

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).¹

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.² 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 bi- 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 Turkish words: *tsıs* '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. /dükkan/ 'shop'; /akili/ 'clever', Tk. /akıllı/. As in the neighbouring languages, there is a weakening of /h/, though the origins of this development in Western Rume-
lian Turkish are thought to be in the features carried by immigrants from northeast Anatolia (Németh 1956: 21): GT /ayvan/ 'animal', Tk. /hayvan/; GT /paali/ 'expensive', Tk. /pahalı/; GT /saba/ '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 /ep, 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. *öğrenci*; 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: *arkadaş* 'friend' (gender-neutral, and by default masculine), *arkadaş-ka* 'female friend'; *koyşi*

'neighbour',
liar'. The suf
identified ma
Muzafer-itsa
minutive suf
in the neigh

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

- (1) a. G
ki
si
't
b. S
da
g
't

The constr
Macedonian

- (2) Mace
a. se
si
b. o
fi
't

4. Verbal s

The copula
not, as in T
order, the p
characterist
infinitive, a
clause linka

'neighbour', *koyşi-ka* 'female neighbour'; *yalancı* 'liar', *yalancı-tsa* 'female liar'. The suffix *-(i)tsa* is further extended to denote a female affiliated with an identified male, thus: *dayo* 'maternal uncle', *day-tsa* 'maternal uncle's wife'; *Muzafer-itsa* '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: *kız-çe* 'little girl', Macedonian *devoj-če*.

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
kıskardeş-i giivegi-den
 sister-3SG.POSS groom-ABL
 'the groom's sister'
 b. Standard Turkish
damad-ın 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
 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: *yaparsın komparatsiya* '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-in-de, a fakulted-i bitir-di-m
 language-POSS-LOC and/however university-ACC finish-PAST-1SG
Makedonce dil-in-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 dır.*
 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) *A gi*
 Q go
 'Have

The Albanian

- (6) *Gel*
 com
 'Please

Subordinate
 thus of Tu
 contaminat
 reinforced
 Possibly, a
 subordinat

6. Consti

Although
 Turkish is
 contexts, t
 in the orga
 ferent deg

In the
 preferred
 constructi

- (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
rubal-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
damad-ın eşya-lar-ı
 groom-GEN clothes-PL-3SG.POSS
 'the groom's clothes'

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

- (8) a. Gostivar Turkish
güzel neka Meryem
 beautiful like Meryem
 b. Macedonian
ubava kolku Merjem
 beautiful like Meryem
 c. Standard Turkish
Merye kadar güzel
 Meryem as.much beautiful
 'as beautiful as Meryem'

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 independent copula stem in *i-*, which, however, occupies the position between the subject and the predicate noun, as in the contact languages:

- (9) a. Gostivar Turkish
Sen (i)-sın küçük bir kız-çe.
 you COP-2SG small INDEF girl-DIM
 b. Macedonian
Ti si edno malo devoj-če.
 you COP.2SG INDEF small girl-DIM
 c. Albanian
Ti je një vajzë vogël.
 you COP.2SG INDEF small ATT girl

d. S
S
y
'

This is the
class or cas

- (10) *Siz*
you
'You

In other co
ically mar
drive towa
of the con
and indire
de-topical
tions in Th

- (11) *Ben*
I
'I sa

- (12) *Ben*
I
bey
hor
'I g

- (13) *On*
the
'Th

The defau
ical predi

d. Standard Turkish

Sen küçük bir kız-sın.
 you small INDEF girl-2SG
 '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) *Siz i-dı-nız ev-de.*
 you COP-PAST-2PL house-LOC
 '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) *Ben gör-dü-m korkuli rüya.*
 I see-PAST-1SG scary dream
 'I saw a scary dream.'
- (12) *Ben ver-dı-m bikate ekmek sizin dort tene*
 I give-PAST-1SG little bread 2PL.POSS four item
beygir-iniz-e.
 horse-2PL.POSS-DAT
 'I gave your four horses some bread.'
- (13) *Onlar gid-ecek-ler düğün-e benim-le.*
 they go-FUT-3.PL wedding-DAT me-INST
 'They will go with me to the wedding.'

