

INTRODUCTION

The Balkans represent one of the oldest intersections among historical linguistic, geopolitical, and language ideological phenomena as recognized in Western scholarship of the past two centuries. The very name “Balkans” is freighted with nonlinguistic ideological meaning (Todorova 1997), and the concept of a Balkan linguistic area (BLA) stands in direct opposition to the notion of fragmentation first imposed on the Balkans by the losers of World War I as their empires were dismantled along the putative nation-state lines that served as the model for the devolution of the Ottoman Empire 1799--1913. Thus, it is ironic that Todorova’s use of Balkanism as a variant on Said’s Orientalism, i.e., a fractious “Other” against which a “West” can define itself, stands diametrically opposed to the original use of Balkanism by Seliščev (1925), i.e., a phenomenon of linguistic convergence resulting from mutual multilingualism. However, Aronson (2006) argues that even the linguistic construction of the Balkans is “Orientalist” (compare Bakić-Hayden 1995).

BLA: Balkan linguistic area

This last viewpoint relates to the fact that, as a field, Balkan linguistics was the first modern approach to language that attempted to deal theoretically with the consequences of language contact as a normal phenomenon rather than as “corruption” (German *Verderbnis*, Schleicher 1850:143). The German Sprachbund language league, language area, etc. (henceforth sprachbund, treated as a loanword such as genre or pretzel), proposed by Trubetzkoy (1928), was intended to account for the Balkan languages (and “cultures”) as a conceptual unit in which the similarities among languages were explained by historical convergence rather than by historical divergence from a presumed or known common source of the so-called genealogical model. No general work on language contact can avoid mentioning the Balkans, but few do more than pay their superficial respects. Because Enfield (2005) has recently and cogently addressed general concerns of language areas in addition to his focus on Mainland Southeast Asia, my article complements rather than repeats his work.

DEFINITIONS

The Balkan peninsula is relatively unproblematically defined geographically on three sides as the land mass bounded by the Black Sea, the Sea of Marmara, and the Aegean, Mediterranean, Ionian, and Adriatic Seas. In modern political terms, the Balkans are most frequently understood as comprising Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, Romania, Turkey in Europe, and the territory of former Yugoslavia. Politicians and others in Greece, Slovenia, and Croatia have all rejected the notion that their nation-states are part of the Balkans. In the case of Greece, the rejection is purely ideological. The northern boundary of the Balkans, however, combines geography and ideology in fractal recursion (Gal & Irvine 1995). Thus, in Vienna, the Balkans begin south of Vienna; in Ljubljana, south of Ljubljana; in Zagreb, south of the river Sava; elsewhere in Croatia, south of the river Una; and along the Dalmatian coast, the Dinaric Alps, and not the Adriatic Sea, is considered the western boundary. The boundaries of Romania have at times included the territory between the rivers Prut and Dniestr (Bessarabia, now the Republic of Moldova) and at other times excluded Transylvania and Bukovina. In the 1920s, what is today western Slovenia was called “Balkan Italy,” and as of this writing, the term Western Balkans refers to the states not in the European Union (EU) and thus excludes Slovenia but includes Croatia.

As a linguistic entity, BLA is traditionally associated with four Indo-European groups: Balkan Slavic (BS)---Bulgarian, Macedonian, and the Southeast (Torlak) dialects of former Serbo-Croatian (BCS) (Friedman 2006); Balkan Romance (BR)---Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian (Atanasov 1990, Dyer 1999, Friedman 2001, Gołąb 1984); Hellenic (Horrocks 1997, Høeg 1925-1926, Mallory & Adams 1997); and Albanian (Friedman 2004). In the nineteenth century, the first three of these groups had different names: Bulgarian, Walachian, and Romaic, respectively, each taken from a different medieval state [the third being the (Eastern) Roman Empire]. As nation-states emerged from the Ottoman Empire, actors in each state sought to maximize its territory by referencing ancient or medieval polities and using language as a marker to justify competing claims. By 1912, there were six Balkan nation-states (Montenegro, Albania, Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Romania), each with overlapping claims on what remained of Turkey in Europe and claims against one another. Ethnographic maps were used in the treaties that determined political borders (Hertslet 1891, Friedman 1996, Wilkinson 1951). At the same time, language standardization was deployed to support rival claims to various dialects and their territories (Friedman 1986, 1997), a process that continues to this day (Friedman 2008). As a result, naming continues to have political implications as does the slippery language/dialect distinction.

BR: Balkan Romance

BS: Balkan Slavic

The Balkan dialects of Romani (Boretzky & Igla 2004; Elšik & Matras 2006; Igla 1996; Matras 1994, 2002), Judezmo (Albaev 2003, Bunis 1999, Friedman 2006, Gabinskij 1992, Luria 1930, Pahlmeyer 1980, Symeonidis 2002, Varol Bornes 2008), and West Rumelian Turkish, and Gagauz (Dombrowski 2011; Friedman 2003b, 2006; Hazai 1961; Matras & Tufan 2007; Menz 1999; Wittek 1953) all participate actively in the BLA, although Sandfeld (1930) explicitly excluded the first two, treated the third as an adstrate, and ignored the fourth. Balkan Armenian requires further investigation, but its lack of infinitive is considered characteristic (Adamou 2008).

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

For so-called external history, Fine (1983, 1987) remains the classic study of the medieval Balkan peninsula, vital to evaluating post-Ottoman claims, although Stephenson (2000) provides interesting new data from a Byzantinist's viewpoint. Inalcik & Quataert (1994) supplies social and economic history for the Ottoman period. Jelavich (1983) is useful for political history 1700–1980. Magocsi (1993) and Hupchick & Cox (2001) are annotated historical atlases. Woodward (1995a,b) can be consulted for understanding the dissolution of former Yugoslavia, whose wars 1991–2001 have resulted in a plethora of studies.

Balkan linguistics (BLc) is usually said to begin with Kopitar (1829, p. 86), who wrote of BS, BR, and Albanian that “one grammar dominates, but with three lexicons.” However, Leake (1814, p. 380) made similar observations. Kopitar's only concrete example was the postposed definite article, although in closing he notes future formation using an auxiliary derived from “want,” the replacement of infinitives by (analytic) subjunctive, which also occurs in Greek and BCS, and possessive formation. Miklosich (1861, pp. 6–8) added genitive-dative merger, object doubling (insertion of an agreeing oblique clitic pronoun), the formation of teens by “on ten,” and several phonological features. Seliščev (1925) added significantly to the list but was eclipsed by Sandfeld (1930; originally published in Danish in 1926), which was the first book-length treatment to collect and synthesize many individual studies and texts, most of which had been published during the preceding 60 or 70 years. Sandfeld is justly credited with establishing BLc as such, and his work remains a trove of important data.

BLc: Balkan linguistics

HANDBOOKS, SURVEYS, CASE STUDIES

The next major BLc work is Gäläbov et al. (1968), whose articles defined the state of the field and included every major scholar of the time. The next attempt at a handbook was Schaller (1975), which generated more than a dozen reviews, most of them critical and well summarized in Joseph (1986). Since then seven synthetic handbooks have appeared, none in English except Tomić (2006), which, unfortunately, has more errors than pages and cannot be recommended (see Sims 2008). Of the others, Asenova (2002), in Bulgarian with a substantial (19 pages) resume in English, represents a real advance over Sandfeld in many respects. It takes advantage of newer sources and gives good historical overviews of textual evidence, although it considers only the four traditional BLA groups, it relies heavily on standard languages, and it treats all BS as Bulgarian. Hinrichs (1999) is a collection of disparate articles, most of them in German. Friedman (2006, 2007) gives a general overview of the BLA, and Friedman & Joseph (in press) provides a detailed discussion of the field.

