In: The Palgrave Handbook of Slavic Languages, Identities and Borders, ed. by Tomasz Kamusella, Motoki Nomachi, and Catherine Gibson, 263-275. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan (2015).

Phonology and The Construction of Borders in the Balkans

Brian D. Joseph

The Ohio State University

Introduction

There are plenty of natural borders and boundaries in the world. Islands and peninsulas, for instance, are naturally bordered, and thus bounded, by the water surrounding them, and valleys by the hills and mountains that help to define them, while rivers create natural breaks in the landscape that require traversing, and so on. But there are just as many borders and boundaries that do not respect the physicality of geography and are instead constructed out of other "material". In many cases throughout the world, this is true of the political borders that separate nations or subparts thereof, such as the states within the United States or the counties within each of those states; that is, such borders have often been drawn based on considerations having to do with the historical expansion of a given group of people or with the effects of colonialization or the like.

Another way of constituting borders, though not necessarily ones that have any official or physical status is by social factors that define various groups, for by delineating one group, these factors at the same time separate that group off from others and thus create a social border. Among the particularly prominent factors of this sort that recur in region after region around the world are religion and ethnicity, as these social parameters unite people in groups but also therefore set them off from other groups. Since these groups thus separated can co-exist in the same general area, so that they are

in a very real sense co-territorial, occupying (more or less) the same physical space, the borders created by social factors need not respect any aspect of geography [any? Borders tend to be created where people live permanently or near such settlements. The ice cover of Antarctica and open seas do constitute, thus far, insurmountable geographical obstacles to social border creation]. In that way, such socially determined borders are incorporated into larger social, political, and geographic entities.

Language differences represent another way in which borders are created within a society, in that the point at which one language leaves off and another one starts represents a border that can divide and separate people and thus needs to be crossed. This holds as much for different dialects of a language as for distinct languages. One crosses a particular linguistic border by paying dues[1] of a certain sort, in the form of learning the other language or dialect so as to enable communication and bridge the divide. Crucially, such linguistic "borders" need not be physical borders; rather they can be created simply by a glance at a newspaper that you cannot read, via an encounter with a stranger on a bus with whom you cannot communicate, or even through the realization that a new next-door neighbor speaks in different ways from you, that is, a different language or dialect from your own.

Nonetheless, there can be, and perhaps often is, some relationship between geographically determined borders and linguistic borders. The heart of traditional dialectology focuses on geography, after all, with mountains creating dialect divisions, probably through the limiting of interaction among different speakers, and with rivers

[1] A visa fee, as it were.

uniting groups, probably through facilitated interaction. Moreover, there can also be a relationship between political borders and linguistic borders. Auer 2005, for instance, in studying the relationship of German as spoken in Germany with that spoken in The Netherlands found that being on one side or the other of the political border correlated with some abrupt differences in linguistic usage, even though historically the area represented more of a gradual dialect continuum. The political border created a situation where speakers on either side of the border oriented themselves more towards their political capital as their "center of gravity" than their traditional dialectal base, leading German speakers in Germany to move in the direction of standard German in their usage, and speakers across the border to move more away from the local dialect, e.g. incorporating (Standard) Dutch loan words into their local German.

Thus, despite the fact that linguistic borders can have some relation to geography and political delineations, they need not. This fact means that the study of linguistic borders in an area cannot just work with national (state) languages, following a simplistic equation of language to nation-state or of dialect to geographic region, but must take a more nuanced approach based on the examination of dialects and languages in intersecting and overlapping spaces.

The Balkans

The Balkan peninsula of southeastern Europe is no stranger to borders, physical, geographic, political, and linguistic. There are obvious linguistic borders in the Balkans,

where there are some twenty distinct modern languages[2] that have each been spoken in the region for centuries. The following *languages of* (or *in*) *the Balkans*, as a purely geographically based designation, can be recognized (accompanied by some explanatory notes where deemed useful):

(1) Languages of/in the Balkans

Albanian

Armenian (spoken in Bulgaria)

Bulgarian

Circassian (Adygey variety; spoken in Kosovo area of [former] Yugoslavia)

German (spoken in Romania)

Greek (including the very divergent dialects like Tsakonian and Pontic [the latter only in Balkans proper via relatively recent migrations])

Hungarian (spoken in Romania)

Italian (spoken in Istria area of [former)]Yugoslavia)

Judezmo (also known as Ladino or Judeo-Espagnol)

Macedonian (NB: the South Slavic language, not connected with Ancient Macedonian)

Romanian (see (2) below for a fuller picture)

[2] Counting the number of languages is made difficult by the situation with the former Serbo-Croatian and with the Romanian complex of speech communities.

