

SAYI 35 • 2010

**OSMANLI ARAŐTIRMALARI**  
THE JOURNAL OF OTTOMAN STUDIES

## Resolving an Anomaly in Balkan Lexical Borrowing: Turkish Loanwords in Serbian / Croatian\*

Adam Siegel\*\*

Despite the extensive literature on language contact and lexical borrowing in the Balkans in general and between Balkan languages and Turkish (T) in particular (from Vuk Karadžić on), little attention has been paid to one of the phonological peculiarities of Turkish loanwords in Serbian/Croatian (SC). While loanwords from other languages with word-initial palatalized velars *k'* and *g'* retain these stops in SC (e.g. *Kıpar* 'Cyprus,' *gimnazija*), similar borrowings from T are modified thus: *kilim* > *ćilim*, *güzel* > *đuzel*. Much of the literature on T loanwords in SC and elsewhere has passed over this phenomenon in silence; those who have considered it have theorized a possible sub- or adstrate influence contingent upon differences between two dialects (Western and Eastern Rumelian) of Balkan Turkish. However, analogically induced change provides a likelier explanation for this anomaly, viz., the presence of Macedonian (M) as intermediary language: the regular phonological correspondences between SC *ć* and *đ* and M *k'* and *g'* (both from Proto-Slavic *\*tj* and *\*dj*) are basic and universal in all environments (e.g., SC *noć* ~ M *nok'* 'night'; SC *ćirilica* ~ M *k'irilica* 'Cyrillic script', SC *tudi* ~ M *tug'i* 'foreign').

### Introduction

While much has been written about the lexical influence of Turkish (T) on Serbian/Croatian (SC), and the other languages of the Balkans,<sup>1</sup> little

\* Author's note: An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Western Association for Slavic Studies session at the 52<sup>nd</sup> Western Social Science Association conference in Reno, Nevada, in April 2010. Responsibility for translations and any errors therein is mine.

\*\* Peter J. Shiels Library, University of California, Davis.

1 The lexicography of T and other foreign loans in SC goes back nearly two centuries, to Vuk's *Rječnik* (1818). Lexicographical resources consulted include M. Filipova-Bairova and St. Ilchev, *Rečnik na chuzhdite dumi v bālgarskiia ezik* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo za Institut za bālgarski ezik, 1982); Alemko Gluhak, *Hrvatski Etimološki Rječnik* (Zagreb: August Cesarec, 1993); Blaže Koneski (ed.), *Rečnik na makedonskiot jazik* (Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik, 1961); M. Mladenova

attention has been paid to a somewhat anomalous phonological realization of T loanwords.<sup>2</sup> (The semantic field of T borrowings in the Balkans is another story: there is an extensive literature devoted to the cultural scope of language contact that dates back at least as far as Vuk Karadžić [1787-1864].<sup>3</sup>) Kragalott summarizes:

Turkish loanwords with / *ć* / and / *đ* / in initial position are the result of palatalization of the Turkish phonemes / *k*' / and / *g*' / in Serbo-Croatian (Menges 1968a: 140),<sup>4</sup> e.g., *ćebe* 'blanket,' *ćilim* 'rug,' *đon* 'shoe sole,' *đozluci* 'eyeglasses,' *đul* 'rose.' Occasionally, in certain jekavian dialects, native Serbocroatian words can have / *ć* / and / *đ* / in initial position. In these

---

et al, *Bugarsko-makedonski rečnik* (Skopje: Prosvetno delo, 1968); Peter Skok, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (Zagreb: JAZU, 1972); and Abdulah Škaljić, *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku* (Sarajevo: Svjetlost, 1966).

- 2 One notable exception is found in Alois Schmaus, "Zur Lautgestalt der türkischen Lehnwörter in den südslawischen Sprachen," in *Gesammelte slavistische und balkanologische Abhandlungen* (München: Rudolf Trofenik, 1971), 260-271. Schmaus notes (260-261) that few apart from Miklosich and Skok have paid significant attention to the fact that the phonological variety of loanwords from T throughout the region is so bewildering as to resist any attempt at systematic description, let alone analysis. This complexity, when combined with the limited knowledge of T historical dialectology both in the Balkans and beyond, only creates more difficulties for comprehensive analysis.
- 3 Compare Schmaus, "Zur Lautgestalt"; Stanisław Stachowski, *Fonetyka zapożyczeń osmańsko-tureckich w języku serbsko-chorwackim* (Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1973); W. Förster, "Zum Status der Turzismen in der serbokroatischen Literatursprache der Gegenwart," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 28/4 (1983): 619-624; Gerhard Neweklowsky, "Terms of Popular Culture Among Muslims," *Die Welt der Slaven* XLVI/1 (2001): 251-258. Among the most important works on T loans in SC are Vuk's *Rječnik*, Otto Blau's *Bosnisch-türkische Sprachdenkmäler* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd. V., No. 3), and Franz Miklosich, "Die türkische Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen," *Denkschriften der kais. Akad. Der Wissenschaften: Phil.-histo. Classe* 34-37 (1884-1892).
- 4 Menges, in his "Türkisches Sprachgut im Serbo-Kroatischen," *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 40 (1968): 135-154, comes tantalizing close to resolving this issue, noting that the fact that the rule *k*' > *ć*, *g*' > *đ* so regularly corresponds to the use of / *k*' / and / *g*' / for foreign loans in Old Church Slavonic, that this fact, coupled with a corresponding lack of occasional substitution of / *x* / rather than / *k* / for the Ottoman / *q* /, as is the case in Old Russian and Old Bulgarian, indicates the antiquity of this development in Ottoman (140).