A number of Balkanisms (in Seliščev's sense) are the subject of individual studies or collections of articles. Joseph's (1983) study of the replacement of the infinitive is now a classic. Belyavski-Frank (2003) on the Balkan conditional has a substantial (53 pages) section on Balkan Romance, Greek, and Albanian despite the focus on South Slavic. Kalluli & Tasmowski (2008) is dedicated to object doubling. For evidentiality, Friedman (2003b, 2004) provides studies. For future formation, the coverage in Asenova (2002) is good [see also Markopoulos (2009) for Greek, Andersen (2006) for Slavic, and Kramer (1994) for general Balkan]. For the postposed definite article, there is no synthetic treatment of the BLA aside from the handbooks, but readers should see Mladenova (2007) for BS, Hamp (1982) and the references listed in Topalli (2010) for Albanian, and Gołąb (1997) for BR, all of which provide coverage of the data and debates.

Joseph (1999) gives a trenchant critique of formalist approaches to BLc, which, interesting though they may be for universalist accounts of language, do not contribute to our understanding of language contact. Afendras (1970) and Sawicka (1997) are the two main attempts to deal with phonology in the BLA. Unlike convergences in lexicon and morphosyntax, most BLc phonological convergences are highly localized (although compare Trummer 1983). Thus we can speak more of Balkan phonologies rather than Balkan phonology. Dombrowski (2011) provides an excellent set of case studies. It would appear that in the BLA some aspects of phonology function as identity markers that resist convergence, although local dialects of different languages (e.g., BS and Albanian) sometimes share phonological developments that make them closer to one another than to other dialects of the respective languages, especially in multilingual towns, where the status of being urban carries historical prestige. Thus, for example, the BS of Prizren (Kosovo) preserves Turkish phonology in loanwords, whereas the Albanian and Macedonian of Debar (Macedonia)—where, in a reversal of the usual hierarchy, Albanian is the urban Muslim language and Turkish is rural—have convergent denasalization (Friedman 2006, compare Ellis 2003; compare also Tuite 1999 on the

limitation of convergence in the Caucasus to glottalized consonants and Alexander 2000 on prosody defining the boundaries of BS).

There is no comprehensive study for the BLA lexicon. Concern with loanwords peaked with Sandfeld (1930), who devotes more than half the book to lexicon and phraseology, whereas Asenova (2002) devotes ~20 pages out of almost 300 pages to the topic. The Turkish lexical element and phraseological calques have been the focus of the most synthetic attention from the nineteenth century until now (Friedman 2003b, Kazazis 1972), and there are dictionaries or indices of Turkisms for Albanian, Bulgarian, BCS, Macedonian, Romani, Romanian, and even Greek (where most studies of Turkisms are concerned with extirpating them; see Kazazis 1977). Numerous studies have been completed of loanwords in various dyads. Sobolev & Domoselickaja (2005–2010) is the first attempt at mapping Balkan lexicon. The series covers selected lexical fields (person and family, spiritual life, animal husbandry, landscape and nature, with others projected to appear) for twelve points in the Balkans: seven Slavic (one in Macedonia, three in Bulgaria, one each in Serbia, Croatia, and Montenegro), two Greek (one north, one south), two Albanian (one Geg, one Tosk), and one Aromanian (in Greece). The series also includes individual dialect descriptions and synthetic volumes on grammatical topics. It is oriented to surface syntax and thus makes available precisely the kind of data that speakers themselves have. Whereas the lexical volumes have Russian glosses, the other volumes do not.

IDEOLOGY, NUMEROLOGY, EUROLOGY: MEMBERS AND MEMBERSHIP

Although Masica (2001, p. 239) cautions against confusing “recent political configurations” with linguistic areas, in the case of the Balkans it is precisely such social factors as the political that can create the conditions for convergence by encouraging communication in one space. However, a recent political configuration is affecting BLc: the EU. Masica identifies 9 heuristic methods and 23 methodological confusions (pitfalls) in identifying linguistic areas, among them “confusing typological, areal, and genetic factors involved in similarities.” (p. 207) It is precisely the conflation of typological and areal linguistics that I have labeled Eurology (Friedman 2006), which is one of the ideologies affecting BLc. According to this ideology, all Europe is a linguistic area, and, moreover, the core is the territory of the Holy Roman Empire, which—after centuries of horrific wars—became the European Economic Community and is now the core of the EU. According to this model, the Balkans are peripheral to this great European whole (e.g., Haspelmath 1998, compare Jakobson 1931/1971, who placed Russia and Russian at the center of a putative Eurasian sprachbund). The confused methodology is exemplified in Siewierska (1998) who writes, “Language typology is the study of regularities, patterns and limits in cross-linguistic variation. The major goal of Eurotyp was to study the patterns and limits of variation in [...] the languages of Europe [...] by characterizing the specific features of European languages against the background of non-European languages and by identifying areal phenomena (Sprachbünde) within Europe [...] and thus contribute to the characterization of Europe as a linguistic area (Sprachbund)” (pp. v—vi).

As Hamp (1977) observes, areal and genealogical linguistics are twin faces of diachronic linguistics, whereas typology is achronic. Areal questions have historical depth and specificity. Confusing areality and typology misses this point. It is not enough to look just at the synchronic state of standard languages, especially when we have a rich historical record and a serious dialectological tradition. Moreover, when the process of feature selection (Mufwene 2008) in the Ottoman period was occurring among the Balkan languages, in Olivera Jašar-Nasteva’s words, you could travel the entire peninsula with a single *teskere* (Turkish for travel document). Meanwhile, western Europe was fragmented into dozens of warring polities. The fact that Macedonian calqued the Aromanian perfect using “have,” which in turn was a Latin innovation brought to the Balkans, is indeed a kind of epidemiological link of the type identified by Enfield (2005), but in the BLA it is a Balkanism and is centered there. See also Joseph (2008) in response to Heine & Kouteva (2006).

