## Πρακτικά Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου

## ΒΑΛΚΑΝΙΚΗ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΣΥΓΧΡΟΝΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΧΡΟΝΙΑ

30 Οκτωβοίου - 1 Νοεμβοίου 1997 Θεσσαλονίκη

Akten des Internationalen Kongresses

# BALKANLINGUISTIK SYNCHRONIE UND DIACHRONIE

30 Oktober - 1 November 1997 Thessaloniki

Επιστημονική επιμέλεια Χρήστος Τζιτζιλής και Χαράλαμπος Συμεωνίδης Herausgegeben von

Christos Tzitzilis

und

Charalambos Symeonidis

ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗ

THESSALONIKI

2000

### Some problems of Balkan Turcisms

#### Snežana Petrović

Institute for Serbian Language, Yugoslavia

- 0. In order to present an overall picture of the origin of words (in this case, Turkish loan-words) that would conform with contemporary etymological studies, it is not sufficient merely to indicate the word's etymon. It is required that they be viewed in a wider, areal context (by comparing them with respective Turcisms in other Balkan languages) in order to analyse the phonetic, semantic and morphological characteristics of these lexemes, as well as to highlight and interpret the number of characteristics that decline from the forms of these words in contemporary Turkish, primarily those characteristics that reflect the influence of West Rumelian dialects1. All these requirements, naturally, cannot be met by a single dictionary, although such lexicographic handbooks have frequently been a starting-point for individual studies dealing with these problems. At the same time, etymological studies and dictionaries, in the field of Turcology, could be improved by exploiting the results of such specialised studies2. Their achievements have depended on, and will continue to depend on, the size and the nature of the studied corpus of SCr lexical material, and also the extent to which Turkish dialects have been studied, as well as on the availability of the Turkish lexicon<sup>3</sup>.
- 1. Our primary topic of interest, the phonetic characteristics of Turkish loans in the Serbo-Croatian language, has been studies by many distinguished scholars: Dmitriev (1928 and 1929), Schmaus (1955), Hazai (1964), Adamović (1972-1973) and Stachowski (1973). The subject of these studies and monographs is mainly the corpus of Turcism in the dictionaries of Vuk, Škaljić and Knežević, the lesser portion of it coming from the RSA dictionary. This lexical material, over a long period of time the only one available, features in the first place Turcisms in the speech of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and central Serbia, as well as in the literary language, so that the conclusions reached in these works are based on the phonetic features of these forms of speech4. In an attempt to show the contribution of this new dialectal material<sup>5</sup> in a study of the phonetic adaptation and phonetic characteristics of Turcisms in the Serbo-Croatian language, this paper analyses the semivowel in Turkish loan-words, be it originally a reflex of the Turkish i, or the consequence of phonets changes typical of the vernacular in southern and south-eastern Serbia<sup>6</sup>. Turcisms from this area, known for their semantic and phonetic peculiarities, are compared with the Škaljić's corpus, and then with the Bulgarian Turcisms on the other hand. Previous studies of the reflexes of the Turkish i in Serbo-Croatian have shown that it is replaced either by existing SCr vowels (usually a, u or i), or rarely by a vocalic r, since the semivowel is normally absent from Serbo-Croatian dialects. It was also noted that the semivowel occurs in place of this Turkish vowel only in

the speech of Kosovo and Metohija, as described in the dialectal dictionary of Gliša Elezović<sup>7</sup>. Among other things, our analysis widens the territory on which this feature is present.

2. First we will point to the appearance of the semivowel in Turkish loans in this dialect, which is etymological, i.e. it has the same position as in the Turkish word model, and it is taken over as such. The majority of examples show the semivowel in SCr words as being stressed, which conforms to the phonetic characteristics of this dialect. There the semivowel (as a reflex of the Protoslavonic palatal and non-palatal semivowel) is in its turn, best preserved when stressed.

2.1. The semivowel in a word base8:

адым, адымче, адам 'human or animal hermaphrodite' (Leskovac, Vranje), адум, хадум (Škaljić)\*, Bulg. ъдъмлък (Grannes 1996: 162) < Turk. hadım 9,

азгын, азган, 'furious' (Leskovac, Pirot, Vranje), азгин (Škaljić), Bulg. азгын, ъзгын (Grannes 1996: 162) < Turk. azgın,

азьр 'ready' (Leskovac, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), азуран (Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), ха́зур (Škaljić), Bulg. азър (BD I 241) < Turk. hazır,

акьл reason' (Leskovac, Pirot), акьлан. (Pirot), акал. (Vlasotince, Leskovac), акил, ак'л (Škaljić), Bulg. акъл. < Turk. akıl,

алтан, алтын 'gold, golden, golden coin' (Pirot, Vranje), алтун, алтин (Škaljić), Bulg. алтын < Turk. altın,

арам, арым 'damned' (Pirot), арум 'furious' (Leskovac), арун, харун (Škaljić) < Turk. harın,

атар, атър 'will, love' (Leskovac, Pirot, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), хатар, хатор, хатер, хатур (Škaljić), Bulg. атър (BD I 242) < Turk. hatır,

