Broad vs. Localistic Dialectology, Standard vs. Dialect: The Case of the Balkans and the Drawing of Linguistic Boundaries

Brian D. Joseph

The Ohio State University

[joseph.1@osu.edu]

1. Preliminaries

Dialectology as a scientific pursuit is interested in charting and accounting for the range and spread of similarities and differences—that is to say, variation—within languages, and where appropriate, across languages too. As such, dialectology and the study of dialects more generally intersect in several ways with Balkan linguistics, the study of the interactions among various languages of the Balkans—Albanian, Greek, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Bosnian-Serbian-Croatian, Aromanian (a close relative of Daco-Romanian spoken mostly in Greece and Macedonia), Daco-Romanian (the language of Romania), Romani (the language of the Gypsies (Rom)), and Turkish—that show structural parallels linking them in a particular type of contact zone known as a "Sprachbund".

First, there can be dialect divisions within a language that indicate that one dialect or dialect area of a language has been influenced by neighboring Balkan languages while other dialects have not, or have not to the same extent. This is the case, for instance, with the Torlak dialects of Serbian, located in the southeastern part of Serbia, where it has been affected by contact with speakers of other South Slavic languages, specifically Bulgarian and Macedonian, to the extent that it has many features more like those languages and less like the rest of Serbian,

e.g. a definite article that is enclitic within the noun phrase and a future tense formed with an invariant marker based on the verb 'want'. In a certain sense, then, the Torlak dialects are more "Balkan", more a part of the Balkan Sprachbund, than are other dialects of Serbian.

Second, the spread of common features across the Balkan languages that has led to their characterization as a "Sprachbund" is analogous to the spread of features dialectally within a language. To a certain extent, for speakers of one language very familiar with a neighboring language, the boundaries between the two may not be as strong or as real as linguists often posit. Thus there is diffusion across languages, more accurately across sets of speakers of different languages, just as there is diffusion across dialects, involving speakers of different dialects of the same language.

Third, these two areas of scholarly exploration are overtly linked by Hock (1988) in his "dialectological" approach to the Balkans, treating (some) Balkan convergent phenomena within the context of larger dialectological divisions to be seen in Europe (e.g. auxiliary selection in formation of future, analytic comparatives, etc.) and arguing that the Balkan situation can be understood as related to large-scale trends involving these features across all of Europe. This approach can be contrasted with the more narrowly focused approach taken, for instance, by Hamp 1989a, who recognizes within the Balkans various intersecting clusters of small and thus highly localized contact zones, and looks to them as the basis for Balkan convergent features. The former sort of dialectology can be characterized as *broad dialectology* ("big picture dialectology"), and can be contrasted with the latter, more *localistic dialectology* ("micro-dialectology"). The first type looks to the widest possible area in which to place the occurrence of certain linguistic features while the second focuses on the narrowest venue in which a feature

is to be found. In a sense the former is a "dialectology" of languages while the latter is a dialectology of local varieties.

Finally, dialectology in part calls attention to distinctions between regional varieties of a language and a standard(ized) form, and within the Balkans, this dialectological call to arms has not been universally embraced. That is, considerable attention has been given—in handbooks at least—to phenomena seen in standard languages to the exclusion of attention to (local/regional) dialects. So in this regard, the interaction of dialectology with Balkan linguistics has been one of neglect, in that the lessons of dialectology, with its interest in a wide range of different varieties of a language, have not always been applied in Balkan linguistics.

The first two of these interactions in a sense form the backbone of studying the Balkan Sprachbund, and represent an essential part of doing business, as it were. But the final two have several important consequences for the linguistic study of the Balkans. Most significant is that if one follows Hock's line of reasoning, there is no Sprachbund, per se, at least not a characteristically Balkan one, as the Balkans in such an approach are (re-)defined as simply a piece of the larger European dialectological scene. That is, the broad approach essentially denies the validity of the Balkan Sprachbund, relegating the convergence among languages in the Balkans to the status of a mere subset of a larger convergence area covering most of Europe. It is thus so large an area that one can legitimately ask what sort of contact among speakers could be responsible for convergence over such a vast region. Still, it is of particular interest to Balkanists to consider whether one has to adopt such a broad view, or if instead the localistic approach gives satisfying results when applied to facts of the Balkan languages. Demonstrating success with the localistic approach would be a way of countering the claims implicit in the application of the broad approach to the Balkans and would thus speak to the validity of the

Balkan Sprachbund as a special contact zone. Finally, as to the last point above, if one attends only to standardized language varieties in the Balkans, a lot of interesting material that should be of great relevance to understanding the diffusion of features gets missed.

