

Opshta i lokalna dijalectologija na Balkanot: Podatoci od slovenskite jazici

[“Broad versus Localistic Dialectology in the Balkans: Evidence from Slavic”]

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University
[joseph.1@osu.edu]

I. Introduction: Dialectology and the Balkans

It is possible to identify two general approaches to dialectology, what we may call **broad** (or **macro-**) **dialectology** and what we may call **localistic** (or **micro-**) **dialectology**. The first looks to the widest possible area in which to place the occurrence of certain linguistic features while the second focuses on the most narrow 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.

The broad approach has been applied to the Balkans by Hock 1988, in what he calls a “dialectological” approach to Balkan convergence. He places several Balkan convergent phenomena within the context of larger typological divisions to be seen in Europe (e.g. auxiliary selection in formation of future with a volitional verb as the basis in some of Germanic (English, that is), analytic comparatives in Romance, etc.) and argues that the Balkan situation can be understood as related to large-scale trends involving these features across all of Europe.

This can be contrasted with the localistic 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.

To a certain extent, the broad approach 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.

My goal today therefore is to show that there is value to the localistic approach and in particular that we gain insight into some convergent aspects of Balkan linguistic structure by focusing on a highly micro-level. My case-studies come from the realm of phonology, with special attention to instances in which South Slavic is involved. Secondly, I take these examples as an opportunity to stress the importance of **familiarity** as a factor in determining outcomes in language contact situations.

II. Some Local Convergences in the Balkans Involving Slavic

Looking at fairly narrowly defined areas within the Balkans reveals many localized convergences, all largely due to bilingualism. Bilingualism can be judged to be a quintessentially local phenomenon, inasmuch as the languages involved in bilingualism typically are co-territorial, occupying virtually the same space, as their speakers live side-by-side.

Hamp (1989b: 203) offers a particularly cogent example of convergences involving the consonants of Geg (northern) Albanian with regard to local Slavic varieties with which Geg speakers have been in contact. In particular, different dialects of Geg show different realizations of various fricatives and affricates, always in the direction of the prevailing Slavic variety of the locale. He details the facts as follows:

Much of Geg (including Gusî) shares a consonantal characteristic with the neighboring Slavic languages. In Northern Geg *k̑* and *g̑* are articulated as affricates in exactly the same fashion as Serbo-Croatian *ć* and *ǰ*' (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 *ǰ*' (orthographic *dž*), and Makedonski has of these pairs only *č* and *dž*; however, Makedonski possesses also *k̑* and *g̑*. Tetovo shows the following interference innovations: **k̑ g̑ > *ć ǰ' > č*

ž and *tj dj > k g, thereby exactly matching Makedonski in distinctive feature structure.

In such a case, local bilingualism is clearly the causal factor; these Geg speakers, as a result of living side-by-side with Slavic speakers for centuries, also know and use the local Slavic idiom, and that knowledge and usage causes spillover – or rather feedback – into their native Albanian, i.e. what may be called “reverse interference” from a second language onto a native language (as shown in various studies by James Flege (nicely summarized and reviewed in Bond, Markus, & Stockmal 2004).

A second case is one involving vowels, as discussed by Sandfeld (1930: 146), Petrovici (1957), and Sawicka (1997) in which word-initial *e* changed to *je* in various languages in the Balkans. This change is widespread across all of Slavic, found even in Old Church Slavonic, and occurring in West South Slavic (Slovene and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian) and dialectally in Bulgarian, though 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. It is also found in Romanian, and generally taken (so Petrovici 1957, Popović 1960: 206, Rosetti 1964: 88, and DuNay 1977: 89) to be a Slavic feature that has entered Romanian, presumably, once again, through localized bilingualism involving Slavic prior to de-jotation in East South Slavic. It is found in loanwords, e.g. *ieftin* 'cheap' (from East South Slavic) but also in indigenous forms, e.g. *el* 'he' (pronounced [jel]). Interestingly, it also occurs in Balkan Turkic (Sawicka 1997: 25, Asenova 2002: 34, citing also Gagauz), e.g.