ачык пита 'kind of a dish' (Vranje), ачик, хачик (Škaljić), Bulg. aчик < Turk. açık,

былгыз 'wife's sisters husband', былгыза, былдыза 'sister in-low (to a man)' (Leskovac), балгыза (Pirot), балдыза (Škaljić), Bulg. балдыза < Turk. baldız<sup>10</sup>,

бакалым 'let's see' (Pirot), бакалум (Škaljić) < Turk. bakalım<sup>11</sup>, бакыр 'copper' (Leskovac, Pirot), (Лесковац, Пирот), бакар (Škaljić), Bulg. бакыр < Turk. bakır,

зьбын 'clothe without a sleeve', зьбынција 'tailor' (Pirot), зубун (Škaljić), Bulg. зъбын < Turk. zıbın,

jaнцык, jeнцык 'leather bag' (Pirot), jaнцик (Škaljić) < Turk. yancık, jaстык 'pillow' (Leskovac, Pirot), jeстык (Pirot, Vranje) < Turk. yastık,

јазък 'damage' (Pirot), језък, језак 'shame' (Leskovac), јазук (Škaljić), Bulg. йазък (BD I 250) < Turk. yazık,

калып 'mold' (Leskovac, Pirot, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), калуп, калуф (Škaljić). Bulg. калып, калап, калуп (BER) < Turk. kalıp,

кьна 'henna' (Pirot), кна, кина, крна, кана, к'на, кена (Škaljić), Bulg. къна (BER) < Turk. kına,

кьсмет, кьсметлија 'destiny, luck' (Leskovac, Pirot, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), кисмет, крсмет (Škaljić), Bulg. късмет < Turk. kısmet,

кадына 'respectable lady' (Pirot) кадуна (Škaljić), Bulg. кадына

(BER) < Turk. kadın,

крмыз 'red' (Leskovac), крмез, крмзи (Škaljić), Bulg. кърмыз

(BER) < Turk. kırmız,

назлын 'noble' (Vranje), назлындисујем 'to be shy' (Leskovac), назланџија ' (Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), назли (Škaljić), Bulg. назлы, назлым, назлама, назландисвам се, назланджия (BER) < Turk. nazlı,

нальне, налуне, наньле, нануле, лальне 'patens' (Leskovac), наламје (Pirot), налуне, нануле, налуле (Škaljić), Bulg. налъм, налън,

налан, налун, лалъм (BER) < Turk. nalin,

ськлет 'oppressiveness' (Leskovac, Pirot), саклет (Pirot, Vranje),

саклет, скрлет (Škaljić), Bulg. съклет (BD I 268) < Turk. siklet,

сакыз 'chewing resin' (Leskovac), саказ, сакрз (Škaljić) < Turk. sakız,

сакын 'don't talk, keep a secret' (Vranje) < Turk. sakın,

сандык, сындык 'box' (Pirot), сандык (Leskovac), сандук (Skaljić) < Turk. sandık,

сатыр 'hacking knife' (Leskovac, Pirot) < Turk. satır,

чадыр 'umbrella', чадор 'tent, group of people' (Leskovac), Bulg.

чадър. (BD I 271) < Turk. çadır,

чакър 'cross-eyed, kind of falcon' '(Leskovac, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), чекър, чакарлија, чекарлија (Vranje, ibid.), чакар, чакр (Škaljić), Bulg. чакърест (BD I 271) < Turk. çakır,

чалык 'mad man' (Leskovac, Vranje), чалнык (Lebane), чалук

(Škaljić) < Turk. çalık,

цаным, цанам, цанум 'my dear' ' (Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), цанум (Škaljić) < Turk. canım,

шашкын 'crazy man' (Vranje, Leskovac), шышкын (Leskovac),

шашкин (Škaljić) < Turk. şaşkın.

2.1.1. Half of approximately thirty examples show a certain fluctuation when it comes to the reflex of a Turkish vowel, even when found in the same locations. So this vowel appears both as a semivowel and as an a, u, o or y: алтан, алтын; азгын, азгын, азыр, азуран; атыр, језык, језак; калып, калып; сандык, сандык. This can be explained by the greater wideness of pronunciation of the stressed vowel.

2.1.2. Most of the Bulgarian material also reflects the semivowel in the same words, except in some cases where, instead of the semivowel, there is also

an i, u or a: Bulg. ачик, калуп, калап.

2.1.3. On the other hand, as expected, the Škaljić's corpus demonstrates a difference regarding the words analysed; the position of the Turkish ι can be occupied by various SCr vowels<sup>12</sup>: instead of *ατωρ* in the Prizren-Timok dialect, there are *κάταρ*, *κάτορ*, *κάτορ*, *κάτγρ*; instead of *κωςμετ* - *κμέςμετ*, etc. In the following examples: *κρμα*, *κρέςμετ*, *έρκηετ*, *έρκητες*, *έρκητες* 

demonstrated in the studies written by Lehiste and Ivić (Ivić-Lehiste 1967). The vocalic r usually appears after or before the velar k. Only when it comes to the word  $\mathbf{uakp}$ , is there an r in the Turkish word, while in the other examples the SCr vocalic r, due to its phonological nature, stands for the Turkish  $\iota$ .