Romani (the Indic language spoken by the Roma people ['Gypsies'])

Ruthenian (also known as Rusyn, spoken in Vojvodina area of [former] Yugoslavia [sometimes considered a dialect of Ukrainian])

'Serbo-Croatian' (now better referred to as 'BCS,' for Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian [with Montengrin possibly to be added to the mix])

Slovak (in a small enclave in Vojvodina area of [former] Yugoslavia)

Slovenian

Turkish

Despite the differences historically at all levels of grammar among these languages, even those that are part of the same language family,[3] a subset of these languages have come to converge in terms of their structure and their vocabulary; these may be referred to as *Balkan languages*, and the zone of convergence that they constitute can be referred to as the *Balkan Sprachbund*. It should be noted that involvement in the Sprachbund is not an all or nothing sort of thing; rather, the degree of involvement, as measured by the extent to which one sees convergence along various features, can vary considerably. These Balkan languages include the following, with additional notes as needed and with the less-involved languages and dialects marked in *italics*:

(2) Balkan languages

[3] Note especially that the Indo-European languages fall into five distinct branches of the family: Albanian, Greek, Indic, Italic (specifically Romance), and Slavic.

Albanian (major dialects: Geg [North] and Tosk [South])

Bulgarian

Greek (most dialects, including Tsakonian [but excluding Asia Minor and Southern Italy dialects])

Judezmo (mostly at the phonological [and to some extent lexical] level; see Friedman and Joseph 2014)

Macedonian

Romanian (actually more specifically Aromanian [also known as Vlach], and Megleno-Romanian, less so *Daco-Romanian* and even less so *Istro-Romanian*)

Romani

BCS (really only via the southeastern Serbian ['Torlak'] dialects as most relevant; much less so *Croatian*, *Bosnian*, etc.)

Turkish (not a 'full' structural participant but crucial nonetheless, especially lexically)

The most-involved languages can be grouped as Balkan Albanian (taking in Geg and Tosk), Balkan Hellenic (taking in the relevant dialects of Greek), Balkan Indic (taking in relevant Romani dialects), Balkan Romance (taking in Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, and in a more limited way, Daco-Romanian), and Balkan Slavic (taking in Bulgarian and Macedonian, and Torlak Serbian).[4] The features upon which the Balkan

[4] The designation "Balkan X" also emphasizes that with the convergence, these varieties show divergence typically from related dialects and languages outside of the Balkans. Balkan Turkish can also be

languages converge range over all aspects of grammar -- especially phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics -- as well as pragmatics and lexicon. Such convergent features are often referred to as "Balkanisms"; in (3), a typical list of such convergences is given, though it must be borne in mind that for each feature listed, there is a great deal of simplification of complicated patterns of realization across dialects within the languages in question:

(3) Some 'Balkanisms'

a. a *reduction in the nominal case system*, especially a falling together of genitive and dative cases

b. the *formation of a future tense* based on a reduced, often invariant, form of the verb 'want'

c. the use of an *enclitic (postposed) definite article*, typically occurring after the first word in the noun phrase

d. *analytic comparative* adjective formations

e. *marking of personal direct objects* with a preposition

f. *double determination in deixis*, that is a demonstrative adjective co-occurring with a definite article and a noun (thus, "this-the-man")

g. *possessive use of dative enclitic* pronouns

---

recognized, since the dialects of Turkish in the Balkans converge on some features with other Balkan languages, and diverge from non-Balkan Turkish.

h. the use of verbal forms to distinguish actions on the basis of *real or presumed information-source* ('*evidentiality*'), commonly referred to as marking a witnessed/reported distinction but also including nuances of surprise (admirative) and doubt (dubitative)

i. the *reduction in use of a nonfinite verbal complement* ("infinitive") and its replacement by fully finite complement clauses

j. the *pleonastic use of weak object pronouns* together with full noun phrase direct or indirect objects ("object doubling")

k. the *formation of the "teen" numerals* as DIGIT-'on'-TEN

l. various *common discourse markers*, e.g. for the adversative/contrastive connective 'but, however' and for an unceremonious term of direct address

m. various *phraseological calques*, with the same basic semantics but constructed out of language-particular material.