instances, however, /ć/ and /đ/ are matched by /t/+ /j/ and /d/+ /j/ in other dialects of the language, e.g., *đevojka* ~ *djevojka* ‘girl,’ *đeca* ~ *djeca* ‘children,’ *ćerati* ~ *tjerati* ‘to chase,’ *ćedan* ~ *tjedan* ‘week.’ Thus, if /ć/ and /đ/ are found in word-initial position, they offer a phonological clue for the proper identification of Turkish elements in the Serbocroatian lexicon.<sup>5</sup>

Kragalott and others who have simply acknowledged this realization are too quick to take Menges at his word.<sup>6</sup> While word-initial /ć/ and /đ/ do in fact frequently dignify a foreign loan (e.g., *đavol* ‘devil’ < Latin *diabolus*), the fact that the SC phonemes /ć/ and /đ/ are originally derived from alveolar + palatal clusters \**tj* and \**dj* imply that it is unlikely that this velar palatalization is as simple and regular as it appears.<sup>7</sup> We should expect to find other instances of velar palatalization of loans that yield /ć/ and /đ/ – if we do not, then we shall have to discover why T loans are the exception.

It is not that SC cannot phonologically tolerate borrowings with word-initial palatalized velars or velar-front vowel onsets: e.g., *gesla* ‘slogan’ < Czech *heslo*, *gete* < Italian (Ital.) *ghétta*, *gem* ‘heron’ < Hungarian (H) *gem*, *kebar* < German (Ger.) *Käfer* ‘beetle,’ *kifla* ‘pastry’ < Ger. *Kipfel*. Throughout the Balkans, we find T loanwords reproduced with their velars intact: Bulgarian (B) *кюприя* < T *küprü*, *гьобек* < T *göbek*; Greek (Gk) *keramidi*, Albanian *qeramidhe*, B *керамуда*, Macedonian (M) *к’ерамуда*, SC *ćeramida* < T *keremid* < Arabic (Ar.) *قمريدة*.

The Slavist Alois Schmaus has offered a possible methodology for addressing T loans: distinguish between the pronunciation and orthography of T loans; distinguish among dialectal variation; remember the predominance of the oral over the written in transmission.<sup>8</sup>

5 Jasna Kragalott, “On the Phonology of Turkish Loanwords in Serbo-Croatian,” in *Topics in Slavic Phonology*, ed. Demetrius J. Koubourlis (Cambridge: Slavica, 1974), 127-139.

6 Compare V. E. Häneen-Antilla, “Les emprunts turcs dans les langues slaves du sud,” *Scando-Slavica* IX (1963): 227-233; Schmaus, “Zur Lautgestalt”; Stachowski, *Fonetyka*.

7 Terence R. Carlton, *Introduction to the Phonological History of the Slavic Languages* (Columbus: Slavica, 1991), 326-328.

8 Schmaus, “Zur Lautgestalt,” 261: “Die Sichtung wird erleichtert, wenn man gewisse methodische Grundsätze befolgt: (1) Man hat jeweils – auch für die arabischen

As noted, the phonological process affecting sound change in T loans has been observed and discussed for at least two centuries, with only one systematic attempt at fixing upon a cause for this phenomenon.

### The Rumelian Theory

The most elaborate account offered thus far for what might be referred to as the SC anomaly is what might be called the Rumelian hypothesis, which basically holds that differences between dialects of T spoken in the Balkans (Western and Eastern Rumelian, the border between which runs roughly north-south through western Bulgaria) are responsible for phonological differences in reflexes of T loans in the region, claiming the SC as T innovation.