2.2. The semivowel in the suffix -lik<sup>13</sup>

агьлык, агалык, аганлык, агалык 'pleasure' (Leskovac) Bulg. агалык, Мас. агалак < Turk. agalık,

азгынлык, азганлак 'rage' (Vranje, Pirot), Bulg. азгынлык, азгынлык (Grannes 1996: 162) < Turk. azgınlık,

аилык 'agreement' (Leskovac), ајлык 'salary' (Pirot, Leskovac), ајлык 'id.', ајлук (Leskovac), Виlg. айлык, Мас. dial. ајлык (Stachowski 1991) < Turk. aylık,

ајнаџилък 'laziness' (Pirot), Bulg. айнаджилък (Grannes 1996: 161) < Turk. aynacılık,

албатлык 'blacksmith's trade' (Pirot) < Turk. nalbantlık,

алтальк 'golden coin' (Leskovac), Bulg. алтальк, алтьльк (Grannes 1996: 163) < Turk. altılık,

аргатлык 'work as a day laborer' (Pirot) < Turk. irgatlik,

арсьзлык 'malice' (Pirot), Bulg. арсьз (BER) < Turk. arsızlık,

ацильк 'pilgrimage' (Pirot), Bulg. хаджильк (Grannes 1996: 202) < Turk. hacılık,

быдывлык, бадавлык\*14 'idleness' (Leskovac) < Turk. bedava,

бьтьклык, батаклык 'damage' (Leskovac), Bulg. батаклык (Grannes 1996: 165), Mac. батакчилык (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. batak, bataklık,

бакалык 'groceries' (Leskovac, Pirot), Bulg. бакаллык, Mac. dial. bakalык (Stachowski 1991) < Turk. bakkallık,

баксузлык 'trouble' (Leskovac) < Turk. bahtsızlık,

бачалык, башчалык 'a gift given by the bride' (Leskovac), бошчалык (Pirot, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981) < Turk. bohçalık,

бачованлык 'gardening' (Leskovac), башчеванцилык (Pirot), Bulg. бахчеванлык, бахчеванджилык (Grannes 1996: 165) < Turk. bahçıvanlık, bahçıvancılık,

бышкылык (Leskovac), башкалык 'a separate portion of property' (Pirot, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), Bulg. башкалык (BD I 242) < Turk. başkalık,

бећарлък 'bachelorhood' (Leskovac), Bulg. бекярлък (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. bekârlık,

бојацлык 'painters trade' (Pirot), Bulg. бояджилык (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. boyacılık,

домазлык 'property' (Leskovac, Pirot), домазлыкчија 'host' (Pirot), домазлычан 'best kept for breeding' (Leskovac, Vranje), Bulg. дамазлык, дамазлык (BER) < Turk. damızlık, damazlık,

душманлык 'hate' (Pirot), Bulg. душманлык (BER) < Turk. düşmanlık,

инацильк 'spite' (Pirot), Bulg. инатльк (BER) < Turk. inatçılık, јавашльк 'negligence' (Pirot), јавашлук (Leskovac), Мас. јавашлак (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. yavaşlık,

јебанџилък 'foreign country' (Pirot), Bulg. йъбънджилък (Grannes 1996: 178) < Turk. yabancılık,

казанџилък 'coppersmith's trade' (Pirot), Bulg. казанджилък (BER) < Turk. kazancılık,

калабалык 'crowd' (Leskovac, Pirot, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), Bulg. калабалык, Мас. калабалак (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. kalabalık,

каванлык 'beekeeping' (Leskovac, Pirot, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), Bulg. кованлык (BER) < Turk. kovanlik,

кулакьлык 'kind of a woman cap' (Pirot), Bulg. кулаклык (BER) < Turk. kulaklık,

мурдьлык 'sloppy' (Leskovac), мурдарлык (Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), Bulg. мурдарлык (Grannes 1996: 190) < Turk. mundarlık, murdalık, murdarlık,

мутавџилък 'the trade of making articles of goat hear' (Pirot), Bulg. мутафчилък (Grannes 1996: 190) < Turk. mutafçılık,

натаналык 'slowly' (Vranje), на тенелык (Leskovac) < Turk. tehna, ортаклык 'mutual business' (Vranje), Bulg. орталык (BER), ортаклык (Grannes 1996: 192) < Turk. ortaklik,

раатлык 'comfort' (Pirot), Bulg. рахатлык, Mac. рахатлак (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. rahatlık,

сарачлык 'saddler's trade' (Pirot) < Turk. saraçlık,

табаклык 'tanner's trade' (Pirot), Bulg. табаклык (Grannes 1996: 198) < Turk. tabaklık,

ћесатлык 'stagnation in business' (Vranje), Bulg. кесатлык (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. kesatlık,

ћириџилък 'carrier's trade' (Pirot), Bulg. кираджилък (BER) < Turk. kiracılık,

чорбалык 'kind of a plate' (Leskovac, Pirot), Bulg. чурбылык (Grannes 1996: 206) < Turk. çorbalık,

чорбацилык 'wealth' (Pirot), Bulg. чорбаджилык (Grannes 1996: 206) < Turk. çorbacılık,

цабалык 'cheapness' (Pirot), цьбылык (Leskovac) < Turk. \*cabalık (Stachowski 1992: 35),

шашавлык 'stupidity' (Leskovac, Pirot) < Turk. şaşal,

шашкьлык, шьшкьнлык 'stupidity' (Leskovac), шашканлык (Pirot) < Turk. şaşkınlık.