Accordingly, in what follows, I examine various phenomena in the Balkans, mostly focusing on phonology, to show that a localistic approach to Balkan dialectology is especially revealing, suggesting that the broad approach is too broad to be of value and thereby also vindicating the notion of the Sprachbund. I also document the value of turning one's attention away from standard language phenomena and towards regional varieties. These two issues are related, of course, in that regional features tend to be highly localized in nature. In addition, in the course of this investigation, I explore some of the factors that play a role in localistic phonological convergence in the Balkans, including bilingualism, familiarity with contact language, ideology and attitudes, and degree of social integration.

2. The Study of Phonology in the Balkans

It is generally the case that only rather scant mention of phonology is to be found in the handbooks on Balkan linguistics, and what there is usually treats the phonology of the standard languages, with no attention to regional dialects. The relative length of the phonology sections in various handbooks as compared to the sections on morphology/syntax, as shown in Table 1, is quite instructive as to the importance generally given to Balkan phonology, even if we grant that morphology and syntax require more space than phonology since the examples given are typically longer.

Schaller 1975	10 pages on phonology	27 on morphology and 11 on syntax
Banfi 1986:	6 on phonology	7 on morphology and 24 on syntax

Feuillet 1986:	10 on phonology	38 on morphology
Asenova 1989:	12 on phonology	176 on morphosyntax
Asenova 2002:	15 on phonology	215 on morphosyntax)
Demiraj 1994:	14 on phonology	80 on morphology/syntax
Steinke & Vraciu 1999:	9 on phonology	19 on morphology and syntax.

Table 1: Phonology vs. Morphology/Syntax in Balkan Handbooks

Moreover, the relatively few putative contact-induced phonological convergences (phonological "Balkanisms") that are mentioned in the handbooks are often hard to reconcile with the conception of "Balkanism" as a structural characteristic brought on by language contact. This can be seen especially clearly by considering two of the most commonly referred-to features, the occurrence of stressed schwa in Bulgarian, Albanian, Romanian, and the nature of the vowel system in several of the languages.

The relevant facts about schwa are as follows. There are loan words in Balkans that show the schwa (e.g. Albanian *këndoj* 'sing' from Latin *cantō*), but the schwa also results from native developments, in that regular sound changes in some of the languages yield a schwa (e.g. in Tosk Albanian, from earlier nasal vowels, as in *është* 'is' vs. Geg Albanian *âsht*). Importantly, also, in some of the languages, there are several different sources for the schwa. In particular, northern dialects of Macedonian (e.g. Tetovo, Kumanovo, Kriva Palanka) have schwa from the Proto-Slavic ultra-short high jer vowels, east central dialects (e.g. Tikveš-Mariovo) have schwa from vocalic *l*, and many peripheral dialects (e.g. Ohrid-Prespa) have schwa from the Proto-Slavic back nasalized vowel. In Daco-Romanian, the mid central vowel *ă* derives when stressed from Latin *o* in some contexts, as in *contra* 'against' > *către* or *foras* 'outside' > *fără*, and the high

central vowel *î,* when stressed, derives from (stressed) *a* before a nasal, as in *cîmp* 'field' from Latin *campus*, and from *i* after *r*, as in *rîpă* 'cliff' from Latin *ripa*.

What these facts mean for the assessment of stressed schwa as a Balkanism is that one would have to assume that words with schwa were borrowed from one language (that had schwa) into another that did not have schwa and that speakers of the recipient language adopted such forms without altering (adapting) the schwa to a native sound in their phonological inventory. Such nonadaptation of loan words does occur, as examples in sections 4.1 and 4.2 below show, but it is perhaps less usual than their being adapted to the borrowers' phonology. Moreover, one would then have to assume too that schwa made its way into native vocabulary in the borrowing language. Again, this is possible (see 4.1 and 4.2 below) but again is perhaps less usual. Even more, though, the schwa in native vocabulary results from several earlier sounds in some of the languages in ways that look like regular sound changes, in that the changes affect a number of lexical items without exceptions. Thus under a contact-induced account of the emergence of stressed schwa in the Balkan languages, the mere occurrence of a few stressed schwas in loan words has to be assumed to be sufficient to lead different sounds in each of the recipient languages in the direction of schwa in such a way as to appear to be a regular, exceptionless sound change.

Further, if interference or substratum effects are claimed as the cause and not diffusion from lexical borrowings, the question arises as to how to explain that speakers of a language with schwa carried over their schwa-producing habits into their pronunciation of the words of another language, including in stressed positions where vowel reduction in the direction of a schwa is less expected. And, finally, even if all this were plausible, it is hard to link the developments in

one language, say Albanian, with those in another, say Bulgarian, where different sets of second-language speakers would be involved.

Thus, despite the insistence over the years that the overall schwa developments could well be a significant shared feature in the Balkans, the history of the individual languages suggests it has nothing to do with language contact, other than occurring in some loanwords.