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

- (14) *Parlament-in-de var-dır iki dil.*
 parliament-3SG-LOC exist-COP.3SG two language
Arnaut-lar Arnautçe konuş-ur.
 Albanian-PL Albanian speak-AOR
Makedon-lar Makedonce konuş-ur.
 Macedonian-PL Macedonian speak-AOR
Azınlık-lar Makedonce konuş-ur.
 minority-PL Macedonian speak-AOR
Bir tek Arnaut-lar Arnautçe konuş-ur.
 one only Albanian-PL Albanian speak-AOR
 'In Parliament, there are two languages.
 The Albanians speak Albanian.
 The Macedonians speak Macedonian.
 The minorities speak Macedonian.
 Only the Albanians speak Albanian.'

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 converbs 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
Yarın ist-er-im oyna-(ya)-im düğün-de.
 tomorrow want-AOR-1SG play-SUBJ.1SG wedding-LOC
 b. Macedonian
Utre saka-m da igra-m na svadba-ta.
 tomorrow want-1SG COMP play-1SG at wedding-DEF

The finite
 ish infinit
 (modal co

- (16) *Da*
 mo
 'I p

Factual o
 either fin
 clauses, i

- (17) *His*
 fee
 'It

In this m
 spect of t
 the other
 and non-
 Bulgarian
 expressed
 ments, a
 plements

Relati
 other Ru
 interroga
 postpose
 Turkish
 tion once
 where th

c. Albanian

Nesër dua të luaj në darsëm.
 tomorrow want.1SG COMP play.1SG in wedding

d. Standard Turkish

Yarın 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) *Daa çok sev-er-im anlat-ır-sın 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 *ki*, which is also common in Tk.:

- (17) *Hised-il-mes ki vardır 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 *deka* vs. *da*, Greek *oti* vs. *na*, Bulgarian *če* vs. *da*, Romani *kaj* vs. *te*, and so on), in GT the opposition is expressed by using the inflected subjunctive on the verb in modal complements, and the *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 *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 *ki*. The formation once again matches that of the principal contact language Macedonian, where the relativizer is equally derived from the interrogative 'what':

- (18) a. Gostivar Turkish
O kış-çe ne gel-di biz-de şimdi yaşa-r
 that girl-DIM REL come-PAST 1PL-LOC now live-AOR.3SG
Stambol-da.
 Istanbul-LOC
- b. Macedonian
Devoj-če-to što dojde kaj nas sega živee vo Istanbul.
 girl-DIM-DEF REL came at us now live.3SG in Istanbul
- c. Standard Turkish
Biz-e gel-en kız şimdi İstanbul-da yaşı-yor.
 1PL.DAT come-GER girl now İstanbul-LOC live-PROG.3SG
 'The girl that came to (visit) us now lives in İstanbul.'

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 *açın* '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 što* lit. 'where what'), reason (introduced by *niçin* 'because' < 'what-for', cf. Macedonian *zošto* 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 *kolku što*). 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, whe
 pears to be

8. Lexico

Despite m
 ing is pred
 of the stat
 ical borro
 mantic are
 (teatar 'th
 board', ka
 dinatsiya
 terms for
 'dentist',
 'student',
 and profe
 ya 'dents
 'graduati
 şifunyer
 rage', sate
 miscellan
 'sound', s

9. Concl

It is inter
 guage in
 Matter bo
 and conju
 public lif
 The lexic
 ing societ
 theless, t
 Macedon
 type, and
 language

Thus, where Turkish already operates with finite subordinations, there appears to be no motivation to re-organize the structure of clause linking.