While it might seem that such convergent developments mean that linguistic borders are breaking down or at least are porous, it can be argued that quite the opposite is the case. These convergences actually cut across and thus defy most of the commonly defined linguistic borders in the Balkans, as delineated in part by genetic (or genealogical)[5] criteria, so that there are cross-cutting and partially overlapping groupings of languages and dialects according to particular features. For instance, the Romanian

[5] This is 'genetic' in its etymological sense of 'having to do with origins' (Greek *genetikós*); some linguists prefer the term 'genealogical' in this sense.

complex of languages and some Macedonian dialects show feature (3e), Greek and some of Albanian and Macedonian show feature (3f), Turkish, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, and some dialects of Aromanian show feature (3h), Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian, and all of Romanian show feature (3c), all of the languages show feature (3d), and so on. In fact, it makes sense to think of the larger Balkan Sprachbund as a cluster of smaller, more localized mini-Sprachbünde (as in Hamp 1989), and therefore to view the convergences as taking place in a highly localistic way. These localized patterns of convergence are shaped in large part by social interactions among speakers, so that the linguistic "borders" that they represent are socially driven. Moreover, there are ideological factors involved in the shaping of these borders, much as Auer 2005 has discussed with respect to national borders, national identities, and language, and as Preston 2005 has discussed with respect to certain sound changes in present-day English.

Accordingly, this investigation focuses on the construction of linguistic borders in Balkans, drawing largely on material already discussed in more detail in Friedman and Joseph (2014) and in a more limited way, Joseph (2009, 2011). To that end, both the notion of localized convergences and the way in which they define borders are highlighted, as is the role ideology plays in the border-construction process.

Local Phonological Convergence in the Balkans – Some Examples

Looking at regional dialects of the various Balkan languages and the ways in which they interact with other languages in the Balkans reveals many localized convergences. It must be pointed out first that while it is common to talk in terms of interaction and

contact between dialects and languages, what is really happening is interaction and contact among speakers of different dialects and languages. These interactions therefore set up a context in which language use and features found in particular speakers' realizations of their language can serve to unite different groups of speakers along a given structural parameter, while at the same time setting off a group of speakers from another. For the most part, these developments are a result of bilingualism, which is, after all, a quintessentially local phenomenon since the languages involved in bilingualism typically are co-territorial, occupying virtually the same space, as speakers live side-by-side. In some instances, the bilingualism can lead to a phenomenon called 'reverse interference' (Friedman and Joseph 2014), where a second language used extensively by speakers comes to have an effect on those speakers' command of their native (first) language. Whatever the mechanism for the convergence, the result in any case is a localized secondarily induced[6] similarity between two languages that brings them together and thereby establishes a border between them and other varieties of the same languages.

For instance, the Arvanitika dialects of Albanian, that is the dialects spoken in Greece for some 600 years, show prenasalized voiced stops for pure voiced stops found in Albanian dialects elsewhere. Sasse (1991: 61-62) states that voiced stops 'tendieren … zur Pränasalierung,' and this tendency has been noted also by Hamp (1989: 201). This nasal prop for voiced stops is exactly what one finds in Greek, in that many speakers have no pure voiced stops but rather only voiced stops accompanied by some nasality.

[6] 'Secondarily' in terms of similarity that might be expected – or not – due to the languages' genetic/genealogical relationship.

Since Arvanitika speakers are generally fluent also in Greek and use Greek on a regular basis, this prenasalization effect is most likely the result of Greek phonological habits 'bleeding' into their use of their native Arvanitika. This interpretation is bolstered by the fact that in these same Arvanitika dialects, *younger* speakers of Arvanitika are moving in the direction of denasalizing Nasal + Stop clusters, of the sort found in Albanian dialects elsewhere, yielding pure voiced stops, exactly the same development as in Greek speakers in the same age-group (Sasse 1991, Tsitsipis 1998: 25n. 3).