The other commonly cited phonological feature of the Balkan Sprachbund is that the languages have simple clear five-(or so)-vowel systems, with no length or nasalization distinctions. This statement is largely based on the phonology of the standard languages. In fact, looking at dialects would make one wonder if there is anything of a convergent nature to note, since there are dialects of Balkan languages that are considerably at odds with the stated Balkan "norm". For instance, the Albanian dialects of Shkodra and environs have as many as 24 vocalic phonemes, with length and nasalization distinctions, e.g., i – i: - î – î: (Beci 1981, 1984, Sawicka 1997).[1]

Of course, these are peripheral dialects (so also Cypriot—see footnote 1), so that it could be argued that they perhaps are not relevant to the Balkan Sprachbund, not part of the core of Sprachbund languages nor of the Balkan language contact zone. Importantly, though, one could say the same thing for the present-day contemporary standard languages, since they are not involved in any sort of on-going contact in the Balkans.

What facts like these suggest is that one should adopt the view of Friedman (2005, 2006a; see also Friedman & Joseph (2009: Chap. 5)) that there is "no Balkan phonology, only Balkan phonologies", meaning that what one finds in the Balkans are convergent phenomena which can

[1] Similarly, Balkan consonant systems are said to have no geminates (Feuillet 1984, Sawicka 1997), but the Cypriot dialect of Greek has geminates.

only be discerned by focusing localistically on the dialect level. And, since taking this view means looking to regional and highly localized dialects, this is consistent with the "cluster" approach to the Balkan Sprachbund of Hamp (1989a), an approach that is basically dialectological in nature in a localistic way, not in Hock's broad way.

3. Local Convergences in the Balkans Exemplified

Just as looking at the standard languages in the Balkans reveals relatively little in the way of convergent contact-induced phonology, looking at local dialects in the Balkans reveals a considerable number of localized convergences. By way therefore of countering the paucity of standard language phonological Balkanisms, I offer here a few examples of these many localized phonological convergences.

All of these cases can be explained as a result of local bilingualism: speakers of one language, living side-by-side with speakers of another language, come to know and use the local other language, and that knowledge and usage causes spillover—or rather feedback—into their native language, i.e. what may be called "reverse interference" from a second language onto a native language, a contact phenomenon shown in various studies by James Flege (e.g. Flege 2006; see Bond, Markus, & Stockmal 2004 for a useful summary of the relevant literature). Since bilingualism can be understood as a quintessentially local phenomenon, in the sense that the languages involved in bilingualism typically are co-territorial, occupying virtually the same space, with speakers living next to and interact with one another in the same locale, such convergences are necessarily localistic in nature.

3.1. In Arvanitika, the Tosk Albanian dialect spoken in Greece for some 600 years, as reported by Sandfeld (1930: 104), [mnj] occurs for [mj] that is found elsewhere in Albanian. For

instance, in Arvanitika, *mnjekrë* 'chin' occurs, as opposed to *mjekër* elsewhere in Tosk. Sandfeld notes that the shift of [mj] to [mnj] is "comme en grec", where, for instance, one finds [mnja] for 'one' from earlier (and still possible for some speakers) [mja]. Thus, presumably, the Greek of Arvanitika speakers who are Greek-dominant (or at least highly conversant in Greek) "spills back" into their Arvanitika, bringing about a convergence.

3.2. In another localized feature involving Arvanitika, Hamp (1973: 314) points out that in southern varieties of Arvanitika (e.g. in the Peloponnesos), as in Greek, there is preservation of the number of syllables in words, and he considers this to be a significant shared contact-induced feature. That is, southern Arvanitika, like the local Greek it is in contact with in the Peloponnesos, shows no syncope and no apocope, so that the syllable count in a word remains constant (see also Tsitsipis 1998: 24). Interestingly, this is unlike the more northerly varieties of Arvanitika in Greece and also unlike the northern Greek dialects (which show loss of unstressed high vowels). Thus it appears that here too there is the "bleeding" of Greek speech patterns into local varieties of Arvanitika, again presumably through bilingualism.

3.3. Such localized convergence is not restricted to Arvanitika nor to Greece. Hamp (1989b: 203) offers an insightful account of convergence in consonantism between Geg (northern) Albanian and local Slavic varieties it comes into contact with:

> Much of Geg (including Gusî) shares a consonantal characteristic with the neighboring Slavic languages. In Northern Geg *ḱ* and *ǵ* are articulated as affricates in exactly the same fashion as Serbo-Croatian *ć* and *ʒ́* (orthographic *đ* or *dj*); in Dukagjin in northern Albania, the articulation shifts further to *ś* and *ź*. In Kosovo these merge, in Albanian and Serbo-Croatian, with *č* and *ǯ́* (orthographic *dž*), and Makedonski has of these pairs only *č* and *dž*; however, Makedonski possesses also *ḱ*

and *ǵ*. Tetovo shows the following interference innovations: **ḱ ǵ* > **ć ʒ'* > *č ǯ* and **t̲j d̲j* > *ḱ ǵ*, thereby exactly matching Makedonski in distinctive feature structure.