Another problem of recent methodologies is numerology, i.e., taking a list of features and ticking off this or that (usually standard) language as having or lacking the feature and thus arriving at a quotient of areality that loses sight of the dialectological and historical facts (e.g., Campbell et al. 1986, Lindstedt 2000, Schaller 1975, van der Auwera 1998). For languages with little or no historical record or dialect descriptions, such a methodology is better than none, but this is not the case in the BLA. Moreover, a gross definition of a feature such as object doubling fails to examine differences in conditioning factors, which in turn indicate different degrees of integration into the grammar. The feature is more pragmatically conditioned in Greek, Bulgarian, and Romanian but grammatically governed in Albanian and Macedonian, whereas in Aromanian, the rules for the dialects in Greece follow Greek and those in Macedonia follow Macedonian. To say that Macedonian lacks stressed schwa (if we assume this is an areal feature) is to ignore the fact that all but the West Central dialects on which the standard is based do have stressed schwa (but from different sources in different regions, thus calling into question the utility of the feature). Van der Auwera (1998) even implies that the choice of areal features is arbitrary, which accounts for differences between his claim of Bulgarian, Campbell et al. 1986’s claim of Romanian, and Hamp 1977’s identification of Macedonian as “the most

‘Balkan’ of languages.” (p. 281) With inadequately specified features, lack of dialectological nuance, and faulty data (e.g., Campbell et al. get the facts of “have” perfect distribution wrong), reliability is impossible. When the BLA is examined in a careful and nuanced fashion, we see that, as Hamp (1977) observed, Macedonian, and specifically southwest Macedonian and the Aromanian and Tosk Albanian dialects with which it is in contact, are the most convergent dialects of their respective languages. As observed by Gołąb (1976) and Sobolev (2008), however, an ancient split also exists between the east and west Balkans (coincidentally resembling the current EU configuration) such that Macedonian is influenced by Aromanian and later influences it as well, whereas Romanian is influenced by Bulgarian but not vice versa [except in some border villages near the Danube (Friedman 2007)]. Gołąb hypothesizes that differences in economy and social relations account for the differences in directionality. Two other pitfalls identified by Masicca (2001) are the assumption that if a feature is not areal in one place, then it is never areal and, related to that, that if all the languages do not share all the features, then it is impossible to identify the region as a sprachbund. Various linguists make much of the fact that the postposed definite article does not occur in Greek---or Romani [where, however, the preposed definite article looks like a Greek loan but is, in fact, a Greek-induced innovation (Matras 2002)], or Judezmo, or Balkan Turkish---but it does occur in Scandinavian, North Russian, and elsewhere. How then, they ask, can this be a Balkanism? Or, conversely, how can Greek be Balkan? In fact, Common Slavic arrived in the Balkans with a postposed definite marker: The relative pronoun *ji could be suffixed to adjectives to make them definite. This marking was lost, but there are still remnants of this usage in BCS and Slovene and the morphology has left traces all over Slavic. The postposing of a demonstrative pronoun gradually weakening to an article, however, happened after the dissolution of Common Slavic at the time when BR, BS, and Albanian were in contact, and we know from both textual evidence and comparison with other Romance and Slavic languages that BR and BS developed the feature along with numerous other convergences (Gołąb 1997) such that chance parallelism is unlikely, regardless of the phenomenon elsewhere. Stolz (2006) recognizes that Trubetzkoy’s (1928) formulation of belonging to a sprachbund in the same sense as belonging to a linguistic family is problematic. His conclusion, however, is to suggest discarding the concept of sprachbund altogether rather than trying to reach a more nuanced understanding of diffusion. Such an all-or-nothing approach fails account for the fundamental historical fact that, like the political boundaries and institutions that sometimes help bring sprachbunds into being, the “boundaries” of a sprachbund are not immutable essences but rather artifacts of ongoing multilingual processes. Unlike the EU, the BLA is not a club of which one is or is not a member. Hamp (1989) notes that a region such as former Yugoslavia can be understood as a “crossroads of sprachbünde,” with “a spectrum of differential bindings” rather than “compact borders.” (p. 47). Thus, to take just one example, the use of an invariant particle derived from etymological “want” for future marking characterizes the Slavic, Romance, Romani, Greek, and many Albanian dialects of the Balkans. In Slavic, however, the usage shades into conjugated “want” [still in contrast to future marking in the rest of Slavic, including Kajkavian (northeasternmost) BCS], whereas in Albanian the usage is consistent in Tosk and Southern Geg and then enters into more salient competition with “have” as one moves north, with “will” being stronger in border zones with Slavic, especially with Macedonian. In Romani, the isogloss between presence versus absence of the feature cuts through the middle of coterritorial BCS dialects that use conjugated “want.”

None of this vitiates the idea of associating contact-induced change with a shared geographic space, but different dialects occupy different positions in it for various reasons. As language tree diagrams are idealizations not to be taken literally, so wave diagrams (van der Auwera’s “isopleths”) do not represent the complexity of lived reality. However, whereas the tree diagram can represent how speech communities diverge into separate entities---even if those entities in fact form a continuum---wave diagrams, when taking a single point for an entire language, do violence to the facts of distribution, particularly when the phenomena are treated achronically, as is the case when typology and areal linguistics are conflated. Here the data in Asenova (2002) and those in various histories and case studies (e.g., Horrocks 1997, Mladenova 2007) make it clear that phenomena identified as Balkanisms took their current shape during the Ottoman period under conditions of local multilingualism. Once we see speakers participating in convergent processes rather than belonging to a putative type, the problem of membership ceases to have relevance, and, like other geographic denominations, the BLA becomes a convenient heuristic device rather than an essentializing label.

The ideology of the homogenous nation-state also affects how BLA is perceived in the BLA itself. It is no coincidence that, on the one hand, the Greek government is so desperate to deny the existence of ethnic minorities in Greece that it even does so under a bikini-clad model in a U.S. men’s magazine (Maxim, November 2006, p. 176) and, on the other hand, that Andriotis & Kourmoulis (1968) declare the BLA “a fiction” and Balkanisms completely “inorganic and superficial” (p. 30). The opposition to local multilingualism in Greece is so violent that on June 2, 2009, the author of this article was assaulted by members of Hrisi Avgi (Golden Dawn), a political party with a seat on the Athens Municipal Council, at the promotion of the first Macedonian-Greek dictionary to be published in

Greece (a video of the assault can be viewed at <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L40kQfnFuik&feature=related>). Tsitsipis (2007) has published extensively on the shift from Arvanitika to Greek, and indeed a variety of factors enter into such choices, including urbanization and access to resources. Nonetheless, the climate of intimidation is also a factor (Kostas Kazazis, personal communication).

As Kazazis (1972, 1977) makes clear, ideologies of purity, pollution, and prestige have affected the BLA lexicon in efforts to erase shared vocabulary by conscious substitution. Words of Turkish origin---a major component of Trubetzkoy's "culture words"---were targeted for replacement throughout the BLA. In Turkish itself, many of these same words were also eliminated because they were of Arabo-Persian origin. Turkisms indexed the language of a conqueror and/or small-town marketplace, and replacement was equated with liberation, prestige, and refinement. In Turkish, Arabo-Persian words indexed cultural oppression and a threat to Turkish nationalist (versus Ottoman) identity. (However, many old-family urban Muslims in Macedonia still identify as Ottoman rather than as one of the modern nationalities.) After the fall of communism, Turkisms became associated with resistance and experienced a renaissance in the press, especially the newly liberated yellow press. In languages that are only now standardizing such as Romani and Aromanian, Turkisms still have neutral colloquial value, and in Romani in particular, because the majority of Roms in the southern Balkans are Muslim (except in Greece outside of Thrace), the association of Turkish with Islam makes it an acceptable source of vocabulary enrichment for some language planners (Friedman 2003b).

LANGUAGE AND IDENTITY

I must limit myself here to works that are concerned primarily with language and linguistics. Friedman (1996, 2003a) discusses the relationship between language and identity in the Republic of Macedonia with historical background that engages the entire Balkan region, given Macedonia's central position, ethnolinguistic complexity, and the overlapping claims to its language, territory, church, and even name. Among the issues involved are correspondences between language choice and religion; the urban/rural divide, which in Ottoman Turkey was a legal category (Ellis 2003); and the increasing one-to-one correspondence between language and nationality (Friedman 2003a) and the expansionist hegemonies referred to in Definitions section above.