According to Neweklowsky, “[t]he most evident Western Rumelian Turkish innovative feature is the palatalization of *k* to *ć* and *g* to *đ* before front vowels, e.g., *ćilim*, *ćeške*, *ćulah* (from T *külâh*), *đečerma*, *jenda*, *đerdan*, *leđen*, *đeric*. At the same time the conservation of *đ* (where derived from *ğ*) can be regarded as archaic since in Modern Turkish the pronunciation of *ğ* before front vowels changes into [y] (e.g., *leğan*).”<sup>9</sup>

The basis for this Rumelian hypothesis is the observation that differentiation between T dialectal groupings (distinct from the variant of Istanbul) in Bosnia dates back to the medieval period, and that a resolution of the problem of the classification of southwestern Turkic languages (including Ottoman) may shed light on language contact issues in the Balkans.<sup>10</sup>

---

und persischen lexikalischen Bestandteile des tk. – vom der volkstümlichen tk. Lautform und nicht von der gelehrten oder schriftsprachlichen Form auszugehen. (2) Man tut gut daran, jene Varianten auszusondern, die sich aus mundartlichen Besonderheiten der aufnehmenden Sprache erklären und den Entlehnungen – bzw. Aneignungsprozess selbst nicht berühren. (3) Zu der ersten Forderung berechtigt die Beobachtung, dass die Übernahme zu allgemeinen auf mündlichen Wege erfolgt ist. Der zweite methodische Grundsatz hilft das verwirrende lautliche Bild vereinfachen und lässt das Wesentliche deutlicher hervortreten.”

9 Neweklowsky, “Terms of Popular Culture Among Muslims,” 256.

10 N. K. Dmitriev, “Problemy i dostizheniia bosniiskoi turkologii,” *Zapiski kolegii Vostokovedov*, II (1926): 97-108. Dmitriev notes that textual record indicates that even during the Middle Ages Bosnia was home to Turkish dialect groupings that were distinct from the dialect of Istanbul, and that this material would serve as a

N. K. Dmitriev notes that the written evidence shows that the SC anomaly is of some historical standing, given its appearance in manuscripts dating back to the 16<sup>th</sup> century: “Accordingly, the law of Serbo-Croatian *Anlaut* ( $k' > \hbar$  and  $g' > \check{h}$ ) can even reflect the transmission of Ottoman words, and it is possible to conclude (even hypothetically) that Bosnians encountered distinct Ottoman dialects which had in their *Anlaut* voiceless / k / and / x / rather than their voiced counterparts.”<sup>11</sup>

Prokosch proceeds from here, arguing that the problem of how and when T words were introduced to SC not only requires attention to the linguistic history of Ottoman T, but its pre-history as well: “The problem in the transmission of Ottoman words in the language of the Serbs and the Croats, i.e., in modern Serbo-Croatian, has not yet been satisfactorily resolved. [...] More recently the problem of transmission has been taken up anew, so that we do not simply proceed assuming the Turkish etymon as point of departure, but rather learn to recognize an older linguistic stratum in the origin of many Ottoman words in SC.”<sup>12</sup>

Prokosch has most fully elaborated the hypothesis that dialectal differences within Anatolian T, with specific reference to treatment of palatalized velars, were carried with the Ottomans into the Balkans, where a fundamental distinction between Western Rumelian and Eastern Rumelian dialects of Ottoman T arose: “We can assume that Western Rumelian, the area of which was precisely determined by (J.) Németh, is the point of departure for the Ottoman lexicon in the language of the Serbs and Croats, as the dividing line between West and Eastern Rumelian runs through Bulgaria. All Ottoman dialects west of this line belong to the Western Rumelian group.”<sup>13</sup>

---

means of determining and classifying southwestern Turkic languages in general and Ottoman T in particular (107).

11 Ibid. A recurrent theme in the Rumelian hypothesis is the belief that Ottoman orthography indicates phonological reality, viz. the use of the Arabic *qaf* (ق) and *ghayn* (غ) to represent non-palatalized / k / and / g / vs. the use of *kaf* (ك) to represent both voiced and voiceless palatalized velars. Miklosich demonstrates in “Die türkische Elemente” exhaustively that the vast majority of front rounded vowels in T loans in SC occur with the *kaf* (i.e., palatalized velars).

12 Erich Prokosch, “Zur Ableitung der osmanischen Wörter in der Sprache der Serben und der Kroaten,” *Österreichische Osthefte* 27/1 (1985): 78-81, 78.