8. Lexicon

Despite multilingualism in the region where GT is spoken, lexical borrowing is predominantly from Macedonian, reflecting the growing importance of the state language in the past two to three generations especially. Lexical borrowing from Macedonian naturally affects in the first instance semantic areas belonging to the public domain, such as names for institutions (*teatar* 'theatre', *fakultet* 'faculty', *univerzitet* 'university', *vodovod* 'water board', *kanalizatsiya* 'infrastructure', *militsiya* 'police', *armiya* 'army', *ordinatsiya* 'dental surgery', *klinika* 'clinic', *autobuska stanitsa* 'bus station'), terms for practitioners and professionals (*električar* 'electrician', *stomatolog* 'dentist', *sestra* 'nurse', *apoteekarka* 'pharmacist', *direktor* 'director', *student* 'student', *privatnik* 'having business in the private sector'), academic subjects and professions (*meditsina* 'medicine', *farmatsiya* 'pharmacy', *stomatologiya* 'dentistry', *ispit* 'exam', *praktično* 'practical exam', *poen* 'mark', *matura* 'graduation'), construction and technology (*kuyna* 'kitchen', *pato* 'flooring', *šifunyer* 'cabinet', *parno* 'central heating', *radiator* 'radiator', *garaja* 'garage', *satelitska* 'satellite', *kaseta* 'cassette', *elektrika* 'electricity'), as well as miscellaneous domains (*mačka* 'cat', *šatka* 'duck', *sok* 'fruit juice', *zvučnost* 'sound', *spetsijalizatsiya* 'specialization', *tragediya* 'tragedy', etc.).

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

ABL	ablative	ATT	attributive marker
ACC	accusative	COP	copula
AOR	aorist	DAT	dative

DEF	defi
DIM	dim
FUT	futu
GEN	gen
INDEF	ind
INF	infi
INST	inst
LOC	loc
NEG	neg

Notes

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

Reference

- Caferoğlu, 1964
 Friedman, 2003
 Heine, Ber 2005.
 Matras, Ya 1998
 2004
 Németh, C 1956.
 Tufan, Şir 2007

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

References

- Caferoğlu, Ahmet
 1964 Anadolu ve Rumeli ağızları ünlü değişimleri. TDAYB. 1–33.
- Friedman, Victor A.
 2003 *Turkish in Macedonia and Beyond*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Heine, Berndt, and Tania Kuteva
 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron
 1998 Convergent development, grammaticalization, and the problem of 'mutual isomorphism'. In: Winfried Boeder, Christoph Schroeder, and Karl-Heinz Wagner (eds.) *Sprache in Raum und Zeit*, 89–103. Tübingen: Narr.
 2004 Layers of convergent syntax in Macedonian Turkish. *Mediterranean Language Review* 15: 63–86.
- Németh, Gyula
 1956. *Zur Einteilung der Turkischen Mundarten Bulgariens*. Sofia: Bulgarische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Tufan, Şirin
 2007 Language convergence in Gostivar Turkish (Macedonia). PhD thesis, University of Manchester.

Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective

Edited by

Yaron Matras

Jeanette Sakel

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)
is a Division of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin.

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the
ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective / edited by Yaron
Matras, Jeanette Sakel.

p. cm. — (Empirical approaches to language typology ; 38)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-3-11-019628-3 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Language and languages — Foreign elements. 2. Grammar, Com-
parative and general. I. Matras, Yaron, 1963– II. Sakel, Jeanette,
1973–

P324.G73 2007

410–dc22

2007042917

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-11-019628-3

ISSN 0933-761X

© Copyright 2007 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin.

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book
may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical,
including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without per-
mission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany.

Conte

List of co

Introduct

Yaron Ma

Types of

Jeanette

The borro

Yaron Ma

Gramma

Maarten

Gramma

Joachim

Gramma

Felix K.

Gramma

Vincent A

Gramma

Yaron M

Gramma

Yaron M

Gramma

Geoffrey

Arabic g

Werner A