In the late Ottoman period, millet "nationality" was a legal category defined by religion. Although the nineteenth century saw the shift of identity from religion to language, religion continues to play a role in language choice and ideology not only at the everyday level but also at the state level. Thus, aside from Judezmo as a Jewish language and Turkish as a Muslim language (except for Gagauz, which is Christian), Macedonian and Bulgarian imply Christianity. Therefore, the Bosnian standard of BCS is colonizing Macedonian-speaking Muslims. Pomaks are Bulgarian-speaking Muslims in Bulgaria, but in Greece they are "Muslim Greeks," as are Turks and Muslim Roms. Turkish in Greece is called *Mulsimaniká Thrákis* "Muslimish of Thrace"; there is some effort to treat Pomak in Greece as a separate language. Musliman "Muslim" was first used as a Yugoslav nationality category in the 1961 census for Muslims who refused to identify as Serbs, Croats, Macedonians, Albanians, etc., and in 1994, several people declared Muslim nationality and Catholic religion. Joseph (2000) discusses how Constantinopolitan Jewish Greek is more conservative than Christian Greek, but in Greece, modern Judeo-Greek differs only minimally from Christian Greek (Connerty 2003; see also Krivoruchko 2011). This may be concerned with tensions between Romanioties (Hellenophone Jews) and Sephardis (Hispano-/Lusitano-phone Jews), the latter having used Turkish as their *lingua franca*.

It is well known that leaders in linguistic changes are frequently gendered; i.e., men or women as a group are more or less likely to adopt innovations or to remain conservative. The question of which gender innovates involves factors such as desires for prestige and opportunities for social mobility. Thus, for example, in France women have led and men resisted innovation, whereas in the BLA, men led and women resisted (Grannes 1996, Récatas 1934). If speakers in the same family have different languages or dialects as primary, receptive multilingualism is a common practice: Each individual speaks his/her primary language and is understood by the others. In such mixed Balkan families, the male children generally follow the father's religion/language, and the female children follow the mother's. In some extended families different brothers would adopt different religions/nationalities---historically as a protective measure: Whichever religion/nationality was in favor with the authorities, there would be someone in a position to represent the family's interests to them. Brides were expected to adopt the language of their husbands, but other pressures could change this pattern (Ellis 2003). In Macedonia, Turkish is still valued as sophisticated by old urban families, and Albanian is considered rural, albeit politically more powerful and now a pragmatic necessity. Greenberg (2004), despite the main title, treats the dissolution of Serbo-Croatian but deals more with standards than with identity and has little to say about the BLA (see Alexander 2006b). His work is especially valuable, however, in tracing how nationalist dialectologists contributed to the break-up. Alexander (2006a, pp. 379--426) covers much the same ground more succinctly. On the separation of Macedonian from Bulgarian and BCS, see Friedman (2000) and Gal & Irvine (2000). For Aromanian versus Romanian, see Jašar-Nasteva (1997) and Friedman (2001).

Albanian is a mirror image of BCS: Religion was subordinated to language in constructing identity, and the significant dialectal differences between Geg (north) and Tosk (south) were not addressed in practice until the communist period, when a Tosk-based standard was promulgated in Albania then adopted by Albanians in Yugoslavia. After the fall of communism, Gëgs in Albania wanted to revive bidialectalism, but Kosovars resisted until after the 1999 NATO war. Even today, however, the expression in the Academy in Kosovo is “opening up the standard,” i.e., allowing more Geg elements in without actually splitting pan-Albanian unity.

PROBLEMS OF DESCRIPTION AND CAUSATION: GRAMMARS versus SPEAKERS

The original explanation for BLc convergence was language shift. Kopitar (1829) assumed the resemblance came from an “autochthonous” (i.e., pre-Latin, non-Hellenic) substratum. Leake (1814), however, posited that the resemblances were due to a Slavic superstratum. Sandfeld (1930) attributed the convergences to Byzantine Greek, whereas other authors have argued that Latin was the prime mover. The problem with substratum theories is that we do not have a single sentence in any pre-Latin non-Hellenic Balkan language, so we have no evidence for this or that feature being substratal. [See Crossland (1982), Katičić (1976), Polomé (1982), and Woodard (2004) on these languages and Adams (2003) and Adams et al. (2002) on recent advances in the study of ancient language contact.] Hamp (1982), however, sees evidence for an autochthonous postposed definite article (-ta) in ancient Drobeta near modern Turnu Severin, Romania. On the basis of certain idiosyncratic innovations shared by Albanian and Messapic and a couple of striking lexical items Hamp (personal communication) now believes Albanian to be related to, but not descended from, Illyrian. [See also Hamp (1981/1982, 1992b, 2002) on various historical reconstructions of evidence for earlier Balkan linguistic processes.]

The very term autochthony is freighted with ideology. It implies a level of priority that none of the Indo-European languages has in Europe, much less the Balkans, but it is invoked to justify claims to resources. Ancient Greek, for example, is very conservative in its grammar, and its lexicon may be more than 50% non-Indo-European or, in part, perhaps Indo-European but pre-Greek (Mallory & Adams 1997, p. 243). Moreover, what looks like BLA contact could in some cases be due to pre-Balkan contact. Hamp (1992a, 2010) argues that the Indo-European dialects that became Albanian and Slavic were originally in contact in northern Europe on the basis of Winter’s law, some shared loanwords, and the fact that while both have “on ten” for the -teens, “ten” is feminine in Albanian and Romanian but masculine in Slavic. Thus while Albanian (and the language from which Romanian speakers presumably shifted) was autochthonous vis-à-vis Slavic, they too were arrivals.

The history of object doubling also illustrates the problems with positing one directionality. The construction is attested at its earliest in Vulgar Latin. Even if there are hints of the construction in New Testament Greek, these possible examples of object doubling in Greek date from a period when contact with Latin was already becoming significant. In the case of Albanian, we cannot know what the situation was before the sixteenth century, and object doubling in the earliest texts is not well established. For Slavic, the phenomenon may date back to the Old Church Slavonic period, but it does not become well established until the early modern period; the evidence from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries indicates that pragmatic factors were still important even in western Macedonian, where today it is mostly grammatically conditioned. Even if internal factors played a part in the rise of object doubling in BS, the fact that the phenomenon is absent from Slavic outside the Balkans points to language contact as a contributing or decisive factor. Moreover, the dialectal pattern of degree of grammaticalization in BS also points to language contact as the chief factor in the spread and establishment of object doubling. The core of the phenomenon is seen in western Macedonia, but the evidence of Megleno-Romanian suggests a South Danubian Romance impetus.

When examined in their historical contexts, i.e., with a view to both the sociolinguistic and geopolitical contact situation and also the comparison with genealogically related languages in other regions, what emerges for the Balkan languages in terms of auxiliaries is a result of feature selection (Mufwene 2008) in which a variety of individual preexisting tendencies produced complexly congruent outcomes owing to changes that resulted from, or were reinforced by, language contact. Joseph (2001) observes that, e.g., the development of future marking involves ordinary and well-understood processes in language change---sound change, reduction of redundancy, and (analogical) generalization of one variant at the expense of another---and that grammaticalization is an epiphenomenon resulting from other processes of change (see also Joseph 2004).