2.2.1. Most of the scholars who have studied the phonetic form of the Turkish suffix -lik in Serbo-Croatian (Hazai, Schmaus, Stachowski, Adamović) had at their disposal only lexical material in which that formans is almost always used as  $-\pi y\kappa$ . The tendency toward phonetic unification in SCr Turcisms is explained as a consequence of the situation in West Rumelian dialects in which, continuing a feature typical of the Old Osmanic language, the suffix -lik/-lik comes after the labial and non-labial bases. Numerous examples of Turcisms with this suffix in our material show a tendency toward unification in the variant  $-\pi b\kappa$ , with a few parallel examples with  $-\pi y\kappa$  and  $-\pi a\kappa$ . The most acceptable explanation for this situation should be sought in already mentioned

characteristics of the West Rumelian dialects of the Osmanic language, although the morphological explanation offered by Grannes should not be completely discarded (Grannes 1996: 228-229).

2.2.2. The suffix -π<sub>b</sub>κ in these SCr forms of speech (as well as in Bulgarian), and relatively more than in other SCr territory, is very productive with non-Turkish bases<sup>15</sup>. This fact might have contributed to its phonetic unification even in places where it would be expected to appear as -π<sub>u</sub>κ<sup>16</sup>. Even in such examples we can consider this to be the etymological form of the suffix. This is primarily due to the fact that some studies based on older Turkish lexicographic sources and on comparative Balkan material lead us to the conclusion that in the earliest phase of the West Rumelian Turkish dialects this suffix appeared solely as -l<sub>l</sub>k, which yielded a SCr -π<sub>y</sub>κ, and -π<sub>b</sub>κ in this speech (Németh 1956: 28-29, Adamović 1972/73). Also in Prizren Turkish speech this suffix only appears as -l<sub>l</sub>k (Hafiz 1979: 70). Those examples are:

антерилык, антерилык 'making a dress' (Leskovac) < Turk. entarilik, бешлык 'transverse beam, silver coin' (Vranje, Leskovac), Bulg. бешлык (Grannes 1996: 214) < Turk. beşlik,

везирлык 'pleasure' (Vranje, Zlatanović) < Turk. vezirlik,

дунђерлък 'masonry' (Pirot), Bulg. дюлгерлък, дюлгерлик (Grannes 1996: 216) < Turk. dülgerlik,

ешеклык 'mischief' (Leskovac), Bulg. ешеклик (Grannes 1996: 217) < Turk. eşeklik,

јергенлък 'bachelorhood' (Vranje), јерђенлък (Pirot), Bulg. ергенлък, ергенлик (BER) < Turk. ergenlik,

комшилык, комшилык 'neighborhood' (Leskovac), Bulg. комшилык, ком

марифетлык 'skill' (Leskovac), марифетлук (Vranje), Mac. марифетлак (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. marifetlik,

мезельк 'tidbits to accompany a drink' (Leskovac), Bulg. мезельк, мезелик, Mac. мезелик (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. mezelik,

мејанцильк 'profession of a tavern keeper' (Pirot), Bulg. механджильк (БЕР) < Turk. meyhanecilik,

муштерилык, муштерилык 'buying' (Leskovac) < Turk. müşterilik, резилык 'infamy' (Leskovac, Pirot), резилык (Leskovac), Bulg. резилык (Grannes 1996: 221), Mac. резилык (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. rezillik,

серсемлык 'malice' (Leskovac, Pirot), серсенлык 'ability' (Leskovac), серсемлык, серсемлик (Grannes 1996: 221) < Turk. sersemlik,

севтельк, сефтельк 'first sale of a day, beginning' (Leskovac, Vranje) < Turk. dial. sefte (Németh 1965: 404, Grannes 1996: 58), seftelik,

суртуклык 'vagrancy' (Pirot) < Turk. sürtüklük, \*sürtüklik (Stachowski 1962: 60),

тепельк 'small woman cap' (Pirot, Leskovac, Vranje, Zlatanović 1981), тепелук (Vranje ibid.), тепелак (Leskovac), Bulg. тепелик (Stachowski 1961), тепельк (Grannes 1996: 222) < Turk. tepelik,

терзилык 'tailoring' (Leskovac, Pirot), Bulg. терзилык (BD I 269), терзилик (Grannes 1996: 222), Mac. dial. terzilык (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. terzilik,

трлык lower part of a sock' (Пирот), Bulg. търлък, терлик (Grannes

1996: 222) < Turk. terlik,

перемицилык 'tile making' (Pirot) < Turk. kiremitçilik,

ћирлык 'kind of a white cap' (Pirot), ћирлак (Pirot, Panajotović) < Turk. dial. kirlik (DS),

чивилык 'hanger' (Leskovac, Pirot), Mac. чивилук (Stachowski

1961) < Turk. dial. \*çivilik, \*çivilük (Stachowski 1962: 26),

чивлык, чифлык 'farm' (Leskovac), чивлык (Pirot), Bulg. чифлик, Мас. dial. чифлик, чивлик (Stachowski 1961) < Turk. çiftlik.