A reverse interference effect seems to be at work in these cases too.

3.4. Finally, in a feature that involves Balkan Romance (Daco-Romanian, in this case) and other languages not yet treated here, Petrovici 1957 and others, e.g. Sandfeld 1930: 146, Sawicka 1997, have remarked on the development of initial *#e* > *je* in the Balkans. This feature is widespread across all of Slavic, found even in Old Church Slavonic, and occurring in West South Slavic (Slovene and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian). It also appears dialectally in Bulgarian, although it is no longer present now in most of Bulgarian or Macedonian. But it is clearly a Common Slavic feature and the general absence in Bulgarian and Macedonian is a secondary (later, and relatively recent) development. Interestingly, #e > je is found also in Daco-Romanian, and is generally taken (so Petrovici 1957, Popović 1960: 206, Rosetti 1964: 88, and DuNay 1977: 89) as a Slavic feature that has entered the language, presumably through localized bilingualism involving Slavic prior to de-jotation in East South Slavic. This shows up in loanwords, e.g. *ieftin* 'cheap' (most directly from East South Slavic but ultimately from Greek where it had initial *e-*) but also in indigenous forms, e.g. *el* 'he' (pronounced [jel]).

The occurrence of this feature is not limited to Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance. It is found also in Balkan Turkic (Sawicka 1997: 25, Asenova 2002: 34, citing Gagauz as well), e.g. Rodopi (Balkan) Turkish *jel* 'hand', *jis* 'trace' (elsewhere: *el*, *iz*) and Gagauz *jilik* 'first', *jüç* 'three' (elsewhere: *ilik*, *üç*), and it is said (by Sawicka) to be from Slavic influence, specifically Bulgarian. Moreover, it is even attested in some northern dialects of Greek. Newton (1972: 29), drawing on Phavis 1951, notes [je] from earlier [e] in Chalkidiki (in northern Greece), as in [jékama] 'I did' (cf. standard Greek [ékana] with a variant [ékama] found dialectally) and [jéxu] 'I

have' (cf. standard [éxo]). In this case, Phavis invokes the "stronger stress usually claimed for northern dialects", but Slavic influence seems more plausible. In particular, the occurrence of this feature in Greek could well represent the importation of Slavic speech habits into Greek, via Greek-Slavic bilingualism, given the geographical restriction of the change within Greek and the fact that the north of Greece was once been extensively Slavophone; relevant here too is the fact noted by Newton (idem) that "[wó] for [ó] [occurs] in Kozani and other parts of [Greek] Macedonia", as this is also a Slavic-like on-gliding development).

4. Beyond Bilingualism: The Effects of Familiarity

The examples in section 3 show localized effects of bilingualism on the phonology of languages in contact. It seems, however, that more is involved in these effects than just bilingualism. In particular, other cases suggest that the familiarity that bilingualism breeds is equally important, and that moreover, language ideology is involved as well, since familiarity can be seen to have an ideological dimension to it. Therefore, the facts concerning some developments with one class of sounds in the Balkans are first given, and then the issue of how to interpret the notion of familiarity is addressed.

A particularly telling case of a localized phonological convergence in the Balkans where familiarity can be seen as active involves the fricatives *ð/θ* (and to a lesser extent *γ*) in the Balkans. The facts on the distribution of these sounds in the various Balkan languages are as follows.

The interdental fricatives *ð/θ* are found in Greek, Albanian, Aromanian, and dialectal Macedonian (e.g. Boboščica (in Southern Albania) and Nestram, Gorno Kalenik, and Popałžani (in Greece)), but not in Daco-Romanian nor in Bulgarian. For Greek and Albanian, the sounds

result from very early, pre-Sprachbund sound changes (e.g. (Ancient Greek) [t^h] > [θ] for Greek, (Proto-Indo-European) *k' > θ (orthographic < th >) for Albanian). Thus, from the point of view of the study of the Balkan Sprachbund, and thus for dialectology more generally, these sounds are interesting really only with regard to Aromanian and Macedonian. Moreover, for them, the local other language makes a difference, in that the dialects of Macedonian and Aromanian that have (relatively recently) come to have *ð/θ* are co-territorial with languages (Albanian and Greek) that have had *ð/θ* for a far longer time. The situations in these languages are taken up in turn, with greater attention, due to the greater availability of material, given to Aromanian.

4.1. The situation with Aromanian is particularly revealing.[2] Different dialects of Aromanian have been in contact with different co-territorial other languages, Greek for Aromanian in Greece, and Macedonian (Slavic more generally) for Aromanian in Slavophone territory. The basic interesting fact here is that the different Aromanian dialects show different outcomes regarding *ð/θ (*and *γ)*, especially in loanwords.

