkish, e. g. the first example may be turned into Turkish exactly, retaining even the word-order of the owner's name which must necessarily precede that of the thing owned in Turkish. When translating we should of course remember that the analytical type of dative-possessive with the prefix *na* in Slavonic (Macedonian) is replaced by the synthetic genitive with the suffix *-in* in Turkish, i. e. *o fukaranın kadın-ı* (*ı* represents the pronominal possessive suffix of the third person singular „his“). The Turkish syntactic model is in this case unquestionable¹. The Turkish model influenced the fixing of the word-order, the owner's name was put before the name of the thing owned (cf. the first four examples). This construction came into being as a result of an exact translation of a corresponding Turkish construction. It also appears, though, less regularly, in the Kulakia dialect, cf. e. g. *tātko mu na dētito* Kul., 55/14, *tātko mu nēgu* (sic!) Kul., 49/25 „his father“

¹ The Turkish syntactic model has found suitable conditions in the syntactical system of Macedonian, namely so called „redoublement du complément“ by proclitic or enclitic pronouns. Besides, the construction of the type *na nōs sirumāχ žinātamū* seems to be limited to a narrow group of words meaning family members.

(by giving up *na* before *negu*), *na Maria mžut mu* Kul., 90/19 „Maria's husband“ etc. This construction is rarer in the Kulakia dialect. This rarity seems to be connected with two other forms of expressing the sense of possession unknown in Suho and Visoka. These two forms are 1. the type *zlátotu ut ágata* Kul., 31/7 „the aga's gold“ i. e. the preposition *ut* $\leq$ *ot* instead of *na*, which makes it impossible to qualify additionally the name of the thing owned with the enclitic pronoun in the Dative, 2. the type *snágata Gospodínova* Kul., 184/4 „Corpus Christi“ i. e. the possessive adjective in *-ov*, *-ova*, *-ovo* derived from the owner's name. But in this type we have a Turkish calque. Here we observe a tendency on the part of a possessive suffix to join the whole group of words which together form the owner's name. In such a case the possessive suffix often breaks the principle of congruency with the name of the thing owned, and then it begins to function as an exponent of *sui generis* Possessive. It is striking especially in the following examples: (uf) *tátko-m-uva kúkja* — *εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου*, (na) *tátko-m-uto imi* — *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός αὐτοῦ*, Pl. (na) *Tátko-m-iti rábodi* — *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου* Kul., p. 120. We have here the extension of a group *noun + enclitical personal pronoun in the dative-possessive* by a possessive suffix *-ov*, *-ova*, *-ovo*, i. e. in the first case *tátko-mi + ova* > *tátko-m-uva*, in the second *tátko-mu + ovo(to)* > *tátko-m-uto*, in the third *tátko-mi + ovi(te)* > *tátko-m-iti*. The form of the possessive suffix is reduced in an unstressed position. This reduction is far-reaching, especially in the second case (*-uto*), which is then the basis for the plural form (*-iti*) in the third case. It seems very probable that these constructions appeared as a result of the influence of Turkish ones of the type *baba-m-in evi*.

Besides the two above quoted calques of the type *na nòs sirumàx žinàtamu* and the type *tátko-m-uva kúkja* there appear still other phenomena in the South Macedonian dialects which may be attributed to Turkish influence, although it is impossible to determine this definitely. In the first place there is the establishment of a uniform form *mu* for all genders and num-

bers in the unstressed Dative of the personal pronoun in the 3rd person. This is the case e. g. in the Kulakia and Lerin (South-West Macedonia) dialects. Although in Suho and Visoka *mu* was introduced in the plural on place of the older *im*, in the singular there was still a difference between masculine-neuter *mu* and feminine *ji*; the same may be found in Bobošica and on the Lower Vardar. In Suho, however, *mu* for the feminine singular has also been noted, e. g. *mu vil'ášì* „he told her“ S52. The problem is complicated, because it is possible to interpret the whole process of change from *mu : ji : im* to *mu* on a native Slavonic basis without taking the foreign influence into consideration (cf. Kul., p. 144). It is, however, not out of the question that the introduction of a uniform dative *mu* for masc.-neut. and fem. sing. of the unstressed pronoun for the 3rd person occurred first in possessive phrases of the type *na Maria mžut mu*, *na nòs sirumàx žinàtamu* etc. (cf. above) which undoubtedly were calques of the Turkish type with a uniform pronominal possessive suffix *-(s)i* without distinction of gender. Then hence this *mu* instead of *mu : ji* might have been generalized as a neuter exponent as regards gender, and become an additional exponent of the indirect object of the predicate (cf. e. g. in Lerin *mu veli Tréskata na Čúmata* „says Febrato Džuma“, *na Marko mu reče kojno* „the horse said to Mark“ etc. see Zbigniew Gołąb, *Funkcja syntaktyczna proklityki zaimkowej w gwarach macedońskich* in *Lingua Posnaniensis*, IV, p. 283).

It is possible that Turkish also influenced the disintegration of the category of grammatical gender, which may be observed in the Kulakia dialect. It is to be seen clearly in the mixture of the gender forms of pronouns and adjectives referring to nouns describing inanimate objects, i. e. in cases, where the gender is a mere formal grammatical category (cf. e. g. Kul. p. 111 a. o.). This problem would need an extensive discussion, especially an exposition of the native Slavonic grammatical bases for the initiation of the process of disintegration of the sense of grammatical gender in the Kulakia dialect. These

bases involve in the first place the reduction of gender endings. This is why I confine myself to a mere mention of the problem.

In the present article I have tried to sketch the influence of Turkish on the Slavonic dialects of Macedonia, concentrating on the problem of grammatical calques. All the problems could not be exhausted in one article, and in any case this was not the author's aim. He has rather endeavoured to arouse the interest of oriental philologists in these problems.

Before closing my discussion I should like to touch on one more problem which might influence the future of the Turkish loans in Macedonian dialects, and especially of the words used in them. I mean the anti-Turkish tendency in the newly-created literary Macedonian. It is true that this language draws its vocabulary to a large extent from folk-speech not only from the central dialects which are its phonetic and grammatical basis but also from others, e. g. the western dialects. But on the other hand the creators and codifiers of this language, who are often both philologists and men of letters (e. g. professor Blaže Koneski) are endeavouring to limit the number of the old Turkish loan-words in the literary language. They retain them mainly as elements adding local or historical colour to a literary work. There is a very characteristic article by B. Koneski, *Odživenite rečnički elementi vo našiot jazik* (Obsolete Lexical Elements in Our Language) in the collection of articles *Za makedonskiot literaturnen jazik* by the same author published in Skoplje in 1952.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Besides the items cited in the text, I have also used the following: for Literary Macedonian H. Lunt, *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*, Skoplje, 1952 (containing a selection of texts and a vocabulary); for the Suho and Visoka dialects, also the second part of Maček's book, containing a vocabulary (abbreviations S-V);

for the Kulakia dialect the well-known work of Mazon and Vaillant providing a rich material from the Macedonian dialects under the modest title *L'Evangéliste de Kulakia un parler slave du Bas-Vardar*, Paris, 1938 (abbreviation Kul; the figure before the bracket in the quoted examples stands for the paragraph of the Gospel text, the figure behind the bracket stands for the line); for the Bobošćica dialect representing the South-West dialects, I have made use of Mazon's work (cf. p. 30) and for Turkish G. Weil's, *Grammatik der osmanisch-türkischen Sprache*, Berlin, 1917.