13 Ibid., 78-79.

For Prokosch (and his predecessors, such as Németh), all T loans in SC arrived via Western Rumelian. For him, the main problem is that this process cannot be documented in the lexicography.<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, a claim is made that Németh's glossary in his 1965 *Die Türken von Vidin* is both support for the Rumelian hypothesis and also tool for tracking transitional dialects between West and Eastern Rumelian.<sup>15</sup> Velars are an important isogloss for the two dialects, and the retention of velars before unrounded vowels (e.g., *kór*, *kúpri*; *gúbek*) is taken for evidence of the status of the T dialect of Vidin as transitional dialect.<sup>16</sup>

Prokosch goes on to claim that the palatalization of T loans in SC is part of broader T dialectal phenomenon, which he calls "Randosmanisch," whereby throughout the periphery of Ottoman T, both in the Balkans and in Anatolia (Trabzon and Rize), velars are palatalized or palato-alveolarized.<sup>17</sup>

Thus the SC anomaly can simply be reduced to a local variant of this Randosmanisch phenomenon, whereby the depalatalized Eastern Rumelian *k* is rendered as *ć* further west: *ćor* < \**ćór* (compare [cf.] Eastern Rumelian *kör*), *ćuprija* < \**ćúpri* (cf. Eastern Rumelian *köpri*, *köprü*), *šečer* < *šečer* (cf. Eastern Rumelian *šeker*). SC only uses *č* when it corresponds to Eastern Rumelian *č*: *česma* (cf. Eastern Rumelian *češme*).<sup>18</sup>

The same holds for Eastern Rumelian voiced velars: *đubre* < Western Rumelian \**d'ubre* (cf. Eastern Rumelian *gübre*), *đerdan* < Western Rumelian \**d'erdan* (cf. Eastern Rumelian *gerdán*). SC uses *dž* only when

14 Ibid., 79-80.

15 J. Németh, *Die Türken von Vidin* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1965); Németh reasons that similarities between Anatolian and Balkan dialects of T (or of dialectal unity) indicate that velar-alveolar palatalization is an innovation introduced by T speech communities to the South Slavs; J. Németh, *Zur Einteilung der türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens* (Sofia: Bulgarische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1956), 7.

16 Prokosch argues that T Black Sea dialects (Trabzon and Rize) are the source of the Ottoman lexicon in SC: Eastern Rumelian *k* ["as opposed to *q*!"] is always palatalized in "Randosmanisch," and tends toward *ɣ*: *kedi* > *čedi*, *beķār* > *bečar*, or to *t'*: *hareket* > *heret'et*. The same holds for the corresponding voiced consonants: Eastern Rumelian *g* is palatalized in "Randosmanisch," and tends toward *ğ*: *gelin* > *ğelin*, oder zu *d'*: *güneš* > *d'üneš*; "Zur Ableitung," 80.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid.

the underlying Western Rumelian  $\check{g}$  corresponds to Eastern Rumelian  $\check{g}$ : *džamija* (cf. Eastern Rumelian *ğāmi<sup>e</sup>*), *džep* (cf. Eastern Rumelian *ğep* < Ar. غيب).<sup>19</sup>

While there is no doubt that language contact between Rumelian dialects of T and Slavic languages did leave many traces, most evidence indicates that rounding or unrounding of front vowels has been a far more noticeable outcome: Grannes, in discussing the use of palatalization in B to render T front rounded vowels (T *güveş* > B *гювеш*, T *kürk* > B *кюрк*, T *göl* > B *гюл*), notes that the change  $\ddot{u} > u$  is a characteristic trait of the T dialects of Western Rumelian.<sup>20</sup>

Prokosch and his predecessors also neglect to account for exceptions in SC; in addition, they fail to address to any meaningful extent the numerous exceptions to this “Randosmanisch” phenomenon to be found throughout Southeastern Europe. Prokosch in particular complains that the question of Ottoman T loans in the languages of the region is so complex, especially when the intricacies of T dialect history on the peninsula are taken into consideration, that even the delineation of the differences between Western and Eastern Rumelian presents the researcher with an enormous challenge.<sup>21</sup>

### **Macedonian, the Macedonian “Problem,” and Common Slavic**

The evolution of Proto-Slavic phonemes in the Slavic languages has been well documented: *\*tj* and *\*dj* appear in the contemporary Slavic languages in regular, predictable forms; most saliently, in the South Slavic

19 Ibid. It is significant that so little actual evidence of the hypothesized forms of older stages of Western Rumelian can be located.

20 Alf Grannes, *Étude sur les turcismes en bulgare* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1970), 49-50.

21 Prokosch, “Zur Ableitung,” 81. As something of a promissory note, it is hoped that the question of palatalization as contact phenomenon throughout SE Europe will be more fully addressed. Suzanne Kukak’s *Recherches sur l’histoire de la langue osmanlie des XVIe et XVIIe siècles* (The Hague: Mouton, 1973) has assembled a particularly provocative body of evidence that suggests something of the fluidity in directionality with which Ottoman rule in SE Europe influenced language change. Gunnar Svane’s *Slavische Lehnwörter im Albanischen* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1992) is also crucial in drawing a contact-induced change map of the Balkans.



languages, as / ĉ / and / đ / in SC, as / št / and / žd / in Bulgarian (B), and as / k' / and / g' / in Macedonian (M).