In particular, Aromanian in Greece shows Greek-like fricatives, /θ, ð, γ/, in loanwords from Greek that have been adopted into the language without any alteration of the fricatives (Sandfeld 1930: 103-4; Marioteanu et al. 1977). Some examples are given in (1).[3]

(1) /θ/: θámî 'miracle' (< Gr. *θávma*)

---

[2] These facts are touched on briefly, in a different context, in Joseph 2008, and are discussed in greater detail in Friedman & Joseph (2009: Chap. 5).

[3] There are other adaptations in the words to be sure, but the focus here is on the unadapted, unaltered fricatives. Note that the Aromanian [i] for the Greek [e] is probably not an adaptation but rather reflects that the Greek forms here are in their standard Greek form whereas the local Greek dialect that would have provided input into the Aromanian shows the characteristic northern Greek raising of mid vowels. Thus the local Greek form of *anáθema* is *anáθuma*.

θimél[u] 'foundation' (< Gr. *θemélio*)

θar 'courage' (< Gr. *θáros*)

anáθima 'curse' (< Gr. *anáθema*)

/ð/: ðáscal[u] 'teacher' (< Gr. *ðáskalos*)

aðínat[u] 'powerless' (< Gr. *aðínatos*)

ðíspoti 'bishop' (< Gr. *ðespótis*)

/γ/: aγru 'wild' (< Gr. *aγrios*)

γambró, γrambó 'married' (< Gr. *γambrós*)

A structural explanation for the phonological shape of these loan words has been proposed by Marioţeanu et al. (1977: 47). They note that the occlusives of Aromanian form neat square-like oppositions involving correlations of sonority (voicing) and continuancy, as shown for instance in (2) for the labials and for the dentals (so also for prepalatals and palatals):

(2)

p — f	t — s
| |	| |
b — v	d — z

Moreover, they say, as shown in (3), /θ, ð, γ/ fit into these patterned squares of phonological oppositions perfectly in the dentals and the velars. Thus, in their view, the Aromanian occlusives constituted a system that was "ripe" for adopting loans without nativization (i.e., borrowing without adaptation).

(3)

t — θ	k — h
| |	| |
d — ð	g — γ

This is an interesting viewpoint, to be sure, but I would argue that it is more likely that the adoption of these sounds without nativization was instead socially motivated, and more precisely the result of bilingualism on the part of these Aromanian speakers in Greek, and even more specifically due to speakers' familiarity with Greek. That familiarity was behind their ability to allow Greek sounds into their Aromanian without altering them at all.

In this regard, the comparison with Aromanian in Slavophone territory, as reported in Saramandu (1984: 432) is important. Presumably these dialects had the same internal structural pressures of phonological oppositions that are found in the dialects represented in (1), but they were spoken in an area with a different ambient second language, in particular a Slavic language. Significantly, a different outcome is found for words ultimately of Greek origin with fricatives in the Greek. In particular, the stops /t d g/ occur for the sounds in Greek loanwords that ended up with fricatives in (1), as shown in (4).

(4) **t**imél'^{u} 'foundation' (Grk *θemélio*)

dáscal^{u} 'teacher' (Grk *ðáskalos*)

grámă 'letter' (Grk *γráma*)

These facts, and the differential outcome with Greek loan words, can be explained by reference to the fact that in this region, the second language that Aromanian speakers know and are more familiar with is a Slavic language (Macedonian), where the fricatives in question do not occur. This effect extends also to words with fricatives borrowed from Albanian, as in *dár**d**ă* 'pear', from Albanian *dardhë*. It is of course important to realize that what is partly at issue here too is the proximate source of the loans. Presumably the borrowing of 'teacher' and 'pear' into Aromanian in this region was through the mediation of the local variety of Slavic. Greek and Albanian fricatives would be reflected as stops in Slavic, due to Slavic phonological patterns and

a presumed relative unfamiliarity with Greek at the time of borrowing (e.g., 'window' is ***firídă***, ultimately from Greek *θiríða*, with /d/ for Greek *ð*, but with /f/ for the Greek *θ*, a characteristic of early loans from Greek into Slavic), so this word can be assumed to have entered Aromanian through Slavic. This means that the stops /d/ (etc.) in (4) are just as likely to be a Slavic alteration of Greek fricative as the result of anything Aromanian speakers in the area did. Still, returning to the data in (1), the crucial fact here is that there are Aromanian dialects in contact directly with Greek that adopt Greek loans without phonological nativization.