The same can be said with regard to the realization of affricates in Arvanitika, but also in Romani. That is, Greek has no palatal affricates in general but rather has only dental affricates. Interestingly, as described by Sasse (1991: 58-59), Greek-type dental affricates (*ts*/*dz*) are found among many speakers of Arvanitika in place of common Albanian palatal affricates (*tʃ*/*dʒ*). Similarly, Igla (1996: 190) reports that Greek-type dental affricates are found in the speech of many speakers of Romani in Greece in the dialect of Ayia Varvara, in place of common Romani palatal affricates (*tʃ*/*dʒ*).

Another case like this involves the loss of a contrast between *rr* (a vibrant voiced apical trill) and *r* (a voiced apical flap) in various Albanian and Romani dialects under conditions of contact, and thus bilingualism. That is, as described by Gjinari (1989: 185), in almost all urban Tosk Albanian dialects (for example, Berat, Korçë, Dibër), the Common Albanian long trilled *rr*, still found in some dialects, is lacking. This development can be attributed to Turkish influence, since Turkish, with no *r*/*rr* distinction, was the language of the towns in the region for several centuries and thus was used to a great extent by Albanians in those towns. Such is also the case among younger

Arvanitika speakers in Greece, in that the trill *rr* is absent and this absence is attributable to their bilingualism with Greek, a language that does not have this sound either (Sasse 1991: 57-58, Tsitsipis 1998). And, in the (Geg) Albanian of parts of Kosovo and in Debar (Elezović 1950: 65) an absence of *rr* has been noted, a development that correlates with the absence of this sound in Turkish and Serbian, the two key other languages historically in the region. Finally, Boretzky and Igla (2004) note that the original distinction of two types of rhotic in Romani is lost in the dialects of Macedonia, Greece, Kosovo, and Turkey, where the co-territorial languages have no such distinction, but preserved in dialects in Albania, where distinction is maintained for some speakers.

In each of these cases, bilingualism is at work, leading to reverse interference, given that these speakers, for the most part, are also secondarily fluent speakers of the language – in these cases, Greek, Turkish, or Serbian – that comes to impinge on their native language. Thus, for instance, with regard to nasals and voiced stops in Greece, these bilingualism-related effects serve to unite Greek with Arvanitika, in a sense altering the boundaries between the two languages on the basis of prenasalization and denasalization, while at the same time giving a further basis for dividing Arvanitika from other dialects of Albanian. Similar interpretations can be made for the other cases listed above. In each case, convergence affects linguistic borders.

The Role of Ideology

The effects of convergence on linguistic borders need to be viewed through a prism which speakers themselves seem to use, namely ideology. The role of ideology is

especially evident in some facts about the emergence of certain fricatives in various languages of the Balkans. Though discussed in some detail in Joseph (2009, 2011), they bear repeating here, owing to the importance they show of recognizing this factor.

The key facts here are that the occurrence of certain fricatives in the phonemic inventory of a language in the Balkans seems to be a feature that has been affected by language contact. There are some languages, or more accurately, some dialects of some languages, that have certain gaps as far as their inventory of fricatives is concerned when compared with other dialects and other languages. For the most part, Balkan Slavic, with the exception of some Macedonian dialects, and Balkan Romance, with the exception of much, but not all, of Aromanian, lack /ð/ and /θ/, whereas these sounds are found throughout all of Albanian and Greek. Similarly, all of the languages except for Greek and some dialects of Albanian and some dialects of Aromanian lack /ɣ/. Thus the presence or absence of /θ ð ɣ/ is a feature along which Balkan languages show convergence and divergence.