More recently, Labov (2007) has resuscitated the claim that structural borrowing is rare or nonexistent, although he admits that it occurs and even cites Balkan infinitive replacement as a counterexample. Although it is true that borrowing or copying involves surface elements, this does not mean that adult nonlinguists are incapable of making the kind of generalizations that linguists observe, and the BLA provides examples not only in morphosyntax but also in bound morphemes. Whereas the oft-cited Megleno-Romanian 1sg, 2sg present markers -m, -sh may, in fact, have native rather than Macedonian sources (see Friedman 2009a for details), the Turkish 2pl preterite marker -nIz is

reanalyzed as -Iz and then borrowed into the 2pl preterite of a number of Romani dialects, where it then spreads by analogy to the 1pl preterite (Elšik & Matras 2006, Friedman 2009b). Evidentials appear in Albanian and BS after the Ottoman conquest, and, as in Turkish, where they are attested in the earliest (eighth-century) sources, they use former perfects. In BR, only Megleno-Romanian and one dialect of Aromanian have such usage--the former in intimate contact with Macedonian, the latter with Albanian (prior to 1919). Romanian lacks an indicative evidential. Greek lacks morphological evidentiality altogether. In Romani (Sliven, Skopje, Haskovo) and Judezmo (Istanbul), individual dialects have evidential strategies--the former use the Slavic interrogative particle *li* or a Turkish particle *berim*, the latter a pluperfect---that have not been generalized beyond those dialects. Turkish competed with Greek for prestige among Ottoman Christians, with urban Aromanians favoring Greek and urban Albanians and Slavs favoring Turkish. Roms and Sephardi Jews also favored Turkish, but they were socially marginalized groups. Large numbers of Albanians and Slavs converted to Islam during the Ottoman period, but small numbers of Greeks and Aromanians did so as well. In contrast, the largest Megleno-Romanian village, Nante, converted to Islam (Kahl 2006). Roms and Jews who converted to Islam were not accepted as "real" Muslims. The former were taxed as non-Muslims (Friedman & Dankoff 1991), and the latter were mostly Sabbatians (Turkish, Dönme). Thus, the spread of evidentiality in the Ottoman Balkans followed social relations regardless of linguistic structure (Friedman 2007, Lindstedt 2000). The current distribution of evidentials in the BLA reflects historical social relations connected to power, prestige, intimacy, and resistance, suggesting a correlation between cultural values and borrowability in sprachbunds. This supports the argument that limits on borrowability are not structural but social. See Matras (2009) for a functionalist approach to causation and Topolińska (1995) on creolization.

Speakers are thus central to the understanding of language contact; moreover, the contact takes place at the dialectal/colloquial level: This is the crucial locus of contact. Hence the combination of individual as situated in society and the dialect used by those individuals are the chief explanatory sites of contact-induced change. Shared discourse particles (Fielder 2008a,b; Hauge 2002; Matras 2000), given their conversational nature, constitute proof that speaker contact was vital in the diffusion of BLc features in general. They are both colloquial and abstract and spread only through oral encounters between speakers, and they are indicative of the daily necessities of communication (compare Grannes 1996). In the absence of media such as the Internet and television, discourse markers could only have spread via face-to-face encounters.

Code-switching is another area that needs more work. Code-switching in the Balkans is attested historically and occurs today (see Friedman 2003b, Kappler 2002). Friedman (2009b), Iglá (1996), and Elšik & Matras (2006) discuss Turkish conjugation used in Romani. As in the situation identified by Auer & Muhamedova (2005) for Kazakh-Russian code-switching, at any given moment, any given language may be employed. However, the data demonstrate that code-switches can also result in the creation of utterances in which neither language can be said to be dominant because a new, third, interlingual situation is created without actually creating a third language. One could argue that precisely such transferences were involved in Balkan contact phenomena, where phonology, morphology, morpho-syntax, syntax, and lexicon were all exchanged, but under varying social and geographic circumstances and not in a uniform manner.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I echo Enfield's (2005) call for more socio-ethno-linguistic research. My own work in Skopje, Republic of Macedonia (Friedman 2010), shows that the processes discussed in this article are alive and well in the only Balkan polity where BS, BR, Albanian, Turkish, and Romani all have official status, which is a significant factor for multilingual complexity in Europe. Although researchers can chip away at the analytical distinction between transmission and diffusion, the difference between reconstructable regular sound change, on one hand, and other types of changes, on the other, is no more obscure today than it was when Trubetzkoy argued against corruption as confusion. Although the concept of the language family may not be as easily delineated as it was in the days of the first Neogrammarians, it remains a useful heuristic with bases in historical events. It is certainly true that all language change originates with individual speakers and, if adopted, becomes characteristic of a larger group. Nonetheless, speakers themselves have various senses of "sameness" and "difference," and one of the field's tasks is to analyze what these are. In terms of communicative practice, a Balkan Romani speaker can understand Turkish in some contexts in the same way that a Macedonian-speaker can understand a Romani news program broadcast in the Republic of Macedonia. Here, Haugen (1966) is relevant for languages whose origins are wildly disparate vis-à-vis the source of Scandinavian. Such is the power of "words," be they "core" or "culture." The current fascination with linguistic structure has diverted attention from lexicon, and indeed it is remarkable how easy it is for a speaker of one Balkan language to grasp the syntax of another (provided s/he has not been taught in school to believe otherwise). Nonetheless, changes continue to occur at all levels in the BLA, with English as the new Turkish in

Comment: OK

terms of dominance. Eventually, the BLA may become an artifact of history, but that is no reason to cast it into the dustbin.

Future ISSUES

Research on the highly endangered Balkan languages/dialects in Greece is urgently needed. Unfortunately, the climate of fear created by fascists and police in that country is a problem for both speakers and researchers. Minority-languages in other Balkan countries, e.g., non-Turkish Muslims in Turkish Thrace, Aromanian in Albania, Greek in Bulgaria, Balkan Armenian, are also in need of documentation and analysis. Balkan linguistic studies examining multilingual villages that move beyond the traditional dialect atlas that looks at the monoglot village are needed for a more realistic picture of modern Balkan language contact. Balkan urban sociolinguistics in multilingual neighborhoods where language contact is historically grounded rather than the result of recent colonization or immigration are needed to provide tests of theories founded primarily on data from these latter two contact situations. Large corpora and integrated databases for nonstandard Balkan languages/dialects are needed for modern research agendas that go beyond planned standard languages.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research on which this article is based was conducted over many years with support from the following grants and organizations: American Council of Learned Societies (2000--2001), National Endowment for the Humanities (2001), Slavic and East European Language Resource Center at Duke University (2003), Research Center for Linguistic Typology at LaTrobe University (2004), Fulbright-Hays (2008--2009), John Simon Guggenheim Foundation (2009). None of the opinions expressed herein is the responsibility of any of these organizations. All translations are my own.