Blaže Koneski points out that the planning and codification of standard Macedonian in the postwar period required acknowledging distinct dialect regions: specifically, the existence of a transitional region between southern SC and northern M, with an isogloss belt based on the distinction between palatalized velar stops (M) and palatalized alveolar affricates (SC).<sup>22</sup> This isogloss is a well-known phenomenon in Serbian dialectology as well – according to Serbian historical linguist Ivan Popović: “The sounds *ħ* and *ĥ* (*k'* and *g'*), which we use exclusively today, are the result of interference from more northerly Serbian dialects.”<sup>23</sup>

No matter the vantage point, the linguistic history of Macedonia presents a thorough challenge for both Turcologists and Slavists:

The Common Slavic (CS) clusters *\*tj*, *\*kt'* (before front vowels) and *\*dj* have given various reflexes in the South Slavic (SSI) group, and this alone is sufficient reason to think that this development reflects dialectal differentiation during the period after the fall of CS unity. Old Macedonian probably *t'* for *\*tj* and *\*kt'* (which before front vowels had fallen together with *\*tj* at an earlier date) and *d'* for *\*dj* as apparently was the case in some other regions of SSI territory, by the 7<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>24</sup>

Given the paucity of sources for determining the linguistic history of South Slavic (SSI) speech communities in the pre- (and post-) Ottoman area, most accounts of isogloss movement or contact-induced phonological change are conjectural. However, the broadest dialect geography for Common Slavic (CS) *\*tj* and *\*dj* in the Balkans can be surmised. As Koneski points out: “For example, the changes *k*, *g'* for CS *tj*, *kt'* - *dj* occur almost exclusively in the north, whereas in the central part of Macedonia there are many words ending in *št* and *žd*, while in the southern part of the country the latter forms predominate.”<sup>25</sup>

22 Blaže Koneski, *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik* (Skopje: Kočo Racin, 1965), 12-13.

23 Ivan Popović, *Istorija srpskohrvatskog jezika* (Novi Sad: Matica Srpska, 1955), 63.

24 Blaže Koneski, *A Historical Phonology of the Macedonian Language* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1983), 10.

25 Koneski, *Istorija*, 12-13.

Koneski has also acknowledged the fluidity (motivated by political factors) with which these features must have spread during the medieval period:

It is interesting to pose the question of the extent to which contact with the medieval B(ulgarian) and S(erbian) states influenced the direction of the diffusion of such phenomena. One cannot exclude the possibility that the close contact of the M and B dialects within the framework of the First Bulgarian Empire (9<sup>th</sup> – 10<sup>th</sup>- centuries) influenced the spread of such older features as *\*tj > št* and *\*dj > žd* [...] while the penetration of medieval Serbia into M regions (13<sup>th</sup> – 14<sup>th</sup> centuries), thereby strengthening earlier contacts, contributed to the spread of changes such as *\*tj > k'* and *\*dj > g'* ...<sup>26</sup>

I submit that this pre-Ottoman state of affairs—the fracture of CS *\*tj* and *\*dj* into at least three distinct SSl reflexes (SC / *ć* / and / *đ* /, M / *k'* / and / *g'* /, and B / *št* / and / *žd* /) the isoglosses of which seem to have been significantly mobile in the medieval Balkans—constitutes the reason for the SC anomaly: M, spoken immediately to the south of the SC speech communities (i.e., closer to Turkey), has, as part of its defining phonological inventory the palatalized velars / *k'* / and / *g'* /. These velars, as reflexes of CS *\*tj* and *\*dj* obviously long predate the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans. They are defining components in an enormous number of everyday lexical items of Common Slavic stock, and generally serve as the sole point of distinction between M and SC: M *nok* ' ~ SC *noć* 'night,' M *lug'e* ~ SC *luđe* 'people. This is the case in all environments: *Božik* ' ~ *Božić* 'Christmas,' *domak'in* ~ *domaćin* 'householder,' *kuk'a* ~ *kuća* 'house,' *k'erka* ~ *ćerka* 'daughter,' *meg'a* ~ *međa* 'boundary,' *grag'anec* ~ *građanec* 'citizen,' etc.<sup>27</sup> Given the longstanding dialect continuum that runs through the SSl linguistic area, it can be assumed that this fundamental distinction among the various reflexes of CS *\*tj* and *\*dj* has been universally recognized among

26 Koneski, *A Historical Phonology*, 2.

27 Koneski provides the most authoritative account here; *A Historical Phonology*, 51-54. While standard M is, of course, to a certain degree a product of postwar language planning, the historical phonology of the dialectal continuum of SSl that runs from Bulgaria through Macedonia and into Serbia and further northwest demonstrates the longevity of this phonological distinction. This is well covered in the work cited and Horace G. Lunt's *Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language* (Skopje: Drzhavo Knigoizdatelstvo, 1952).

the speech communities along its isoglosses, most saliently in those parts of the Balkans (southern Serbia, Macedonia, eastern Bulgaria) which define Western Rumelia.