The various qualifications put on the distribution of these sounds within particular languages or language groups are necessary because of some localized convergences involving /θ ð ɣ/. In particular, the Aromanian of Greece has /θ ð ɣ/ in loan words from Greek with these sounds; for this dialect, therefore, the loans are unassimilated, i.e. unaltered and unadapted, in terms of their phonology (Sandfeld 1930: 103-4, Marioţeanu et al. 1977); examples include the following:

/θ/: **θ**iimél^{u} 'foundation' (< Gr. *θemélio*)

/ð/: **ð**áscal^{u} 'teacher' (< Gr. *ðáskalos*)

/γ/: a**γ**ru 'wild' (< Gr. *aγrios*)

Interestingly, by contrast, the Aromanian of Macedonia has /t d g/ for Greek /θ ð γ/, as shown by the outcomes in that dialect of the borrowing of the very same words (Saramandu 1984: 432):

timəl'^{u} 'foundation' (Grk *θemélio*)

dáscal^{u} 'teacher' (Grk *ðáskalos*)

grámă 'letter' (Grk *γráma*)

A caution here is that the words with /t d g/ may well have entered Aromanian via Slavic as the proximate source of the borrowings, since /t d g/ are the way in which Slavic has typically dealt with Greek fricatives. Still, the key aspect to these facts is that in Greek-speaking territory, Aromanian shows unadapted sounds, whereas in Slavic-speaking territory, such is not the case.

Similar facts are found in the Macedonian dialect of Boboščica, in southern Albania, as described by Sramek (1934), Mazon (1936: 46), and Afendras (1968: 70, 109). Macedonian is a language that for the most part, that is, in most dialects, shows stop outcomes for Albanian and Greek loan words with coronal fricatives in the source languages; however, in the Boboščica variety, where Macedonian speakers are

surrounded by Albanian speakers and are themselves users of Albanian, the sounds /ð/ and /θ/ occur in loan words from Albanian and also from Greek. Moreover, /ð/ has been extended, in place of [d], even into some words of Slavic origin. The same holds for the Macedonian of three villages in Greece near the border with Macedonia: Nestram (Nestorion, in Greek), as described by Schmieger (1998:56-58), Gorno Kalenik, as described by Hill (1991), and Popəłžani, as described by Dvorák (1998). In the Macedonian of these villages, /ð/ and /ɣ/ occur, mostly in loans from Greek, but not exclusively so; native Slavic *graðo* 'the town', for instance, shows intervocalic /ð/ for etymologically expected /d/ (cf. Bulgarian *grad*).

Finally, as Sandfeld (1930: 103-4) notes, although Albanian in general has fricatives *ð/θ* in all dialects, the voiced velar fricative /ɣ/ is more restricted, occurring primarily in Arvanitika and not elsewhere in Tosk Albanian. Greek, with its /ɣ/, presumably has something to do with this, and in fact loans from Greek, unaltered and incorporated as such without nativization, are the main source of Arvanitika /ɣ/, for instance, *aɣapis* 'love', from the Greek perfective stem *aɣapis-*.

In each of these cases, one has to wonder what it is that allows speakers of those particular dialects to adopt foreign words without any adaptation of the words to their phonological patterns, that is, without any nativization. Why were Aromanian, Arvanitika, and Macedonian speakers of Greece able to incorporate Greek loan words into their language while still maintaining Greek phonology? And why were Macedonian speakers of Albania able to do likewise with Albanian loans? In Joseph (2009, 2011) and Friedman and Joseph (2014: Chap. 5), it is suggested that what makes these Albanian,

Aromanian, and Macedonian facts as they are is familiarity and close contact, as argued for by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 88-91) regarding Russian loanwords into Siberian Eskimo;[7] Greek is familiar to these non-Greek speakers, just as Albanian is a known quantity to Macedonian speakers in Boboščica, Albania. In fact, Greek is a language that the Aromanian and Macedonian speakers in Greece generally know well and use, and the same holds with regard to Albanian for the speakers in Albania. Thus, the coterritorial second language that the speakers know matters; in this way, Greek sounds, for instance, are not so alien to the Aromanians, Arvanites, and Macedonians in Greece, and thus such speakers have a degree of 'comfort' with these sounds. Therefore, the social surrounding for borrowing, and especially the ambient other language, is relevant in outcome of phonological contact effects; as Joseph (2009: 129) puts it, 'bilingualism breeds familiarity and familiarity breeds receptivity to other-language phonology.'

Moreover, the spread of sounds within a dialect, with once-foreign sounds extended outside of the loanword context through which they first entered the language into native words (as with *graðo* above) shows just how familiar speakers were with the other language; familiarity here allowed speakers to view these foreign sounds as somehow less foreign, and that in turn made the sounds more assimilable into their lexicon.