2.2.3 The Turkish suffix -lik, present in this unified form in the South Moravian vernacular of the Prizren-Timok dialect, is also present in the Turcisms of West Bulgarian speech, which is the opposite of the situation in East Bulgaria<sup>17</sup>.

2.3. From the etymological standpoint, and linked to the phonetic realisation of Turcisms with this suffix, the question arises whether it is justified or even necessary, in such and like cases, reconstruct the Turkish dialectal form as an etymon, or to give the used but phonetically rather inappropriate form of the Turkish word. If we are to accept the method of reconstruction of the West Rumelian form of Turkish lexemes, the way Stachowski does<sup>18</sup>, then the etymon

of SCr бешлык, for example would be balk. Turk. \*beşlik.

3. The most interesting examples are those in which appears non-etymological semivowel. An explanation of this phenomenon should first be sought in the characteristics of local Turkish speech forms<sup>19</sup>, or among the recognised characteristics of the West Rumelian dialect, and it is only after that interpretation proves impossible that we should consider the characteristics of the Prizren-Timok dialect of Serbo-Croatian. However, before trying to trace the origin of this semivowel, we must express certain reservations regarding the very manner of its transcription. Since the semivowel in the lexicographic sources exploited is designated by a single sign, it is impossible to establish its precise quality, i. e. to distinguish between a genuine semivowel and a reduced pronunciation of one of the vowels.

3.1. The semivowel resulting from vowel reduction.

абер; абьр 'news, message' (Pirot), абер, хабер (Škaljić), Bulg. абър (BD I 241) < Turk. haber,

агьлык 'pleasure' (Leskovac), агалук (Škaljić) < Turk. ağalik,

бьдьвлык 'idleness' (Pirot), бьдьвинја, бадавинја 'idle' (Leskovac), бадавација (Škaljić), Bulg. dial. бъд'аавъ, бъд'ьъвъ, (BD VIII 107) < Turk. bedava,

бымбађава, бамбађава 'free' (Leskovac), бамбадава (Škaljić) <

Turk. bambedava,

бычылык, бышчылык 'a gift given by the bride' (Leskovac), бошчалук (Škaljić) < Turk. bohçalık,

бышкылык, башкылук 'separate part of a property, secret' (Leskovac), башкалук (Škaljić), Bulg. dial. бышкы, бышкылык (BD VIII 108) < Turk. başkalık,

безьрђан 'merchant' (Leskovac), базерђан, базрђан (Škaljić), Bulg. базиргян (BER) < Turk. bezirgân,

зьрзыват, зарзават 'mixture of various ingredients, spice' (Leskovac), зарзават, зерзеват (Škaljić), Bulg. зарзават (БЕР) < Turk. zerzevat,

кылыбылык 'crowd' (Leskovac), калабалук (Škaljić), Bulg. калабалык (BER) < Turk. kalabalık,

кьлып, калап 'mold' (Leskovac), калуп (Škaljić), Bulg. dial. къльбъдан (BD VIII 141) < Turk. kalip,

сьглам, саглам 'correct' (Pirot), саглам (Škaljić), Bulg. dial. съглам (BD VIII 141) < Turk. sağlam,

сьмьньлык, самырлык 'stable' (Leskovac), саманлук, самалук (Škaljić), Bulg. саманлык (Grannes 1996: 195) < Turk. samanlık,

сьрмальк, сармальк 'kind of dish' (Leskovac) < Turk. sarma, тазьльк 'early fruit and vegetables' (Leskovac), тазелук (Škaljić) < Turk. taze, tazelik,

цьньбет (BD VIII 123) < Turk. cenabet.

3. 1. 1. The presence of the non-etymological semivowel before or after the accent in a pre tonal or post tonal position in the Turkish loan-words analysed could be a consequence of the phonetic characteristics of the SCr speech forms it is recorded in. It has already been noted that the Prizren-Timok dialect features a dynamic accent only, with no tonal opposites, which brings it closer to the Balkan League zone than the other SCr dialects. This type of accent results in a significant difference between the stressed and unstressed vowels, which diminishes the potential of the unstressed vocalism to carry phonological distinctions, thus resulting in a non distinctness of some vowels that otherwise, when in a stressed position, do differ (Ivić 1991: 202). Bearing this in mind, in the pronunciation of the given examples a reduction of unstressed vowels and their shift toward a semivowel may be assumed and this was then reflected in their spelling. One argument in favour of this interpretation is the fact that in many locations identical lexemes are simultaneously used with the semivowel and etymological vowel occupying the same position. Of special interest are lexemes which, in Turkish loans, show a different realisation of an accented vowel and, in the same word, the semivowel before the accent, e. g. бымбађава, бамбађава. In examples like: быдывлык, бычылык, бышчылык, бышкылык, кылыбылык; etc., the semivowel in the word base may be interpreted as an intersyllabic vocal assimilation or as a formation by analogy.