LITERATURE CITED

- Adamou E. 2008. Arménien. In *Le Patrimoine plurilingue de la Grèce*, ed. E Adamou, pp. 71--76. Leuven: Peeters
- Adams JN. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Adams JN, Janse M, Swain S, eds. 2002. *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Afendras EA. 1970. Can one measure a sprachbund? A calculus of phonemic distribution for language contact. *Folia Linguist.* 6(1/2):93--103
- Alexander R. 2000. Tracking sprachbund boundaries: word order in the Balkans. See Gilbers et al. 2000, pp. 9--27
- Alexander R. 2006a. *Bosnian Croatian Serbian: A Grammar with Sociolinguistic Commentary*. Madison: Univ. Wis. Press
- Alexander R. 2006b. Review of Robert Greenberg 2004. *J. Slav. Linguist.* 14(1):79--90
- Altbaev M. 2003. *Judeo-Spanish in the Turkish Social Context: Language Death, Swan Song, Revival or New Arrival?* Istanbul: Isis
- Andersen H. 2006. The periphrastic futures in Slavic: divergence and convergence. In *Change in Verbal Systems. Issues in Explanation*, ed. K Eksell, T Vinter, pp. 9--45. Bern: Peter Lang
- Andriotis NP, Kourmoulis G. 1968. Questions de la linguistique Balkanique et l'apport de la langue Grecque. See Gălăbov et al. 1968, pp. 21--30
- Aronson HI. 2006. The Balkan Linguistic League, "Orientalism", and Linguistic Typology. *Ann Arbor/New York: Beech Stave*
- Asenova P. 2002. *Balkansko ezikoznanie*. Sofia, Bulg.: Faber. 2nd ed.
- Atanasov P. 1990. *Le Mégléno--Roumain de nos jours*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske
- Auer, P, Muhamedova, R. 2005. 'Embedded language' and 'matrix language' in insertional language mixing: some problematic cases. *Rivista di Linguistica* 17(1):35--54.
- Bakić-Hayden M. 1995. Nesting orientalisms: the case of former Yugoslavia. *Slav. Rev.* 54:917--31
- Belyavski-Frank M. 2003. *The Balkan Conditional in South Slavic*. Munich: Otto Sagner
- Boretzky N, Igla B. 2004. *Kommentierter Dialektatlas des Romani*. 2 Vols. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Bunis DM. 1999. *Voices from Jewish Salonika*. Jerusalem-Thessaloniki: Misgav Yerushalayim, Natl. Auth. Ladino Cult., Ahaim Found.
- Campbell L, Kaufman T, Smith-Stark TC. 1986. Meso-America as a linguistic area. *Language* 62:530--70
- Connerty M. 2003. *Judeo--Greek: The Language. The Culture*. New York: Jay Street

- Crossland RA. 1982. Linguistic problems of the Balkan area in late prehistoric and early classical periods. In *The Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 3, Part 1: The Prehistory of the Balkans; and the Middle East and the Aegean World, Tenth to Eighth Centuries BC*, ed. J Boardman, IES Edwards, NGL Hammond, E Sollberger, pp. 834--49. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. 2nd. ed.
- Demiraj B, ed. 2010. *Wir Sind die Deinen: Studien zur Albanischen Sprache, Literatur und Kulturgeschichte, dem Gedenken an Martin Camaj (1925--1992) gewidmet*. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Dombrowski A. 2011. *Phonological Aspects of Language Contact along the Slavic Periphery*. PhD thesis. Univ. Chicago, Dept. Ling. & Dept. Slav. Lang. & Lit.
- Dyer DL. 1999. *The Romanian Dialect of Moldova: A Study in Language and Politics*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen
- Ellis BA. 2003. *Shadow Genealogies: Memory and Identity Among Urban Muslims in Macedonia*. Boulder, CO: East Eur. Monogr.
- Elšik V, Matras Y. 2006. *Markedness and Language Change: The Romani Sample*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Enfield NJ. 2005. Areal linguistics and mainland Southeast Asia. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 34:181--206
- Fielder GE. 2008a. Macedonian discourse markers in the Balkan sprachbund. *Sprachtypol. Univers.* 61(2):105--19
- Fielder GE. 2008b. The status of discourse markers as Balkanisms in South Slavic. In *Am. Contrib. 14th Int. Congr. Slavists, Ohrid, Sept., Vol. 1: Linguistics*, ed. CY Bethin, pp. 111--29. Bloomington, IN: Slavica
- Fine JVA. 1983. *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Fine JVA. 1987. *The Late Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Late Twelfth Century to the Ottoman Conquest*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich. Press
- Friedman VA. 1986. Linguistics, nationalism, and literary languages: a Balkan perspective. In *The Real World Linguist: Linguistic Applications in the 1980s*, ed. V Raskin, P Bjarkman, pp. 287--305. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Friedman VA. 1996. Observing the observers: language, ethnicity, and power in the 1994 Macedonian census and beyond. In *Toward Comprehensive Peace in Southeastern Europe: Conflict Prevention in the South Balkans*, ed. B Rubin, pp. 81--105, 119--26. New York: Council on Foreign Relations, Twentieth Century Fund
- Friedman VA. 1997. One grammar, three lexicons: ideological overtones and underpinnings in the Balkan Sprachbund. In *CLS 33: Papers from the Panels on Linguistic Ideologies in Contact; Universal Grammar; Parameters and Typology; The Perception of Speech and Other Acoustic Signals*, ed. K Singer, R Eggert, G Anderson, pp. 23--44. Chicago: Chicago Linguist. Soc.
- Friedman VA. 2000. The modern Macedonian standard language and its relation to modern Macedonian identity. In *The Macedonian Question: Culture, Historiography, Politics*, ed. V Roudometoff, pp. 173--206. Boulder, CO: East Eur. Monogr.
- Friedman VA. 2001. The Vlach minority in Macedonia: language, identity, dialectology, and standardization. In *Selected Papers in Slavic, Balkan, and Balkan Studies*, (Slavica Helsingiensia 21), ed. J Nuorluoto, M Leiwo, J Halla-aho, pp. 26--50. Helsinki: Univ. Helsinki
- Friedman VA. 2003a. Language in Macedonia as an identity construction site. In *When Languages Collide: Perspectives on Language Conflict, Language Competition, and Language Coexistence*, ed. BD Joseph, J DeStafano, NG Jacobs, I Lehiste, pp. 257--95. Columbus: Ohio State Univ. Press
- Friedman VA. 2003b. *Turkish in Macedonia and Beyond*. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Friedman VA. 2004. *Studies on Albanian and Other Balkan Languages*. Peja, Kosovo: Dukagjini
- Friedman VA. 2006. The Balkans as a linguistic area. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. K Brown, 1:657--72. Oxford: Elsevier. 2nd ed.
- Friedman VA. 2007. Balkanizing the Balkan sprachbund: a closer look at grammatical permeability and feature distribution. In *Grammars in Contact: A Cross Linguistic Typology*, ed. A Aikhenvald, RMW Dixon, pp. 201--19. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Friedman VA. 2008. Balkan Slavic Dialectology and Balkan Linguistics: Periphery as Center. In *American Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists*. ed. C Bethin, 131--48. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Friedman VA. 2009a. The diffusion of Macedonian inflections into Megleno--Romanian: a reconsideration of the evidence. In *A Linguist's Linguist: Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in Honor of E. Wayles Browne*, ed. S Franks, V Chidambaram, BD Joseph, pp. 223--33. Bloomington, IN: Slavica
- Friedman VA. 2009b. Codeswitching and code integration in Romani. In *CLS 44 Pap. 44th Reg. Meet. Chicago Linguist. Soc., Vol. 2: The Parasessions*, ed. M Bane, JJB Holle, T Grano, AL Grotberg, Y McNabb, pp. 129--38. Chicago: Chicago Linguist. Soc.
- Friedman VA. 2010. Admirativity and modality in Albanian-Macedonian contact. See Demiraj 2010, pp. 277--81
- Friedman VA, Joseph BD. in press. *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press