Thus, it seems likely that hypercorrection by analogy on the part of SC speech communities, encountering neologisms in the speech of their neighbors to the south, is the most likely explanation for the SC anomaly. T loans were borrowed into M and B with palatalized velars intact. B, in contrast with M, has no native palatal velars, but indicates them orthographically, by softening the following vowel: КЪО- КЮ- КЯ- ГЪО- ГЮ- ГЯ-. The *Bugarsko-makedonski rečnik* indicates a one-to-one correspondence between B palatalized velars and M word-initial / k' / and / g' /. The *Rečnik na makedonskiot jazik*, which provides definitions for M words in SC, shows that almost every entry in the sections for K' and G' lists a corresponding SC form with word-initial / ć / and / đ /. In Skok's dictionary, every SC borrowing from a palatalized velar source from the south (Gk or T) leads with / ć / and / đ /.<sup>28</sup> All corresponding forms in M have word-initial palatalized velars. Borrowings from other directions retain word-initial velars: e.g., *kifla*, *gem* (see above).

SC dictionaries reveal that most entries for / ć / and / đ / are borrowed. Native words are either obviously onomatopoeic or descend directly from CS \**tj* and \**dj* (*ća(h)oriti* 'blow like the wind,' *ćaća* < \**tjatja* 'daddy'). Tellingly, foreign loans with word-initial / ć / and / đ / whose direction of transmission is not obviously intermediated by M are cases in which an original palatalized alveolar was retained: *đavol* < Latin *diabolus* 'devil.' In Hadrovics, with one exception (*ćasa* 'deep dish'), all / ć / entries are derived from alveolars.<sup>29</sup> Significantly, Skok considers *ćasa* to be of T origin. Most entries for / đ / in Hadrovics derive, not surprisingly, from Hungarian gy: e.g., *đendēs* < *gyöngyös* 'pearly, ornamented with pearls.' Hungarian loans with word-initial velars, as noted above, remain intact in SC, even those which occur before front rounded vowels: *kečege* < *köcsöge* 'pitcher.'

When we consult the lexicographical evidence, we can use this hypothesis to explain seeming exceptions to the SC anomaly: SC *keča* < T *kece*

<sup>28</sup> For the three dictionaries referred to, see n. 1 above.

<sup>29</sup> László Hadrovics, *Ungarische Elemente im Serbokroatischen* (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1985).

‘mat, carpet’ seems to be an exception (we would expect *ćeča*). While dissimilation might be an explanation, the fact that the T loan is attested in H and Polish (*kecse*, *kieca*) and not in Gk or B implies that the loan entered SC through H, and not M. The fact that in M the word appears as *keča* rather than the expected *kek’a* further underscores the likelihood that the loan arrived from the north.<sup>30</sup>

### Directionality

Proceeding from this hypothesis as a starting-point, we are now in a position to track language change across the Ottoman Balkans both geographically and chronologically. While it is obvious that B is the logical transition zone for the transmission of T loans in Western Rumelia, the process by which T velar obstruent + front rounded vowel emerged as palatalized obstruent + back vowel warrants closer attention. Grannes, who authored the most comprehensive study on the subject, notes the process (T *güveş* > B *giuvesh*, T *kürk* > B *kiurk*, T *göl* > B *g’ol*) and acknowledges that it is characteristic of Rumelian T dialects as well.<sup>31</sup>

As the role of B as intermediary is now better understood, we can address the role of SC as intermediary for T in other languages of the Balkans and SE Europe. Hungarian presents a special case, as it is likely that a significant T lexicon entered the languages both directly from T (or some intermediary language that left loans largely unchanged) or SC. As noted above, if we assume that hypercorrection accounts for all T loans in SC, those exceptions at the periphery of the SC area or beyond can be assumed to have entered the language by some route other than through M.

30 It should be stated that while the primary evidence for hypercorrection are loans from T, SC *ćelija* ‘cell’ (~ M *kelija*) is borrowed directly from Gk *kellion*. Hypercorrection may account for an exception to this regular correspondence between SC and M: the name of their common alphabet, SC *ćirilica* ~ M *kirilica*. We should expect M *k’irilica*. One possible reason may be the lack of uniformity in the pronunciation of ‘Cyrillic’ throughout the Slavic world: while B and Russian also use / k /, Czech uses an alveolar affricate: *cyrilice*. A more likely explanation is that the word’s form in modern literary M was retained (cf. B *kirilica*) simply as a Slavic internationalism.