3.2. The stressed non-etymological semivowel:

алчык 'stupid' (Leskovac, Vranje), алчак (Škaljić), Bulg. dial. ал'чек (BD II 123), алчак (BD VIII 205) < Turk. alçak,

быр (быремке) 'at least' (Leskovac), бар; барем (Škaljić), Bulg. баре, барем (БЕР) < Turk. bari,

бьтык 'bad' (Leskovac), батык 'refuse' (Leskovac), батак (Škaljić)

< Turk. batak,

баш, быш 'really' (Leskovac), баш (Škaljić), Bulg. баш, быш (BER) < Turk. baş,

батлак, батлык 'mud' (Pirot, Leskovac), Bulg. батлак (BD I 242)

< Turk. dial. batlak (DS),

белензыци 'bracelet' (Leskovac), белензука (Škaljić), Bulg. белезик (BER) < Turk. bilezik,

дьлып, далап, дьлыпче, далапче 'old-time closet' (Leskovac),

долап (Škaljić), Bulg. долап (BER) < Turk. dolap,

далак, дальк 'diaphragm' (Leskovac), далак (Škaljić), Bulg.

далак (BER), Bulg. dial. дълак (BD IV 200) < Turk. dalak,

замын, заман 'always' (Leskovac), земан (Škaljić), Bulg. заман

(BER), Bulg. dial. зъман (BD VI 34) < Turk. zeman,

јълпаз 'nasty' (Leskovac), јолпаз (Škaljić) < Turk. yolpaz,

лыв, лав, лаф 'chat, respectability' (Leskovac), лаф (Škaljić),

Bulg. лаф, льфа pl. (BER) < Turk. lâf,

мутлык 'probably' (Leskovac), мутлак (Škaljić), Bulg. мутлык,

мутлак (BER) < Turk. mutlak,

нацык 'gruff' (Leskovac), нацак (Škaljić), Bulg. наджак (BER) <

Turk. nacak,

сын, сан 'small metal plate' (Leskovac), сан, сахан (Škaljić) < Turk. sahan,

сусын 'sesame' (Pirot), сусам (Škaljić) < Turk. susam,

тамын 'just right' (Leskovac), таман (Škaljić), Bulg. dial. дълак (BD I 143) < Turk. tamam,

чиплык 'nude' (Leskovac), чиплак (Škaljić), Bulg. dial. чиплак

(BD II 301) < Turk. ciplak.

- 3.2.1. A special peculiarity of these Turkish loan-words are instances in which the non-etymological semivowel occurs under accent  $^{20}$ . Since the stressed vowels in these speech forms do preserve their quality, it is quite a problem to explain their shift into the semivowel in that position. It should also be pointed out that a great number of these lexemes have been recorded both with the semivowel and the etymological vowel, which is another testimony of the instability of the semivowel on this position. In most instances the semivowel stands for an etymological a, and in individual cases for an e, o, or u respectively.
- 3.2.3. The appearance of the stressed semivowel instead of the vowel a between l and k in lexemes like: батлык, далык, мутлык, чиплык can be explained by analogy with the semivowel in words with the Turkish suffix -lik that dominate in these dialects as -лык.
- 3.2.3. The appearance of the stressed non-etymological semivowel in the following examples may be a consequence of another previously noted characteristic of this dialect, which is the reduction of a vowel beside a labial or nasal. In some more western SCr dialects that do not have the semivowel in their system, it has also been noted that the vowel a next to m and n becomes a

semivowel. In the Prizren-Timok dialect this mainly occurs in words of Slavonic origin, and by analogy, the same principle could have been transmitted to Turkish loans as well, like: замын, сыглым, сын, сусын, тамын.