- Friedman VA, Dankoff R. 1991. The earliest text in Balkan (Rumelian) Romani: a passage from Evliya Çelebi's *Seyāhat-nāme*. *J. Gypsy Lore Soc.* 1:1--20. 5th ser.
- Gabinskij MA. 1992. Sefardskij (everjesko--ispanskij) jazyk: Balkanskoe narečie. Kišinev: Ştiinca
- Gal S, Irvine JT. 1995. The boundaries of languages and disciplines: how ideologies construct difference. *Soc. Res.* 64:967--1001
- Gălăbov I, Georgiev V, Zaimov J, eds. 1968. *Actes du Premier Congrès International des Etudes Balkaniques et Sud-Est Européens*, Vol. 6. Sofia, Bulg.: BAN
- Gilbers DG, Nerbonne J, Schaecken J, eds. 2000. *Languages in Contact*. Amsterdam: Rodopi
- Gołąb Z. 1976. On the mechanism of Slavic-Rumanian linguistic interference in the Balkans. In *Bulgaria, Past and Present: Studies in History, Literature, Economics, Music, Sociology, Folklore and Linguistics*, ed. T Butler, pp. 296--309. Columbus, OH: Am. Assoc. Adv. Slav. Stud.
- Gołąb Z. 1984. The Arumanian Dialect of Kruševo in SR Macedonia SFR Yugoslavia. Skopje, Republic of Macedonia: Macedonian Acad. Sci. Arts
- Gołąb Z. 1997. The ethnic background and internal linguistic mechanism of the so-called Balkanization of Macedonian. *Balkanistica* 10:13--19
- Grannes A. 1996. *Turco-Bulgarica. Articles in English and French Concerning Turkish Influence on Bulgarian*. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz Verlag
- Greenberg RD. 2004. *Language and Identity in the Balkans: Serbo-Croatian and its Disintegration*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Hamp EP. 1977. On some questions of areal linguistics. In *Proc. 3rd Annu. Meet. Berkeley Linguist. Soc.*, ed. K Whistlers, R van Valin, pp. 279--82. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguist. Soc.
- Hamp EP. 1989. Yugoslavia crossroads of Sprachbünde. *Z. Balkanol.* 25(1):44--47
- Hamp EP. 1981/1982. On the name Ohrid. *Makedon. Jazik* 32--33:777--84
- Hamp EP. 1982. The oldest Albanian syntagma. *Balk. Ezikozn.* 25(1):77--79
- Hamp EP. 1992a. Albanian. In *The Indo-European Numerals*, ed. J Gvozdanović, pp. 835--922. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Hamp EP. 1992b. Kukës and Prizren. *Stud. Filol.* 46(29):57--58
- Hamp EP. 2002. On Serbo--Croatian's historic laterals. *Indiana Slav. Stud.* 12:243--50
- Hamp EP. 2010. On the etymology of Crimean Gothic apel. *North-West. Eur. Lang. Evol. (NOWELE)* 58/59:453--80
- Haspelmath M. 1998. How young is standard average European? *Lang. Sci.* 20(3):271--87
- Hauge KR. 2002. At the boundaries of the Balkan sprachbund: pragmatic and paralinguistic isomorphisms in the Balkans and beyond. *Mediterr. Lang. Rev.* 14:21--40
- Haugen E. 1966. Semicommunication: the language gap in Scandinavia. *Sociol. Inq.* 36:280--97
- Hazai G. 1961. Contributions à l'histoire d'une limite dialectale dans les Balkans. *Orbis* 10:15--19
- Heine B, Kuteva T. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Hertslet E. 1891. *The Map of Europe by Treaty*, Vol. 4 (1875--1891). London: Harrison
- Hinrichs U, ed. 1999. *Handbuch der Südosteuropa---Linguistik*. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Høeg C. 1925/1926. *Les Sarakartsans, un tribu nomade Grecque*. Paris: Champion
- Horrocks G. 1997. *Greek: The History of the Language and its Speakers*. London: Longman
- Hupchick D, Cox HE. 2001. *The Palgrave Concise Historical Atlas of the Balkans*. New York: Palgrave
- Igla B. 1996. *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara---Deskriptive und historisch vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerdialekts*. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Inalcik H, Quataert D, eds. 1994. *An Economic and Social History of the Ottoman Empire 1300--1914*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Irvine, JT and Gal, S. 2000. Language ideologies and linguistic differentiation. In *Regimes of Language*, ed. P Kroskrity, pp. 35--83. Santa Fe, NM: School of Am. Research Press.
- Jakobson R. 1931/(1971). *Karakteristike evrazijskogo jazykovogo sojuza*. Reprinted 1971 in *Selected Writings* Vol. 1, pp. 143--201. The Hague: Mouton. 2nd ed.
- Jašar-Nasteva O. 1997. A contribution to the study of the revival of the Aromanians of Macedonia (based on an autographed manuscript by G. Prličev). *Balkanistica* 10:241--54
- Jelavich B. 1983. *A History of the Balkans*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Joseph BD. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Joseph BD. 1986. A fresh look at the Balkan sprachbund: some observations on H. W. Schaller's *Die Balkansprachen*. *Mediterr. Lang. Rev.* 3:105--14