Rodopi (Balkan) Turkish *jel* 'hand', *jis* 'trace' (elsewhere: *el*, *iz*) and Gagauz *jilik* 'first', *jüç* 'three' (elsewhere: *ilik*, *üç*), where it is said (so Sawicka) to be from Slavic influence, specifically Bulgarian. Again, it can be seen as reverse interference from the secondarily acquired but widely used language (Slavic) into the native language (Romanian, Balkan Turkish, or Gagauz, as the case may be). 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' (standard Greek [ékama]) and [jéxu] 'I have' (standard [éxo]). In the case of Greek, a noncontact account has been offered by Phavis, who invokes the "stronger stress usually claimed for northern dialects". However, Slavic influence seems more plausible (involving importation of Slavic speech habits into Greek, via Greek-Slavic bilingualism) given the geographical restriction of the change within Greek the fact that the north of Greece was once been extensively Slavophone; the fact also that one finds "[wó] for [ó] in [the Greek of] Kozani and other parts of Macedonia" (Newton, idem), further suggests Slavic involvement, since that change is also a well-known Slavic on-gliding development.

III. Balkan ð and θ: Another localized cluster property.

In the time remaining, let me turn now to a more extensive example that shows an interesting difference in outcomes depending on the particular contact language involved. The feature in question here is the occurrence of ð/θ in the Balkans, and it too is another localized cluster property.

Here is a summary of the distribution of these two sounds: they are found in Greek, Albanian, Aromanian, and dialectally in Macedonian (e.g. Boboščica (Southern Albania) and Nestram, Gorno Kalenik, and Popalžani (in Greece)), but not in Daco-Romanian nor in Bulgarian. However, for Greek and Albanian, these sounds result from very early, pre-Sprachbund sound changes, in particular Ancient Greek [t^h] > later [θ] for Greek, and Proto-Indo-European *k' > [θ] (orthographic < th >) for Albanian. This means that as far as the Balkan Sprachbund and thus dialectology are concerned, the distribution of these two sounds is interesting only with regard to Aromanian and Macedonian, but for them, the local other language they are in contact with makes a difference, in that ð/θ occur only in dialects of Macedonian and Aromanian that are co-territorial with languages, specifically Albanian and Greek, with ð/θ.

For instance, Mazon 1936: 46 (see also Afendras 1968: 70, 109, who cites as well Šramek 1934), notes that Boboščica (in southern Albania) has ð/θ in loan words from Albanian and from Greek, and has extended [ð], in place of [d], even into some words of Slavic origin. The same is found in the Macedonian of Nestram in Greece (Gk. Nestorion) according to Šmiger 1998:56-58, and both Hill 1991 and Dvořak 1998, describing the Macedonian of Gorno Kalenik and Popalžani respectively (villages in Greece near the border with Macedonia), mention the occurrence of [ð] and [ɣ] in these dialects, mostly, but not exclusively, in loans from Greek; Hill 1991:24-25, for instance, cites for Gorno Kalenik the native Slavic form *graðo* 'the town', with intervocalic [ð] in place of the etymological [d] found elsewhere in Macedonian and Slavic more generally.

This can be contrasted with the treatment of Greek loans in other varieties of Balkan Slavic, where, for instance, Greek *ḡaskalos* 'teacher' is borrowed as [daskal], with [d], adapting the sounds to more usual Slavic phonological patterns.

The Aromanian facts are similar. Different dialects of Aromanian have been in contact with different co-territorial other languages -- Greek for Aromanian in Greece, Macedonian (Slavic more generally) for Aromanian in Slavophone territory) -- and the basic fact is that the different Aromanian dialects show different outcomes regarding *ḡ/θ* (and *γ*), especially in loanwords.