Thus, the social surrounding for borrowing, and especially the ambient other language, is relevant in outcome of phonological contact effects; in particular, bilingualism breeds familiarity and familiarity breeds receptivity to other-language phonology and to the introduction of foreign elements into a language's phonological system. The foreign sounds in a sense are really not so foreign if the recipient speakers are familiar enough with the donor language. This sense of familiarity has an extension with important consequences for the distribution of these foreign elements in the system. In particular, once-foreign sounds have been extended within Aromanian outside of the loanword context in which they were adopted into the language in the first place. Sandfeld (1930: 104), for instance, reports that southern Aromanian dialects (i.e., those in Greece) have /γ/ for /g/ in words of Slavic origin, e.g. *aγunesku* 'chase' ultimately from Slavic *goniti*; by comparison, Daco-Romanian from the same source has *gonesc*, with /g/. And, Capidan 1940 gives cases of Latinate words in some Aromanian dialects that take on the Greek fricatives, e.g. *ðimtu* 'wind' for the more usual and widespread *vimtu*, from Latin *ventus*. Presumably, familiarity with the other language here makes these originally foreign sounds less foreign-seeming, and more assimilable into a lexicon. The process involved is taken up in the next section.

4.2. The Macedonian adoption of loanwords without alteration is, as noted above, reported for various dialects. In Boboščica, according to Mazon (1936: 46) (see also Afendras 1968: 70, 109, who cites as well Šramek 1934), *ð*/*θ* occur in loan words from Albanian and also from Greek, and there are instances also of extended [ð] in place of [d] even into some words of Slavic origin. The same array of facts is found in the Macedonian of Nestram (Gk. Nestorion) in Greece according to Schmieger (1998:56-58), and both Hill 1991 and Dvořák 1998, describing the Macedonian of Gorno Kalenik and Popəłžani respectively (villages in Greece near the border with Macedonia), mention the occurrence of [ð] and [γ] in these dialects, mostly, but not exclusively, in loans from Greek.[4] Importantly for the approach taken here, Mazon (1936: 46) notes the unadulterated adoption in Boboščica especially among younger speakers, to whom "le dh albanais est familier". Significantly, too, Friedman 2006b has noted that among speakers of Aromanian who do not know Greek or Albanian, especially younger speakers in Macedonia, these fricatives are often replaced by stops. Again, though, familiarity with the donor language is a crucial element, and that can only take place on a highly localized basis.

5. Familiarity (Re)interpreted: Ideology and loan phonology

It is fair to ask whether the Aromanian and Macedonian cases in section 4 are just straightforward instances of speakers being able to incorporate loan words directly into their language if they are sufficiently familiar with the donor language. This certainly seems to be the case, but familiarity can be interpreted as a way of drawing boundaries, fueled by perceptions about where one language leaves off and the other starts, about what is and what can be claimed

[4] Hill 1991:24-25, for instance, cites native words like *graðo* 'the town' (canonically /grad/ 'town' with the postposed definite article).

as "mine" as far as language is concerned, where “mine” is from the recipient speaker’s point of view. Such considerations go beyond the mere feeling of comfort with a particular language that is characterized here as “familiarity”. In particular, notions of “ownership” seem to have something more to them, and that “more” is essentially a type of ideology about language, that is, attitudes and perceptions shaped by those attitudes that have an effect on how speakers react to linguistic material they encounter.

In this way, I follow here Neikirk Schuler 1996 and her Model of Adaptation and Nativization and Variation ("MANAV") in which nativization is seen as an act of the "staking out of linguistic territory" as speakers assess loanwords through the "filter" of a featural assignment of [±NOT MINE]. The process involves the following.

Foreign words start out, almost by definition, as [+NOT MINE], since they come in at the peripheries of a language, inasmuch as they are entering a language from the outside. These words can come to be assimilated to native patterns, thus becoming less "not mine", and more “mine”), that is they may undergo adaptation. However, if the donor language is familiar enough to the borrowers, and the sounds of that language fall sufficiently within the borrowers’ "comfort zone", then even adoption without alteration can be seen as an act of making the borrowed form less "not mine"; in a sense, with sufficient familiarity, the word is essentially [-NOT MINE] (i.e. roughly [+MINE]) almost from the start. That is, familiarity with the other language makes originally foreign sounds less foreign-seeming, but what does the notion of less "foreign-seeming" mean, and what does it rest on? I would like to suggest that it is an ideologically-based drawing of linguistic boundaries in terms of what is or is not a possible element in one's language, an extension of the "comfort zone" with a given sound or set of sounds into a wider range of words.

It is possible to go one step further then and use these notions to explain the process of the extension of such (not-so) foreign sounds from loanwords into native words or loanwords of a different origin. This process can be seen as a type of hyperadaptation (thus somewhat like hypercorrection)[5]. In particular, among speakers within a given speech community there would normally be different degrees of familiarity with a second language. Some speakers would fluctuate between, e.g., native (or nativized) /g/ or foreign /ɣ/ in their pronunciation of a loanword where the source language had /ɣ/, some might have only /g,/ and some might have only /ɣ/. Such an "alternation" between /g/ and /ɣ/ in individual speakers or across sets of speakers could be the basis for the hyperadaptive/hypercorrect extension of the novel sound into words which originally (and "properly" from an etymological standpoint) had /g/.