- 3.3. This leads us to the conclusion that the non-etymological semivowel is mainly typical of SCr speech in the Prizren-Timok zone and that its occurrence was influenced by the phonetic characteristics of this dialect, as well as by linguistic analogy, in a manner similar to that in which the presence of the *i* in Turkish speech in a bilingual community of the past, and consequently in Turkish loan-words too, contributed to an already existing tendency toward preservation of the vocal nature of the Slavonic semivowel.
- 4. Finally, we would say that in Turkish loans in southern and southeastern parts of the Prizren-Timok dialect the semivowel appears regularly as a reflex of the Turkish ι in suffix -πьκ. It is also present in word bases as a reflection of the Turkish vowel as well as a result of phonetic changes typical of this dialect. In these cases the semivowel and other vowels fluctuate both in the etymological and non-etymological positions.
- 4.1. The presented dialectal material does show important singularities regarding the phonetic adaptation of the Turkish i in relation to the corpus of Turkish loans in all other SCr dialects and the standard language. An insight into the available - and by no means final - Bulgarian material shows numerous similarities (though not complete concordance) between (West) Bulgarian Turkish loans and ones from the Prizren-Timok zone. These singularities are primarily conditioned by the characteristics of the Prizren-Timok dialect that led to the specific emergence of the phonetic form belonging to borrowed Turkish words. Due to the shortage of historical sources from this area that would otherwise enable us to use a true diachronic approach to the study of Turkish loans, we must rely on the synchronic dialectal material gathered in the last fifteen years, remembering along the way N. Tolstoy's vivid remark that «the contemporary dialectal landscape (...) is a diachrony developed in space »21 (Tolstoj 1968/1997: 15). If we accept this viewpoint, then further thorough and comprehensive research into the phonetic, semantic and morphological characteristics of Turkish loans in this dialect could clarify a series of interesting points relating to Balkan Turkish loans as well as the West Rumelian dialects.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The principle of quoting the Turkish contemporary language etymon, adopted in the Škaljić's dictionary, has already been much criticised. The same objection is valid for most other etymological handbooks for Serbo-Croatian (Skok, Knežević, etc.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Scholars who have recently studied Turkish etymologies in Serbo-Croatian (e.g. Stachowski 1992, Stachowski 1997) stress the historical development and dialectal characteristics of the Turkish language itself.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Bearing in mind the importance of older lexicographic Turkish language manuals from 16th-19th centuries, a study of Turkish dialects is of special importance for this type of research.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Although the RSA dictionary introduces a great number of words from the Prizren-Timok dialect, it is not a reliable lexicographic source for phonetic and morphological studies since it has carried out a systematic hypercorrection of accent, semivowels, infinitives, etc.

<sup>5</sup>This analysis has been made possible primarily by the appearance of dialectal dictionaries and glossaries from southern and south-eastern Serbia during the last decade or so, which has considerably supplemented the corpus of Turkish loan-words in Serbo-Croatian. This study is based on the dictionaries and glossaries from Leskovac, Vranje, Pirot and Lebane.

<sup>6</sup>We chose to investigate these phonetic characteristics because the Prizren-Timok dialect of Serbo-Croatian, unlike others and the standard language

itself, has preserved the archaic feature of the semivowel.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Stachowski 1973: 39-46.

<sup>8</sup> We have separately treated Turkish loans with the suffix -lik for better organisation of the material and mindful that the phonetic realisation of this suffix has so far been treated as a separate phenomenon.

\*Editorial note: It was impossible, for technical reasons, to make a distinction between the expiratory stress of SE-Serbian dialects and the short ascending accent of S-Cr literary language, both being marked here by a grave, which, consequently, on the words from the Serbian Prizren-Timok dialect designates not the same accentological unit as for instance on those cited from Škaljić's dictionary.

9 Since the etymology is not our primer topic of interest in this paper,

Turkish etymon is mostly taken over from Škaljić's dictionary.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Turk. dial. balgız 'pretty, dear' (DS).

<sup>11</sup>This is a clear example of the Turkish imperative suffix, but we considered that on the Serbo-Croatian level it is taken as an integral part of this word since it is not a morphologically independent form, in the way the suffix -lik is.

12 However, from the spelling of some words it can be concluded that the semivowel used to be pronounced in this part of the Serbo-Croatian language territory too, since Škaljić, lacking another sing, uses an apostrophe twice (in the words ak'l and k'na).

<sup>13</sup>For these examples we shall not give the words from the Škaljić's

dictionary, because this suffix is always realised as -luk.

<sup>14</sup>For the words with the asterisk we couldn't find the appropriate Turkish word with suffix -lik. .

15As an illustration we shall quote some examples; for the ones from Pirot cf. Stachowski 1992: 68-69 ајдуклак 'banditing' (Leskovac), ајдуклък (Leskovac, Pirot), Bulg. айдуклък (BD I 241), богатлък 'wealth' (Pirot), Bulg. богатлък (Grannes 1996: 232), буналък 'rebellion' (Vranje), вантазлък 'stupidity' (Pirot), виделак, виделък 'world, existence' (Leskovac), газдълък, газдалък 'property, wealth' (Leskovac, Pirot), грнчарлък (Pirot), доодлак, доодлък 'arrival' (Leskovac), другарлък 'friendship' (Pirot), Bulg. другарлък (Grannes 1996: 234), ђаволък 'mischief' (Pirot), мајсторлък 'skill' (Pirot), Виlg. майсторлък (Grannes 1996: 236), навацилък 'matchmaking' (Pirot), назадлък 'failure in business' (Pirot), ненавидлък 'hate' (Pirot), обидлък 'trying' (Pirot), оправлък 'easy done work' (Лебане), оратлък 'talk' (Leskovac), пашалък 'field for cattle pasture' (Leskovac, Pirot), Bulg. пашалък (Grannes 1996: 237), пијалък, пијенлък, пијалак, пијанлак 'drink' (Leskovac,

Pirot), Bulg. пийальк, пиельк (Grannes 1996: 237), поодлык 'departure' (Leskovac), расиплык 'wastefulness' (Leskovac, Pirot, Lebane), сиромашлык 'poverty' (Врање), Bulg. сиромашлык (Grannes 1996: 238), спаслык 'salvation' (Vranje), срамотлык 'shame' (Врање), човеслык 'good reputation' (Leskovac).