Aromanian in Greece shows Greek-like fricatives, /θ, ḡ, γ/, in loanwords from Greek (Sandfeld 1930: 103-4; Marioteanu et al. 1977), adopted without alteration:

/θ/: θámî 'miracle' (< Gr. *θάυμα*)

θimél^u 'foundation' (< Gr. *θεμέλιο*)

θar 'courage' (< Gr. *θάρος*)

anaθima 'curse' (< Gr. *ανάθεμα*)

/ḡ/: ḡáscal^u 'teacher' (< Gr. *ḡάσκαλος*)

aḡínat^u 'powerless' (< Gr. *αḡίνατος*)

ḡíspoti 'bishop' (< Gr. *ḡεσπότης*)

/γ/: aγru 'wild' (< Gr. *αγριος*)

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

While a structural explanation for the phonological shape of these loan words has been advanced by Marioteanu et al., 47, evidence from Aromanian in Slavophone territory shows that such an account cannot be maintained. That is, Marioteanu et al. suggest that the occlusives of Aromanian form neat square-like oppositions involving correlations of sonority (voicing) and continuancy, e.g. for the labials and for the dentals (so also for prepalatals and palatals):

p — f	t — s
b — v	d — z

and they maintain that /θ, ð, γ/ fit into these patterned squares of phonological oppositions perfectly in the dentals and the velars. For them, the system was "ripe" for adopting loans without nativization (i.e., borrowing without adaptation):

t — θ	k — h
d — ð	g — γ

However, Aromanian in Slavophone territory, as discussed by Saramandu 1984: 432, presumably has the same internal structural pressures of phonological oppositions as in other dialects, but it is spoken in an area with a different ambient second language, and, importantly, shows a different outcome with loans from Greek. In particular,

stops (/t d g/) occur for the sounds in Greek loanwords that ended up with fricatives in Aromanian spoken in Greece, e.g.:

timél^u ‘foundation’ (Grk *themélio*)

dáscal^u ‘teacher’ (Grk *đáskalos*)

grámà ‘letter’ (Grk *gráma*)

This effect extends also to words with fricatives borrowed from Albanian, as in *dárdà* ‘pear’, from Albanian *dardhë*. While this outcome can be explained by reference to bilingualism (on which see Capidan 1940) on the part of Aromanian speakers with a language, Balkan Slavic, that, unlike Greek, does not have the fricatives in question, there is an alternative account possible here that would treat the stops as pure borrowings, not reverse interference. That is, it might have been the case that the borrowings from Greek and Albanian were first filtered through the medium of Slavic. In such an account, these loans would only ultimately be from Greek and Albanian and their most immediate source would be Slavic; if so, one could argue that they underwent adaptation to Slavic phonological patterns first and in that form were borrowed into Aromanian. Still, a crucial fact here is that there are Aromanian dialects in contact directly with Greek that adopt Greek loans without phonological nativization, and that this represents a different outcome from borrowings found in Aromanian in Slavophone territory.

As with other cases examined so far, these effects suggest the importance of bilingualism and, allowing for reverse interference from a widely known and

dominant second language on the phonology of a speaker's native but somewhat suppressed language, we can make sense of the introduction of these fricatives into Aromanian.

IV. What bilingualism means here

One way of interpreting what bilingualism, with the attendant reverse interference posited in these cases, actually means is that bilingualism crucially affords a degree of familiarity with the other, here the donor, language. That is, bilingualism breeds familiarity and familiarity breeds receptivity to other-language phonology; the foreign sounds in a sense are really not so foreign if the recipient speakers are familiar enough with the donor language. Thus, the social surrounding for borrowing, and especially the ambient other language, can be seen as highly relevant in outcome of phonological contact effects;

That familiarity and the resulting lack of true “foreignness” accorded to the other-language phonology are at work is indicated by the interesting phenomenon that in several instances, the once-foreign sounds are extended within the native language outside of the etymological (inherited or loan) context in which they are first adopted into the language. This is seen in the example from Gorno Kalenik above of *graḏo* ‘the city’, and for Aromanian, Sandfeld (1930: 104) notes that southern Aromanian dialects have /ɣ/ for /g/ in words of Slavic origin, e.g. *ayunesku* ‘chase’ ultimately

from Slavic *goniti* (cf. Daco-Romanian *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, more assimilable into a lexicon, and more able to remain unaltered in the borrowing process.

V. Conclusion

These facts are completely consistent with the localistic approach to dialectology, since, as noted above, bilingualism is a quintessentially local phenomenon; moreover, as the differential introduction of certain fricatives into Macedonian and Aromanian indicates, the ambient co-territorial contact language, i.e. the immediately local other language, matters for the phonological outcome of borrowings.