Viewed in this way, bilingualism again is a contributory force, with the ideological augment of a speaker's degree of comfort with sounds based on familiarity and a willingness to take the sounds in and essentially class them as "mine". Further, one can imagine that the sort of scenario sketched here would only be possible in an area where there were bilinguals (of differing abilities) and where the first appearance of the innovative foreign sounds is in unadapted loan words.

[5] Hyperadaptation, in the sense of Trudgill 1986, is the extension of a pattern or structural element, in a contact situation, beyond what is historically or etymologically justified, based on a perception by speakers of one speech form of what the norms of the other speech form are. See also Joseph 2008 for some discussion pertinent to the Balkans and especially Greek and Greece.

6. One Last Example and Some Concluding Thoughts on Dialectology Borders

At the risk of overkill, I offer one last relevant example, the case of Romani and the absence of phonological convergence it shows even under intense contact. In this case, the facts in question, as described by Friedman 2001, are that in Balkan Romani, the Romani voiceless aspirated consonants (whether deriving from earlier voiceless aspirates, earlier voiced aspirates, or from other developments, e.g. involving clusters) are maintained intact and remain distinctive:

(5) phral 'brother' (earlier Indic *bh-*, cf. Sanskrit *bhrātar-*)

phal 'pale' (earlier Indic *ph-*, cf. Sanskrit *phalaka-*)

khel 'play (earlier Indic *kh-* from *kr-*, cf. Sanskrit *krīḍ-*)

However, all of the surrounding languages in the Balkans lack distinctive aspirates, and Romani has been in sustained and intense contact with these languages. Romani speakers are bilingual in their native Romani and other neighboring co-territorial languages, and the aspirates are unusual in the Balkan context, so one may legitimately ask why Romani speakers have not adjusted their phonology in the direction of the predominant patterns around them.

The answer most likely lies in the social isolation of Romani speakers, inasmuch as they are on the margins of Balkan society. Even though the Rom are bilingual, Romani bilingualism is one-way only—non-Rom do not learn Romani but Rom have to learn other languages. For Romani speakers to keep their Romani phonologically distinct from the other languages establishes distance between it and neighboring languages, and thus is a way for them to maintain the social distance between them and other speakers, demarcating and defining Romani through its distinctive phonology. In a sense, there will never be a sufficiently broad "comfort zone" to allow Romani to assimilate to local Balkan phonology in such a social context. To the extent that drawing borders involves ideology, this situation has an ideological dimension to it.

Moreover, phonology in this case iconically marks this distance—these sounds are marked and marginal within the overall context of Balkan phonology, so they are emblematic of the marked and marginal status of Rom speakers from a societal perspective.

By way of conclusion, let me address the question of what all this has to do with variation and dialectology? I claim that there is a strong connection here. Dialects are involved, as noted at the outset, but more importantly, most of the foregoing is about speakers establishing or removing (thus implicitly always recognizing) boundaries between different forms of speech. We can conceptualize dialectology as being all about recognizing borders, something that is done overtly and explicitly in the dialectological enterprise of the mapping of isoglosses, i.e. the establishing of dialect boundaries. Thus the effects of bilingualism, familiarity, and ideology here are exactly grist for the dialectologist's mill, and all of these occur on a highly localistic basis—we might even say that broad, big-picture dialectology is (at best) for linguists, whereas localistic dialectology is for speakers!

References

Afendras, Evangelos A. 1968. *The Balkans as a Linguistic Area: A Study in Phonological convergence*. Ph.D. Dissertation. John Hopkins University.

Asenova, Petja. 1989. *Balkansko Ezikoznanie. Osnovni Problemi na Balkanskija Ezikov Sŭjuz.* Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Asenova, Petja. 2002. *Balkansko Ezikoznanie. Osnovni Problemi na Balkanskija Ezikov Sŭjuz.* Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo. [2nd edn.]. Sofia: Faber.

Banfi, Emanuele. 1985. *Linguistica balcanica*. Bologna: Zanichelli.

Beci, Behri. 1981. La nasalité vocalique en albanais du Nord. *Studia Albanica* 2.139-69.

Beci, Behri. 1984. Sistemi i zanoreve hundore në të folmen e Shkodrës. *Studime filologjike* 2.45-73.

Bond, Dzintra, Dace Markus & Verna Stockmal. 2004. Sixty years of bilingualism affect the pronunciation of Latvian vowels. Poster presented at LabPhon9: Change in Phonology (Ninth Conference on Laboratory Phonology), University of Illinois (full text and references available at www.oak.cats.ohiou.edu/~bond/LabPhontext3.doc).