31 Grannes, *Étude sur les turcismes en bulgare*, 49-50: “The sound-change *ü* > *u* is a trait characteristic of the Turkish dialects of West Rumelia.”

Kukak argues that T loans in Hungarian (H) arrived via Bosnia, as indicated by the variety of transcriptional options in H for loans from T: for the velar / q / and the palatal / k / not only are the graphemes “k,” “ku,” “c<sup>h</sup>,” “ch,” or “k̂” used, but also “cs” and “ch” for / č /, in accordance with the textual evidence from Bosnian Turkish in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>32</sup>

Kukak, like so many others, identifies the geographic distinction between Western Balkan (i.e., Rumelian) languages and Eastern, and notes that H can be fitted into either region.<sup>33</sup> She also makes the distinction between T loans in H that have obviously arrived via the mediation of SC and those which have not. It would be better to make the distinction between T loans in H that have incontestably arrived via SC (through “Western Rume- lia,” i.e., via M) and those, regardless of path, that have not: “In general, in Hungarian the sound corresponding to palatal *k* is *k*, although *ky* [= *k*] is also found (through depatalization this can also lead to *t*), along with *cs* [= *č*]. It might be supposed that the latter corresponds to Serbo-Croat *ć*, for the words where it appears have resulted from Slavic intermediation.” It is likely that two different paths of transmission into H are the cause for variant forms that co-exist, particularly for personal names: H *Batyir*, *Betir*, *Bicsir* (~ Ottoman T [OtT] *Bekir*), *Csebár* (~ OtT *Kibār*); or *tyihája*, *tihája* (~ OtT *kihāya*), *tyilim*, *csilim* (~ OtT. *kilim*), *vetyil* (~ OtT *vekil*).<sup>34</sup>

The question of Gk loans in SC is an interesting one, given the length of time over which the two have been in contact, and the number of avenues (geographic and cultural) via which Gk loans have entered SC.<sup>35</sup> The

32 Kukak, *Recherches sur l'histoire de la langue osmanlie*, 473: “Ce fait est en rapport avec le caractère bosniaco-turc du manuscrit [Illésházy] en question.”

33 “Certaines parmi les langues d'emprunt font la différence entre les *k* palatal et vélaire, tandis que d'autres la négligent. C'est le *k* qui dans le bulgare, le roumain, le grec moderne et en general aussi dans le hongrois, correspond aux deux sens. Le système des correspondences n'est la meme dans le serbo-croate, le macédonien, l'albanais, et dans une certaine mesure dans le hongrois. Dans ces langues le *q* vélaire est toujours remplacé par un *k*, tandis que dans le serbo-croate, c'est le *ć* (sauf certains cas où le *k* se conserve) dans le macédonien le *k'*, dans l'albanais le *q* qui correspondent au *k* palatal;” *ibid.*

34 *Ibid.*, 473-4. Warranting much closer study is the distinction between alveolars and palatalized alveolars in T velar loans in H. Kukak also holds that the variation stems from differences between West and Eastern Rumelian.

35 This issue has been best handled by Max Vasmer, who notes that SC words of Gk origin are not always borrowed directly from Gk. The indirect paths of transmission

historical record is somewhat inconclusive: Vasmer notes that there are numerous examples of SC loans that resulted either from Gk > T transmission, or vice versa: SC *đumruk*, *g'umruk*' (ca 15<sup>th</sup> cent.) < T *gümriük* < Gk *κουμμέρκι(ον)*.<sup>36</sup> The question of the geography of transmission for such pre-Ottoman loans is equally bifurcated.<sup>37</sup>

Tracking the impact of dialectal variation in language contact in the medieval Balkans is a difficult enterprise, but onomastic evidence is often revealing. As noted above, shifting isogloss boundaries for local reflexes of CS *\*tj* and *\*dj* between Serbia and Bulgaria can be seen in place-names. We also have evidence of hypercorrection by analogy occurring in the opposite direction (i.e., north > south, from SC > M): *Μαρουληκ* a “puzzling” Slavic family name found in a 12<sup>th</sup> century Byzantine trading ledger, is puzzling only if we assume direct transmission of this personal name from Dalmatia to Constantinople. Just as the modern SC Marulić is rendered in M as Marulik', Gk records from Zemun, outside Belgrade, seem to show local variation between / *ć* / and / *k*' /, and closer inspection of the Gk record in Serbia in the Middle Ages may yield some statistically interesting information regarding the ratio between one reflex or the other along this isogloss.<sup>38</sup>

---

are variously Ottoman T, western European languages, typically Romance (Italian or Dalmatian), or B; *Die griechische Lehnwörter im Serbo-kroatischen* (Berlin: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1944), 10.