Additionally, since they involve regional and highly localized dialects, these facts are consistent with the “cluster” approach to the Balkan Sprachbund advocated by Hamp (1989a), an approach that is basically dialectological in nature but in a localistic way, not in the broad form adopted by Hock.

Finally, they provide support for the view of Friedman (2005, 2006; see also Friedman & Joseph (Forthcoming, Chap. 5)) that there is “no Balkan phonology, only Balkan

phonologies” and thus that what one finds in the Balkans are convergent phenomena which can only be discerned by focusing localistically on the dialect level.

REFERENCES

- Afendras, Evangelos A. 1968. *The Balkans as a Linguistic Area: A Study in Phonological convergence*. Ph.D. Dissertation. John Hopkins University.
- Asenova Petja. 2002. *Balkansko Ezikoznanie. Osnovni Problemi na Balkanskija Ezikov Săjuz*. Sofia: Faber [2nd edn.; 1st edn. 1989, Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.]
- 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.
- Dvořák, Bostjan. 1998. Eine Untersuchung der Mundart von Popoľžani. Makedonische Aussiedler aus Griechenland in Deutschland. M.A. Thesis (Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft), Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- DuNay, A. 1977. *The Early History of the Rumanian Language*. Lake Bluff, IL: Jupiter.
- 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. 2006. 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 A. and Brian D. Joseph. Forthcoming. *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2008).
- 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. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.197-210.
- 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.
- Marioteanu, Matilda Caragiu, Stefan Giosu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Romulus Todoran. 1977. *Dialectologie Română*. Bucharest: Editura Didactica si Pedagogică.
- Mazon, André. 1936. *Documents, contes et chansons slaves de l'Albanie du Sud. Vol. I*. Paris: Publications de l'Institut d'Etudes Slaves.
- 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.
- Phavis, V. 1951. O đinamikos tonos tis voriu elinikis ke ta apotelesmata aftu. *Athina* 55.3-18.
- Popović, I. 1960. *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rosetti, Alexandru 1964. *Istoria limbii romîne III: Limbile slave meridionale*. Bucharest: Editura Științifică.
- 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 și Educației Socialiste. Institutul de Cercetări Etnologice și Dialectologice).
- Sawicka, Irena. 1997. *The Balkan Sprachbund in the light of phonetic features*. Warsaw: Energeia.
- Šmiger 1998**
- Šramek, Emmanuel. 1934. Le parler de Boboščica en Albanie. *Revue des Etudes Slaves* XIV.170-203.

Opшта i lokalna dijalectologija na Balkanot: Podatoci od slovenskite jazici

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University
[joseph.1@osu.edu]

I. Introduction: Dialectology and the Balkans

1. Two general approaches to dialectology,

- **broad** (or **macro-**) **dialectology**
- **localistic** (or **micro-**) **dialectology**

2. Broad approach applied to the Balkans (Hock 1988, his “dialectological” approach to Balkan convergence): Balkan convergent phenomena viewed within the context of larger typological divisions of Europe, e.g.:

- auxiliary selection in formation of future with a volitional verb as the basis in some of Germanic (English, that is)
- analytic comparatives in Romance, etc.)

3. Localistic approach applied to Balkans (Hamp 1989a): basis of Balkan convergent features is various intersecting clusters of small and thus highly localized contact zones

II. Some Local Convergences in the Balkans Involving Slavic

4. Basis for convergence: bilingualism (= a quintessentially local phenomenon, since the languages involved in Balkan bilingualism are co-territorial) with “reverse interference” (spillover or feedback from learning and using a dominant second language into one’s first (native) language)

5. Convergence of Geg Albanian consonants to local Slavic varieties (Hamp 1989b: 203):

- Northern Geg *k̑* and *g̑*: articulated as affricates in exactly the same fashion as Serbo-Croatian *ć* and *ǰ* (orthographic *đ* or *dj*);
- Dukagjin in northern Albania: the articulation shifts further to *ś* and *ź*
- Kosovo: merger in Albanian and Serbo-Croatian, with *č* and *ǰ* (orthographic *dž*)
- Tetovo interference innovations: **k̑ g̑ > *ć ǰ > č ǰ* and **tj dj > k̑ g̑*, exactly matching in distinctive feature structure Macedonian, with its : *č* and *dž*, *k̑* and *g̑*.