Capidan, Th. 1940. Le bilinguisme chez les roumains. *Langue et Littérature*. *Bulletin de la Section Littéraire*, ed. by Th. Capidan et D. Caracostea. Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 73-93.

Demiraj, Shaban. 1994. *Gjuhësi ballkanike*. Skopje: Logos-A.

DuNay, André. 1977. *The Early History of the Rumanian Language*. Lake Bluff, IL: Jupiter.

Dvořák, Bostjan. 1998. *Eine Untersuchung der Mundart von Popəlžani*. *Makedonische Aussiedler aus Griechenland in Deutschland*. M.A. Thesis (Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft), Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.

Feuillet, Jack. 1986. *La linguistique balkanique*. (Cahiers Balkaniques No. 10). Paris: INALCO.

Flege, James E. 2006. Language contact in bilingualism: Phonetic system interactions. *Laboratory Phonology 9*, ed. by Jennifer Cole & José Hualde. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Friedman, Victor. 2001. Romani Multilingualism in its Balkan Context. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 54.146-59.

Friedman, Victor. 2005. Phonological borders in the Balkans. Paper presented at Panel on Nouns, Sounds, and Bounds: The Construction of Linguistic Borders in the Balkans, AAASS Annual Meeting, Salt Lake City (November 5, 2005).

Friedman, Victor. 2006a. Dialect as Flag: Towards a Balkanization of the Sprachbund. Paper presented at 15th Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Studies. Berkeley, March 29-April 1, 2006.

Friedman, Victor. 2006b. The Balkan Languages. *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 1, ed. by Keith Brown, 657-672. Oxford: Elsevier.

Friedman, Victor A. and Brian D. Joseph. (To appear, 2009). *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamp, Eric. P. 1973. Albanian words for 'liver'. *Issues in linguistics; papers in honor of Henry and Renée Kahane*, ed. by Braj B. Kachru et al. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Hamp, Eric P. 1989a. Yugoslavia — A Crossroads of Sprachbünde. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 25.1.44-47.

Hamp, Eric P. 1989b. On signs of health and death. *Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in language contraction and death*, ed. by Nancy C. Dorian, 197-210. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, Peter. 1991. *The dialect of Gorno Kalenik*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1988. Historical implications of a dialectological approach to convergence. *Historical dialectology*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, 283-328. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Joseph, Brian D. 2008. On Some Hyperadaptations in Greek and in Greece. To appear in *MGDLT 3. Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph, and Angela Ralli. Lefkosia: University of Cyprus.

Marioţeanu, Matilda Caragiu, Stefan Giosu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Romulus Todoran. 1977. *Dialectologie Română*. Bucharest: Editura Didactica şi Pedagogică.

Mazon, André. 1936. *Documents, contes et chansons slaves de l'Albanie du Sud. Vol. 1.* Paris: Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Slaves.

Neikirk Schuler, Jill. 1996. *From Adaptation to nativization: A Synchronic Analysis of the Category of Aspect in Borrowed Verbs in Russian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian.* Ohio State University Ph. D. dissertation.

Newton, Brian. 1972. *The generative interpretation of dialect. A study of Modern Greek phonology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petrovici, Emil. 1957. *Kann das Phonemsystem einer Sprache durch fremden Einfluss umgestaltet werden? Zum slavischen Einfluss auf das rumänische Lautsystem.* (= *Janua Linguarum* 3), 's-Gravenhage: Mouton.

Popoviç, I. 1960. *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Rosetti, Alexandru 1964. *Istoria limbii romîne III: Limbile slave meridionale.* Bucharest: Editura Ştinţifică.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Saramandu, Nicolae. 1984. Aromâna. *Tratat de Dialectologie Românească*, ed. by Valeriu Rusu, 423-76. Craiova: Scrisul Românesc (Consiliul Culturii şi Educaţiei Socialiste. Institutul de Cercetări Etnologice şi Dialectologice).

Sawicka, Irena. 1997. *The Balkan Sprachbund in the light of phonetic features.* Warsaw: Energeia.

Schaller, Helmut. 1975. *Die Balkansprachen. Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Schmeiger, Roland. 1998. *Nestramski govor.* Munich: Otto Sagner

Šramek, Emmanuel. 1934. Le parler de Boboščica en Albanie. *Revue des Etudes Slaves* XIV.170-203.

Steinke, Klaus and A. Vraciu. 1999. *Introducere în Lingvistica Balcanică*. Iaşi: Editura universitații "Al. I. Cuza".

Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Tsitsipis, Lukas. 1998. *A Linguistic Anthropology of Praxis and Language Shift: Arvanitika (Albanian) and Greek in Contact*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department of Linguistics

222 Oxley Hall

The Ohio State University

Columbus, Ohio USA 43210