<sup>16</sup>It should be borne in mind that it is impossible to establish, in each individual case, whether a Turkish word was loaned already with this suffix, or

whether it was added to it, by analogy, in the already unified form.

<sup>17</sup>A detailed survey of the vocalisation of this suffix in Bulgarian is provided by Grannes 1996: 210-230.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. e.g. Stachowski 1992 and Stachowski 1997.

<sup>19</sup>Unfortunately, they have not been systematically or adequately described until recently (cf. Tryjarski 1990: 438-439) nor in this situation likely to improve in the near future.

<sup>20</sup>In the absence of adequate Turkish proof we have looked for an explanation of this phenomenon in SCr dialectal characteristics, although we advise extreme caution when these examples occur in other Balkan languages.

<sup>21</sup>It is usually stressed that one of the greatest difficulties in attempting of Turcisms is the lack of relevant historical sources in Turkish, as well as in other Balkan languages (cf. Tietze 1983: 238-239).

#### References:

Adamović 1972-73: Adamović M., Razvitak vokalizma kod nekih osmanskih sufiksa, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* XXII-XXIII, Sarajevo, 281-299.

Belić 1905: Белић А., Дијалекти источне и јужне Србије, Српски дијалектолошки зборник І. Београд.

BER: Български етимологичен речник, София 1971-.

BD: Българска диалектология, София.

Dmitriev 1928: Дмитриев Н. К., Этюды по сербско-турецкому языковому взаимодействию, Доклады Академии Наук СССР. XII, Москва, 268-275.

Dmitriev 1929: Дмитриев Н. К., Этюды по сербско-турецкому языковому взаимодействию, Доклады Академии Наук СССР. I, Москва, 89-95, 103-108.

DS: Türkiye'de halk ağzından derleme sözlüğü I-IX, Ankara 1963-1977.

Grannes 1996: Grannes A., Turko-Bulgarica, Articles in English and French concerning Turkish influence on Bulgarian, Wiesbaden.

Hafiz 1979: Hafiz N., Specifičnosti prizrenskog turskog govora, Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju XXVII, Sarajevo, 61-100.

Hazai 1964: Hazai G., Prilog istorijatu morfeme -luk, Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku, Novi Sad, 55-62.

Ivić-Lehiste 1967: Ivić P., Lehiste I., Prilozi ispitivanju fonetske i fonološke prirode akcenata u savremenom srpskohrvatskom jeziku, Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku X, Novi Sad, 55-94.

Ivić 1991: Ивић П., О пореклу и особинама пиротског говора (и других говора српског југоистока), Из српскохрватске дијалектологије, Ниш, 191-203.

Knezević: Knezević A., Die Turzismen in der Sprache der Kroaten und Serben, Meinsenheim am Glan, 1962.

Lebane: Жугић Р., Glossary for RSA.

Leskovac: Митровић Б., Речник лесковачког говора, Лесковац 1984.

Németh 1965: Németh J., Zur Einteilung der türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens, Sofia.

Panajotović: Панајотовић Т. Г., Адети, Пирот 1986.

Pirot: Живковић Н., Речник пиротског говора, Пирот 1987.

RSA: Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика, I-XVI, изд. Српска академија наука и уметности и Институт за српски језик САНУ, Београд 1959-.

Schmaus 1955: Schmaus A., Zur Lautgestalt der türkischen Lehnwörter in den südslavischen Sprachen, Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 6, München.

Skok: Skok P., Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika I-IV, Zagreb 1971-1974.

Stachowski 1961: Stachowski S., Przyrostki obcego pochodzenia w języku serbochorwackim, Kraków.

Stachowski 1973: Stachowski S., Fonetyka zapożyczeń osmańsko-tureckich w języku serbsko-chorwackim, Monografie Slawistyczne 23, Wrocław.

Stachowski 1992: Stachowski S., Türkische Lehnwörter im serbischen Dialekt von Pirot, Prace językoznawcze 111, Kraków.

Stachowski 1997: Stachowski S., Turcyzmy w dialektach serbsko-chorwackich (1), Prace językoznawcze 118, Kraków, 87-102.

Škaljić: Škaljić A., Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku, Sarajevo 1979.

Tietze 1983: Tietze A., Die Probleme der Turzismenforschung, Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik, Berlin, 237-244.

Tolstoj 1968/1997: Толстой Н. И., Некоторые проблемы сравнительной славянской семасиологии, Избранные труды І, Славянская лексикология и семасиология, Моква 1997, 12-43.

Tryjarski 1990: Tryjarski E., Balkan Dialects, Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft, Teil I, Budapest, 414-453.

Vlasotince: Коцић С., Glossary for RSA.

Vranje: Златановић М., Glossary for RSA.

Zlatanović 1981: Златановић М., Турцизми у говору јужне Србије, Прилози проучавању језика 17, Нови Сад, 179-194.