6. Word-initial *e* changed to *je* in various languages in the Balkans (Sandfeld 1930: 146, Petrovici 1957, and Sawicka 1997):

- widespread across all of Slavic (Old Church Slavonic, Slovene, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, and dialectally in Bulgarian (though no longer present now in most of Bulgarian or Macedonian))

- in Romanian, due to Slavic influence (via bilingualism and reverse interference), in loanwords, e.g. *ieftin* 'cheap' (from East South Slavic) but also in indigenous forms, e.g. *el* 'he' (pronounced [jel]).

- also in Balkan Turkic (Sawicka 1997: 25, Asenova 2002: 34), e.g. Rodopi Turkish *jel* 'hand', *jis* 'trace' (elsewhere: *el*, *iz*), Gagauz *jilik* 'first', *jüç* 'three' (elsewhere: *ilik*, *üç*), due to Bulgarian influence

- even in some northern dialects of Greek (Newton 1972: 29, Phavis 1951), e.g. Chalkidiki [jékama] 'I did' (standard Greek [ékama]), [jéxu] 'I have' (standard [éxo]); also [wó] for [ó] in the Greek of Kozani (Newton, idem), also a well-known Slavic on-gliding development.

III. Balkan ð and θ: Another localized cluster property.

7. Distribution of ð and θ in Balkans:

- found in Greek, Albanian, Aromanian, and dialectally in Macedonian (e.g. Boboscica (Southern Albania) and Nestram, Gorno Kalenik, and Popəlžani (in Greece)), but not in Daco-Romanian nor in Bulgarian.

- for Greek and Albanian, early, pre-Sprachbund sound changes are responsible (Ancient Greek [t^h] > later [θ] for Greek, Proto-Indo-European *k' > [θ] (orthographic < th >) for Albanian.

- thus for the Balkan Sprachbund and dialectology, ð and θ are interesting only in Aromanian and Macedonian

8. δ and θ Macedonian (Sramek 1934, Mazon 1936: 46, Afendras 1968: 70, 109, Hill 1991, Smiger 1998):

- Boboščica (in southern Albania): δ/θ in loan words from Albanian and Greek; some extension of [ð], in place of [d], into words of Slavic origin.
- Nestram (in Greece (Gk. Nestorion)): δ/θ in loan words from Greek
- Gorno Kalenik (Hill 1991) and Popəłžani (Dvořák 1998), villages in Greece near the border with Macedonia: [ð] and [ɣ], mostly in loans from Greek but note Gorno Kalenik native Slavic form *građo* 'the town' (vs. *grad*- elsewhere)

9. δ and θ in Aromanian facts: different Aromanian dialects show different outcomes regarding δ/θ (and γ), especially in loanwords Greek (Sandfeld 1930: 103-4; Marioteanu et al. 1977) – Aromanian in Greece has Greek-like fricatives, / θ , δ , γ /, in loanwords:

/ θ /: $\theta\acute{a}m\acute{i}$ 'miracle' (< Gr. *thávmá*)

$\theta im\acute{e}l^u$ 'foundation' (< Gr. *themélio*)

θar 'courage' (< Gr. *tháros*)

$ana\theta ima$ 'curse' (< Gr. *anáthema*)

/ δ /: $\delta\acute{a}scal^u$ 'teacher' (< Gr. *tháskalos*)

$a\delta\acute{i}nat^u$ 'powerless' (< Gr. *adínatos*)

$\delta\acute{i}spoti$ 'bishop' (< Gr. *thespótis*)

/ γ /: $a\gamma ru$ 'wild' (< Gr. *agrios*)

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

10. A structural explanation for facts of (9) (Marioteanu et al., 1977: 47)

p — f	t — s
b — v	d — z

allows for entry of /θ, ð, γ/ into these patterned squares of phonological oppositions:

t — θ	k — h
d — ð	g — γ

11. Aromanian in Slavophone territory (Saramandu 1984: 432), with same internal structural pressures of phonological oppositions as in other dialects, has a different outcome with loans from Greek -- stops (/t d g/) occur for the sounds that are fricatives in Greek:

timél^u 'foundation' (Grk *themélio*)

dáscal^u 'teacher' (Grk *đáskalos*)

grámà 'letter' (Grk *gráma*)

(and so also with loans from Albanian: *dárdà* ‘pear’, from Albanian *dardhë*).

