

## Editor's Preface

The book deals in detail with previously understudied *language contact settings* in the Balkans (South Eastern Europe) that present a continuum between ethnic and linguistic separation and symbiosis among groups of people. The studies in this volume achieve several aims: they critically assess the Balkan Sprachbund theory, they analyse general contact theories against the background of new, original, representative field and historical data, they employ and contribute to recent methods of research on linguistic convergence in bilingual societies, they propose new general assessments of extra- and intralinguistic factors of Balkanization over the centuries, and they outline prospects for future research. The factors relevant to contact scenarios and linguistic change in the Balkans are identified and typologized through models such as those related to a *balanced* or *unbalanced* (socio)linguistic situation.

Each new language on the Balkan Peninsula emerges as a result of migration of (a part of) its native speakers and thus is the result of, so it seems, linguistic Balkanization – the inclusion of this language in processes of convergent structural development with its new neighbours. Balkanization as such yields similar results and occurs with apparent regularity among different languages in different periods. This, in turn, raises the question of the general and particular, internal and external, causes of such development, their particular weight, as well as the degree of determinism of language change on the basis of internal and external parameters.

As for external causes, reexamining the *sociolinguistic situations* so well-known to the field and pertinent to the region's past and present history does not allow us to identify particular circumstances that could be termed “responsible” for convergence in Balkan languages. For example, consider the well-known situation of intense sociolinguistic domination that occurs when the language of state and religion is combined with the mass population of its native speakers. This is reflected in the Balkans with the replacement of a subdominant L1 by a socially dominant L2. This is evident in the paleo-Balkan peoples of antiquity and the Middle Ages when populations adopted Greek, Latin and Slavic languages; when in the Middle Ages and the modern period Romance speakers of the Adriatic coast, West Balkans and Bulgaria adopted Slavic languages; when in middle, modern and recent times Slavic speakers of Wallachia, Albania and Greece adopted Romanian, Albanian and Greek. Nevertheless, the materials and structures of these languages reveal that the linguistic results of such language change differ profoundly. In certain cases substrates can leave deep substantial and functional traces up to whole-scale restructuring of the language type (as in, for example, the so-called Balkan Romance and Balkan Slavic language area, especially in the west Macedonian

version of the latter). In other cases these traces are, as such, absent (as in the Tosk dialects of Southern Albania), even with respect to lexical borrowings (as in the Serbo-Croatian Neo-Štokavian dialect). Similarly, in some cases L1 can be preserved against L2 despite high levels of social dominance with large-scale substantial and functional restructuring of L1 at all linguistic levels (as in the Aromanian Farsherot subdialects of Albania), while in other cases evince an absence of significant change (as in the Pindian Aromanian subdialects of Greece). Quite often no more than structurally insignificant linguistic change can follow severe external divisions as wrought by the separation of large ethnic groups (as in the Muslim Slavs of Greece, the Dropull Greeks in Albania, and the Slavs of Eastern Albania). Yet including a small foreign-language-speaking ethnic group in the midst of a larger one can also preserve the first language and not lead to serious structural changes (for example, the “Vlach” dialects of Eastern Serbia). As a result, it is impossible to point directly to a particular set of sociolinguistic circumstances that could either directly cause or significantly contribute to convergence or its absence among Balkan languages. This thus leads to the appearance of speculative models in the discourse of Balkan studies that are not supported by “the world of things”, i.e. by the facts of the language. With these facts in tow, the search in the contemporary Balkan landscape for more rare and, perhaps, even unique situations of language contact is an important task. And should such situations be observed, they confront our discipline with new methodological challenges.

The first part of this volume makes use of new and existing knowledge to examine in linguistic terms the dialects (idioms) of multiethnic, multilingual South Eastern European communities (that is, it provides syntheses and analyses of new experimentally confirmed and existing knowledge). The focus is on the idioms of bi- and multilingual speakers of the following groups in different contact settings:

- **Greek** as L1 or L2 (Tsakonian on the Peloponnese, Greece; Himariotika in South Albania),
- **Albanian** as L1 or L2 (Dibra dialect in Golloborda, Albania; Laberia dialect in Himara, South Albania; Ana e Malit idiom in Montenegro; Prespa idiom in North Macedonia),
- **Romanian** as L1 (Iabalcea idiom in Karashevo, Romania),
- **Aromanian** as L1 (Prespa idiom in the Republic of North Macedonia),
- **Macedonian** as L1 or L2 (Golloborda dialect in Albania; Prespa dialect in North Macedonia),
- **Serbo-Croatian** as L1 or L2 (Krashovani Slavic dialect in Romania; Mrkovići idiom in Montenegro; Croatian Glagolitic data from the Island of Krk, Croatia, representing contacts of Slavic with varieties of Romance since 11th ct.)