Familiarity bears an important relation to the issue of borders. Language borders involve speaker perceptions of where their language ends and another language begins,

[7] Knowledge of Russian allowed loans in the 20th century to be adopted with Russian phonology, whereas in the 19th century, under circumstances of a lack of familiarity with Russian, loans were subject to nativization.

and familiarity can serve to extend that sense that speakers can have about what is theirs and how far 'their' language goes. There is an ideological dimension to this, as what is 'mine' – or alternatively, what is not 'not mine' – is not something that is objectively measurable; it is determined by speakers themselves, operating subjectively.[8] In that way, ideology can guide a subjective assessment. To the extent then that adoption of loan words without phonological nativization reflects a loosening or extension of linguistic borders, it can be seen as really an ideologically driven process, mediated by a speaker's degree of comfort with the other language, and not as a process driven purely by the structural constraints of the phonological system.

Conclusion

In the opening section above, I emphasize the role of borders in human existence, so it is fair to ask how the material discussed in the other sections has to do with borders. My answer is that the developments presented here are localized dialect developments that occurred under conditions of contact between speakers of different languages and dialects; in each case, speakers establish or remove borders between different forms of speech they encounter, and by so doing, they also implicitly recognize existing borders as they alter them. Borders are thus relevant to conceptualizing the dialectology of language contact in the Balkans, and, presumably, other contact situations.

[8] As discussed in Joseph (2009) and Friedman and Joseph (2014: Chap. 5), I follow here Neikirk Schuler 1996 with her 'Model of Adaptation and Nativisation and Variation' ('MANAV') and its focus on speakers assigning a feature [+NOT MINE] to loanwords and gradually gaining comfort with the words so that they become [-NOT MINE], roughly equivalent to [+MINE].

REFERENCES

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

Auer, Peter. 2005. The construction of linguistic borders and the linguistic construction of borders. *Dialects across borders*, ed. by Markku Filpulla, Juhani Klemola, Marjatta Palander and Esa Penttilä, 3-30. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Boberg, Charles. 2000. Geolinguistic diffusion and the U.S.-Canada border. *Language Variation and Change* 12.1-24.

Boretzky, Norbert and Birgit Igla. 2004. *Komentierter Dialektatlas des Romani*, 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

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

Elezović , G. 1950. *Glasovne osobine arbanaškog dijalekta Dibra i njegove okoline*. Belgrade: SAN.

Friedman, Victor A. and Brian D. Joseph. To appear (2014). *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gjinari, Jorgji. 1989. *Dialektet e gjuhës shqipe*. Tirana: Akademia e Shkencave a RPS të Shqipërisë.

Hamp, Eric P. 1989. Yugoslavia — A Crossroads of Sprachbünde. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 25,1.44-47.

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

Igla, Birgit. 1996. *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara – Deskriptive und historisch vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerdialekts*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Joseph, Brian D. 2009. Broad vs. localistic dialectology, standard vs. dialect: The case of the Balkans and the drawing of linguistic boundaries. *Language Variation – European perspectives II. Selected papers from the 4th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 4), Nicosia, June 2007*, ed. by Stavroula Tsiplakou, Marilena Karyolemou and Pavlos Pavlou, 119-134. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Joseph, Brian D. 2011. On some hyperadaptations in Greek and in Greece. *Studies in Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, Pavlos Pavlou, Angela Ralli, and Spyros Armosti, 27-35. Nicosia: Research Centre of Kykkos Monastery.

Marioteanu, Matilda Caragiu, Ştefan Giosu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxàndoiu, Romulus Todoran, 1977. *Dialectologie Română*. Bucharest: Editura Didactică 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*. Ph. D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Preston, Dennis. 2005. Dialects across internal frontiers: Some cognitive boundaries. *Dialects across borders*, ed. by Markku Filpulla, Juhani Klemola, Marjatta Palander and Esa Penttilä, 121-155. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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).

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1991. *Arvanitika. Die albanischen Sprachreste in Griechenland. Teil 1*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

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

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

Thomason, Sarah & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

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