IV. What bilingualism means here

12. Bilingualism (with attendant reverse interference) = a degree of **familiarity** with the other (here, donor) language. Familiarity breeds receptivity to other-language phonology; the foreign sounds are thus really not so foreign.

13. Familiarity and the resulting lack of true “foreignness” for the other-language phonology account for the extension of once-foreign sounds within the native language outside of their original etymological (inherited or loan):

- Gorno Kalenik Macedonian: *građo* ‘the city’
- Southern Aromanian (Sandfeld 1930: 104): /ɣ/ for /g/ in words of Slavic origin, e.g. *aɣunesku* ‘chase’ (Slavic *goniti*, and cf. Daco-Romanian *gonesc*, with /g/); Latinate words *vimtu* ‘wind’ (Lat. *ventus*) > *đimtu* ‘wind’ (Capidan 1940)

Presumably, familiarity with the other language here makes these originally foreign sounds less foreign-seeming, more assimilable into a lexicon, and more able to remain unaltered in the borrowing process.

V. Conclusion

14. These facts are completely consistent with the localistic approach to dialectology, since bilingualism is a quintessentially local phenomenon, and, as the differential

introduction of certain fricatives into Macedonian and Aromanian indicates, the ambient co-territorial contact language, i.e. the immediately local other language, matters for the phonological outcome of borrowings.

15. Since they involve regional and highly localized dialects, these facts are consistent with Hamp's "cluster" approach to the Balkan Sprachbund

16. Finally, they provide support for the view of Friedman (2005, 2006; see also Friedman & Joseph (Forthcoming, Chap. 5)) that there is "no Balkan phonology, only Balkan phonologies" and thus that what one finds in the Balkans are convergent phenomena which can only be discerned by focusing localistically on the dialect level.

REFERENCES

- Afendras, Evangelos A. 1968. *The Balkans as a Linguistic Area: A Study in Phonological convergence*. Ph.D. Dissertation. John Hopkins University.
- Asenova Petja. 2002. *Balkansko Ezikoznanie. Osnovni Problemi na Balkanskija Ezikov Săjuz*. Sofia: Faber [2nd edn.; 1st edn. 1989, Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.]
- 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.
- Dvořák, Bostjan. 1998. Eine Untersuchung der Mundart von Popoľžani. Makedonische Aussiedler aus Griechenland in Deutschland. M.A. Thesis (Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft), Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- DuNay, A. 1977. *The Early History of the Rumanian Language*. Lake Bluff, IL: Jupiter.
- 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. 2006. 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 A. and Brian D. Joseph. Forthcoming. *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2008).
- 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. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.197-210.
- 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.
- Marioteanu, Matilda Caragiu, Stefan Giosu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxandoiu, Romulus Todoran. 1977. *Dialectologie Română*. Bucharest: Editura Didactica si Pedagogică.

- Mazon, André. 1936. *Documents, contes et chansons slaves de l'Albanie du Sud. Vol. 1.* Paris: Publications de l'Institut d'Études Slaves.
- 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.
- Phavis, V. 1951. O dinamikos tonos tis voriu elinikis ke ta apotelesmata aftu. *Athina* 55.3-18.
- Popović, I. 1960. *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rosetti, Alexandru 1964. *Istoria limbii române III: Limbile slave meridionale.* Bucharest: Editura Științifică.
- 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 și Educației Socialiste. Institutul de Cercetări Etnologice și Dialectologice).
- Sawicka, Irena. 1997. *The Balkan Sprachbund in the light of phonetic features.* Warsaw: Energeia.
- Šmiger 1998**
- Šramek, Emmanuel. 1934. Le parler de Boboščica en Albanie. *Revue des Etudes Slaves* XIV.170-203.