The theoretical and methodological approach for this part of the volume is given in the introduction “Contemporary Language Contacts in the Balkans: Situations and Outcomes” by Alexander Yu. Rusakov and conclusion “Balkan Sprachbund Theory as a Research Paradigm” by Andrey N. Sobolev. Each of these presents its own contribution in accordance with the major research interests of the authors. The research framework adopted in this volume is a functional linguistic approach to the major *levels of language structure* that have been taken into consideration. These include phonetics/phonology, grammar, lexicon and text, as well as the verbalization of traditional culture. Questionnaires have been used to collect previously unrecorded data from bilingual informants, data have been extracted from mediaeval written sources; the examples (words, phrases, texts) are presented in the traditional orthography of each of the respective languages along with an IPA transcription when standard orthography is not phonemically contrastive. Glossing is provided.

Research has been focused on neglected aspects of the language situations under investigation. These are:

1. linguistic competences of bilingual informants in L1 and L2;
2. dialectal attribution of bilingual speech;
3. phonetics/phonology of L1 and L2 (including inventories of vowels, consonants, sound clusters, and phonological rules);
4. grammar (including verbal tense, aspect, and modality systems with special attention to perfect tense and pattern borrowings in syntax);
5. the lexica of L1 and L2 (semantic groups such as “Kinship”, “Family”, “Body parts”, “Animal breeding”, “Administration”, “Construction”, “Christian spirituality”, “Moslem spirituality”, “Traditional calendar”, “Mythology”, “Marriage”, among others, as well as anthroponastics and toponastics, among others, are studied in sufficient detail);
6. authentic, transcribed dialect texts in L1 and L2 showing different effects of code switching/mixing, and the like.

This part of the book, produced by authors from the Institute for Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg, presents the findings of two subsequent research projects supported by a grant from the Russian Science Foundation (“From Separation to Symbiosis: languages and cultures of South Eastern Europe in contact”, No. 14-18-01405 and “Balkan bilingualism in dominant and equilibrium contact situations in diatopy, diachrony and diastraty”, No. 19-18-00244). Significant contributions have been made by the doctoral research of Anastasia L. Makarova, Vyacheslav V. Kozak and Daria V. Konior for the partial completion of the *kandidat nauk* degree, the PhD equivalent in the Russian

Federation. In general, it has taken more than a decade to educate a new generation of specialists in Balkan linguistics in Saint Petersburg capable of doing original research in Balkan multilingual communities.

A very important paper by an invited author from Ohio State University, USA, extended the coverage to include **Judezmo**, according to recommendations of the anonymous reviewers. This volume's editor can only regret that the shortage of resources in the current Russian research landscape did not permit him to follow other recommendations and enrich the book in a similar way with articles on Turkish and Romani.

The individual contributions to this volume are as follows. The introductory chapter "Contemporary Language Contacts in the Balkans: Situations and Outcomes" by Alexander Yu. Rusakov gives an overview of the individual cases scrutinized in the volume through the lens of a contemporary theory of contact linguistics. Two main issues are addressed: the microtypology of the (socio)linguistic situations found on the ground and the types of the language changes observed.

The chapter "Separation and Symbiosis between Slavs and Albanians as a Continuum of Linguistic Contact Situations: New Challenges for New Data" by Andrey N. Sobolev deals with the concept of a Sprachbund as an interlinguistic continuum with no barriers, where contact-induced changes need to be distinguished from internal development. General and special issues are addressed, such as linguistic interference, integration and dis-integration in contemporary contact situations of separation and symbiosis. These are observed directly in areas of contact with dominant and non-dominant Albanian-Slavic bilingualism in Albania and Montenegro.