36 Ibid., 10-11. Vasmer notes that the intermediation of T for the transmission of Gk loans is typically accompanied by regular sound-changes; he also points out that in some cases the path from Gk may have led through Arabic or Persian as well. Old Serbian *kumerk*' is evidence of a loan from Middle Gk. The ultimate source is of course Latin *commercium*.

37 “Lateinisch-romanische Vermittlung vom griechischen Wörtern lässt sich teilweise durch wortgeographische Kriterien wahrscheinlich machen, besonders aber widerum durch lautliche Argumente;” *ibid.*, 11-12. The example given here is rather straightforward. Old Serbian *kiparis*' (13<sup>th</sup> century) ‘cypress’ < Gk *κωπάρισσος* does not necessarily conflict with SC *čepres* ‘cypress’ < Ital. *cipresso*: the retention of the Gk velar in the Old Serbian form most likely reflects the quality of the vowel that follows. A closer examination of older Gk loans into SC may provide clues as to the pronunciation of Gk / *v* / in the region.

38 Dimitri Theodoris, “Das Rätsel um den ‘byzantinischen’ Familiennamen *Μαρουληκ*,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 100/1 (2007): 177-187. Theodoris notes that in the archival sources of Greek merchants in the Serbian kingdom of Zemun, the ratio of the Slavic name-ending *-ić* rendered as *-ίκης* rather than *-ίς* is 3:1.

## Conclusion

In addition to the hypercorrection by analogy hypothesis I have introduced above, an additional refutation of the Rumelian hypothesis for contact-induced language change is that the directionality of change originates with the demographically dominant Slavic languages to the Balkan dialects of T:<sup>39</sup> “Bazı hallerde ö/ü yerine ó/ú: *dort, gotur, yún* [...] İlk hecede ö > ü/ú/w: *küpri/kupri*.”<sup>40</sup> This is true not only for unrounding of front rounded vowels, but for palatalization of T velars: “Kalın vokalli kelimelerde ince *g, k, l* sesleri *g', k'* ve *l'* harfleriyle işaret edilmiştir.”<sup>41</sup> In another context, Menges has described how both Karaim and Gagauz, both minority Turkic languages in close contact with dominant Slavic speech communities (Polish, Ukrainian), have lost front rounded vowels with resultant palatalization of preceding velars.<sup>42</sup> This pan-Turkic phenomenon, rather than the “Randosmanisch” account, is in greater accord with the realities of contact-induced change between numerically disproportionate speech communities.<sup>43</sup> It may well be that we should reserve the term “Western Rumelian” to describe the process by which regular correspondences in the sound systems of closely related neighboring Slavic languages shaped

---

This variant form is also found to the north, the *-ik* ending even appearing in Italian sources (185).

39 Given that the weight of the Rumelian hypothesis rests upon Németh’s work in Vidin (only a few hundred T speakers remained by the early 1930s), it seems strange that the unlikelihood of a small speech community, no matter how politically dominant, would force a phonological change as far-reaching as SC velar-alveolar palatalization. Almost all the texts in Németh’s Vidin glossary came from a single speaker.

40 J. Eckman, “Dinler (Makedonya) türk ağzı,” *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Bellekten* (1960): 189-204, 190.

41 *Ibid.*, 191.

42 Karl Menges, *The Turkic Languages and Peoples* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1968), 63, 181. More complete accounts of Karaim and Gagauz phonology may be found in K. M. Musaev’s “Karaimskii iazyk,” in *Iazyki narodov SSSR, tom II: Tiurskie iazyki*, ed. V. V. Vinogradov (Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Nauka, 1966), 112-138, and L. A. Pokrovskaja’s “Gagauzskii iazyk,” in *Iazyki narodov SSSR, tom II: Tiurskie iazyki*, 260-279.

43 This conclusion may serve as another promissory note for a fuller account of palatalization as a contact phenomenon among Turkic-language speech communities of Eastern Europe: e.g., Rumelian Turkish, “Randosmanisch,” Gagauz, Karaim, and Crimean Tatar.

the transmission of loans and borrowings, most likely beginning with the earliest linguistic differentiation of said communities. Taking a closer look at loans that have passed through the Western Rumelian filter of the SC – M isogloss boundary into neighboring non-Slavic languages (chiefly Hungarian and Albanian) may yield insight into transmission path and period as loan-words from the south (either T or pre-Ottoman) traveled through the region.