Comment: Reference added on p. 8

- Joseph BD. 1999. Is Balkan comparative syntax possible? In *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*, ed. ML Rivero, A Ralli, pp. 17--43. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Joseph BD. 2000. Processes of spread for syntactic constructions in the Balkans. In *Balkan Linguistik: Synchronie und Diachronie*, ed. C Tzitzilis, C Symeonidis, pp. 139--50. Salonica: Univ. Thessaloniki
- Joseph BD. 2001. Is there such a thing as "grammaticalization"? *Lang. Sci.* 23:163--86
- Joseph BD. 2004. Rescuing traditional (historical) linguistics from grammaticalization "theory." In *Up and Down the Cline---The Nature of Grammaticalization*, ed. O Fischer, M Norde, H Perridon, pp. 44--71. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Joseph BD. 2008. *On the Need for History in Balkan Linguistics*. New York: Beech Stave
- Kahl T. 2006. The Islamisation of the Meglen Vlachs (Megleno--Romanians): the Village of Nânti (Nótia) and the "Nântinets" in Present--Day Turkey. *Natl. Pap.* 34:71--90
- Kallulli D, Tasmowski L, eds. 2008. *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Kappler M. 2002. *Turkish Language Contacts in South-Eastern Europe*. Istanbul: Isis
- Katičić R. 1976. *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*. 2 Vols. Ser: Trends in Linguist. State-of-the-Art Rep. 4, 5. The Hague: Mouton
- Kazazis K. 1972. The status of Turkisms in the present-day Balkan languages. In *Aspects of the Balkans: Continuity and Change*. *Contrib. Int. Balkan Conf., UCLA, Oct. 23--28, 1969*, ed. H Birnbaum, S Vryonis, pp. 87--116. The Hague: Mouton
- Kazazis K. 1977. Review of *Nà ksetourkégoume tē glōssa mas* (Greek: Let Us Deturkicize Our Language!), by S Giakovos, S Dizikirikis. *Folia Slav.* 1(2):301--6
- Kopitar J. 1829. Albanische, walachische und bulgarische sprache. *Jahrb. Lit.* 46:59--106
- Kramer CE. 1994. The grammaticalization of the future tense auxiliary in the Balkan languages. *Indiana Slav. Stud.* 7:127--35
- Krivoruchko J. 2011. Judeo-Greek in the globalization era. *Lang. & Communication* 31(2):119-129.
- Labov W. 2007. Transmission and diffusion. *Language* 83:344--87
- Leake WM. 1814. *Researches in Greece*. London: John Booth
- Lindstedt J. 2000. Linguistic Balkanization: contact-induced change by mutual reinforcement. See Gilbers et al. 2000, pp. 231--46
- Luria MA. 1930. A study of the Monastir dialect of Judeo-Spanish based on oral material collected in Monastir, Yugoslavia. *Rév. Hisp.* 79:323--535
- Magoosi PR. 1993. *Historical Atlas of East Central Europe*. Seattle: Univ. Wash. Press
- Mallory JP, Adams DQ, eds. 1997. *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture*. London/Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn
- Markopoulos, T. 2009. *The Future in Greek: From Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Masica C. 2001. The definition and significance of linguistic areas: methods, pitfalls, and possibilities (with special reference to the validity of South Asia as a linguistic area). In *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, ed. P Bhaskararao, K Subbarao, pp. 205--68. New Delhi: Sage
- Matras Y. 1994. Structural Balkanisms in Romani. In *Sprachlicher Standard und Substandard in Südosteuropa und Osteuropa*, ed. by N Reiter, pp. 195--210. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Matras Y. 2000. How predictable is contact-induced language change in grammar? In *Time Depth in Historical Linguistics*, ed. C Renfew, A McMahon, L Trask, pp. 563--83. Cambridge, UK: MacDonald Inst. Archaeol. Res.
- Matras Y. 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Matras Y. 2009. *Contact Linguistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Matras Y, Tufan Ş. 2007. Grammatical borrowing in Macedonian Turkish. In *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, ed. Y Matras, J Sakel, pp. 215--27. New York: Mouton de Gruyter
- Menz A. 1999. *Gagausische Syntax: Eine Studie zum Kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Miklosich F. 1861. Die slavischen elemente im Rumunischen. *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch--Historische Klasse* 12:1--70
- Mladenova O. 2007. *Definiteness in Bulgarian: Modelling the Process of Language Change*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Mufwene S. 2008. *Language Evolution: Contact, Competition and Change*. London: Conitnum
- Pahmeyer K. 1980. Bemerkungen zum Judenspanischen im Balkanraums. *Balkan--Arhiv* 5(n.s.):109--24
- Polomé EC. 1982. Balkan languages (Illyrian, Thracian and Daco-Moesian). In *The Prehistory of the Balkans; and the Middle East and the Aegean World, Tenth to Eighth Centuries B.C.*, ed. J Boardman, IES Edwards, NGL Hammond, E Sollberger, 3(1):866--88. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. 2nd ed.

- Récatas B. 1934. L'état actuel du bilinguisme chez les macédo--roumains du Pinde et le rôle de la femme dans le langage. Paris: Libr. Droz
- Sandfeld K. 1930. Linguistique Balkanique. Paris: Klincksieck
- Sawicka I. 1997. The Balkan Sprachbund in the Light of Phonetic Features. Warsaw: Energeia
- Schaller H. 1975. Balkanlinguistik. Heidelberg: Carl Winter
- Schleicher A. 1850. Die Sprachen Europas. Bonn: König
- Seliščev A. 1925. Des traits linguistiques communs aux langues balkaniques: un Balkanisme ancien en Bulgarie. *Rév. études slaves* 5:38--57
- Siewierska A, ed. 1998. *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
- Sims AD. 2008. Balkan sprachbund morpho-syntactic features, (review). *J. Slav. Linguist.* 16(2):331--47
- Sobolev AN. 2008. Macedonian in the western Balkan linguistic area. *Sprachtypol. Univers.* 61(2):153--61
- Sobolev AN, Domoselickaja, MV eds. 2005--2010. *Malyj dialektologičeskij atlas balkanskij jazykov: Serija leksičeskaja*. 4 Vols. Munich: Otto Sagner
- Stephenson P. 2000. *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Stolz T. 2006. All or nothing. In *Linguistic Areas: Convergence in Historical and Typological Perspective*, ed. Y Matras, A McMahon, N Vincent, pp. 32--50. London: Palgrave
- Symeonidis H. 2002. *Das Judenspanische von Thessaloniki*. Bern: Peter Lang
- Todorova M. 1997. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Tomić OM. 2006. *Balkan Morpho-Syntactic Features*. Amsterdam
- Topalli K. The age of Albanian articles. See Demiraj 2010, pp. 384--88
- Topolińska Z. 1995. Convergent evolution, creolization and referentiality. *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers*, Vol. I, ed. E Hajičová, M Červenka, O Leška, P Sgall, pp. 239--47. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Trubetzkoy NS. 1928. Proposition 16. In *Actes du Premier congrès international de linguistes*, ed. Congr. Int. Linguist., p. 18. Leiden: AW Sijthoff
- Trummer M. 1983. Südslavische Sprachgeographie und Balkanlinguistik. In *Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik*, ed. N Reiter, pp. 245--54. Wiesbaden, Germ.: Harrassowitz
- Tsitsipis LD. 2007. Bilingualism, praxis, and linguistic description. In *Bilingualism: A Social Portrait*, ed. M Heller, pp. 277--96. New York: Palgrave
- Tuite K. 1999. The myth of the Caucasian sprachbund: the case of ergativity. *Lingua* 108:1--26
- Van der Auwera J. 1998. Revisiting the Balkan and Meso-American linguistic areas. *Lang. Sci.* 20(3):259--70
- Varol Bornes MC. 2008. *Le Judéo-Espagnol vernaculaire d'Isantbul*. Bern: Lang
- Wilkinson HR. 1951. *Maps and Politics: A Review of the Ethnographic Cartography of Macedonia*. Liverpool: Univ. Liverpool Press
- Wittek P. 1953. Les gagaouzes---gens de Kaykâüs. *Rocz. Orient.* 17:12--24
- Woodard RD, ed. 2004. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages*. New York: Cambridge
- Woodward S. 1995a. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution After the Cold War*. Washington, DC: Brookings Inst.
- Woodward S. 1995b. *Socialist Unemployment: The Political Economy of Yugoslavia 1945--1990*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press
- RELATED RESOURCES
- Halwachs D, Univ. Graz. ROMLEX Romani lexical database. <http://romani.uni-graz.at/romlex/>
- Kazazis K. 1996. Some recent Greek views on Arumanian. *Newsl. Soc. Fărșărotul* 10(2):9--17
- Matras Y, Elšik V, Univ. Manch. Romani morpho-syntactic database. <http://romani.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/atmanchester/projects/rmsdatabase.shtml>
- Petrucci PR. 1999. Slavic Features in the History of Romanian. *LINCOM Stud. Roman. Linguist.* 8. Munich: LINCOM Eur.
- Sikimić B, Ašić T, eds. 2008. *The Romance Balkans*. Belgrade: SANU, Inst. Balkan Stud.