Anastasia L. Makarova's contribution, "Mutual Understanding among Albanians, Slavs and Aromanians in Prespa, North Macedonia: Perfect Tense as a Perfect Tool", compares verbal past tense systems in Macedonian, Albanian and Aromanian varieties of the Prespa lake region. These forms have developed over time in intimate contact within a geographically closed territory. Several types of grammatical parallelism are described and classified, as well as general information on the ethnic and sociolinguistic composition of the region.

The chapter "Balanced Language Contact in Social Context: Velja Gorana in Southern Montenegro" by Maria S. Morozova investigates the sociolinguistic conditions and linguistic outcomes of an Albanian-Slavic language contact situation without dominance existing in a small ethnically mixed village on the border of Montenegro and Albania. The author uses an innovative approach to the description of the present-day situation, considering the individual scenarios of bilingual speech behaviour that co-occur in the community of Velja Gorana and attributing the contact-induced changes observed in both languages to specific classes

of bilingual speakers. From this she goes on to make projections about the contact situation that could have existed in the whole southern Montenegrin area in the past.

The chapter “Symbiosis Suspectus: Palasa in Himara, Albania” by Andrey N. Sobolev presents field data on a less studied Greek dialect of a Greek-Albanian community with non-dominant bilingualism.

In her chapter “Minority within a Minority: Iabalcea and Caraşova in Romania”, Daria V. Konior examines the origins and functioning of terminology related to spiritual culture under the conditions of intimate language contact. The example of bilingualism among the Krashovani demonstrates that a specific social and historical setting established in the Romanian Banat has been favoring symbiotic relationships between Slavic and Romanian communities, languages and cultures.

The chapter “Evidence for Past Coexistence: The Romance Stratum in Croatian Glagolitic Sources from Krk, Croatia” by Vyacheslav V. Kozak reconstructs the Croatian-Romance and Croatian-Latin written language contacts on the island of Krk by summarizing and interpreting examples of Romance and Latin influence on Old Croatian Glagolitic texts from late mediaeval and early modern periods. Despite the political dominance of Venice on Krk, the reconstruction based on the etymological and quantitative analysis of loanwords within different semantic fields and the examination of replicated grammatical structures show no more than an average level of language influence.

The situation described by Maxim L. Kisilier in his chapter “Reconstructing Past Coexistence: Problems and Mysteries in the Multilingual History of Tsakonia, Greece” is rather enigmatic. The Tsakonian dialect is not in contact with any other language or dialect apart from Standard Modern Greek. Some peculiarities of Tsakonian seem to have nothing to do with interaction with other languages and dialects while others cannot be persuasively explained from the point of view of the internal history of the dialect itself and the influence of Standard Modern Greek alone. It is almost impossible to demonstrate from where each feature could have been borrowed, but the contact-oriented approach may help to find at least typological parallels to some mysterious phenomena and thus to explain them.

Brian D. Joseph, in “Convergence and Failure to Converge in Relative Social Isolation: Balkan Judezmo”, examines the factors affecting whether Judezmo shows convergence or not to Balkan structural features and lexicon, ultimately arguing that time, social setting and the dynamics of interaction are responsible for the resulting unique constellation of convergent and nonconvergent features in the language.

Finally, Andrey N. Sobolev elaborates the “Balkan Sprachbund Theory as a Research Paradigm” and argues that substantializing theoretical concepts

through high-quality dialect data from bilingual communities is a better way of exiting the aporia that dominates what is now called areal linguistics than engaging in a discursive deconstruction of terminology. A research paradigm is developed upon the theoretical background that regular correspondences in the function of linguistic units provide the Balkan Sprachbund theory with the best predictive force.

This publication is aimed at specialists in general linguistics, language variation and change, dialectology, bilingualism, multilingualism, language contact, borrowing, Balkan Sprachbund, cultural anthropology, Orthodoxy, Catholicism, Islam, Judaism, language policy, history, political science, minority and subaltern studies, Balkan studies, Croatia, Montenegro, Serbia, North Macedonia, Romania, Greece, Albania and their respective languages. A broader readership interested in issues of language and cultural contact in South Eastern Europe is addressed as well.

The editor wishes to express his gratitude to Walker Trimble for patient editing and proofreading.

Andrey N. Sobolev  
Bad Nauheim, 13 July 2020