

EKREM ČAUŠEVIĆ

“BOSNIAN” TURKISH AND ITS AUTHENTIC FEATURES*

I. INTRODUCTION

According to N. A. Baskakov, modern Gagauz Turkic and the dialects of the Balkan Turks belong to the Uyghur-Bulghar subgroup of the Uyghur Turkic languages, characterised by the Uyghur Lexis and grammar, although they were influenced by the Bulghar and Kipchak languages.¹ However, Turkish population in the Balkans have their roots in the two Uyghur groups. *The first*, much older group includes, in addition to Bulgarian Gagauzes, northern settlers in the Balkans, descendants of the Pecheneg group and the Uz (< Oghuz): a) Macedonian Gagauzes (Southeast Macedonia), b) Surguchi (who call themselves Gagauzes; they live in the area of Adrianople), and c) Gajali (descendants of the Pecheneg, Uz and Turks (area of Deliorman, Bulgaria)). *The other* and much later group comprises of non-heterogeneous groups of Turks who had settled in the Balkans for various reasons, and Bulgarians and Greeks converted into Turks. It includes: a) *Yürüks / Yörüks* (who came from Asia Minor to Macedonia during Sultan Bayazit, 1389-1402); b) *Karamanlis*, mainly converted Turks and non-Islamised Greeks, who came from Asia Minor and live in the Balkans in various areas); c) *Kızılbaşıs*, small groups who live in the area of Gerlovo and Deliorman; d) Tozluk Turks and Gerlovo Turks (ethnically heterogeneous group, originating from Turks and Bulgarians converted into Turks; they live in the region of Gerlovo and Osman-Bazaar, Bulgaria).² The language of the first group of the Balkan Turks shares a number of common characteristics with the Gagauz and the other group with Turkish (Karamanlis and Tozluk Turks) and with Azerbaijani (Yörüks / Yürüks).

II. DIALECTOLOGICAL FEATURES
OF THE TURKISH DIALECTS IN THE BALKANS

Dialectological features of the Turkish dialects in the Balkans were formed in very complex migration circumstances and under a significant influence by a non-Turkish (mainly Slavic) language substrate. Without taking into account

* See: “Bosanski” turski i njegova autentična obilježja. In: POF 41/1991, Sarajevo 1991, pp. 385-394.

¹ N. A. Baskakov: *Vvedenie v izučenie tjurkskih jazykov*. Moskva 1969, 242, 252.

² N. A. Baskakov: *Vvedenie v izučenie tjurkskih jazykov*, 262.

the older Turkish speaking migrants, it should be underlined that they were coming from the Ottoman Empire in various periods and that a dialectological map (i.e. the features of those dialects) was changing according to the size of groups of newcomers. As M. Adamović said, the "Ottoman" dialect, which brought together a series of popular *s* (the term does not include the language of polite letters "which by itself is a favoured dialect"),³ started moving toward the Balkan Peninsula as from 1350 and particularly after the Turks occupied it.⁴ That "Ottoman" dialect was not different from the dialect of the first Turkish citizens of Istanbul. Moreover, some of its features are present in modern dialects of the Balkans and can be found even in the literary works of the 18th century (*seniñ, bulmuş, buldi, babaler, babade*, etc.), although the citizens of Istanbul would pronounce them *senin, bulmuş, buldu, babalar, babada* etc.⁵ Namely, in the period from 15th to 18th century a new dialect was formed in Istanbul and East Trakia. It included the elements of older "Ottoman" and Central Anadolia's dialects of Konya and Ankara, and according to M. Adamović, a modern period began in 1750 which was the last phase of forming "Ottoman dialect".⁶ It was not different from the Istanbul idiom and related dialects.

Although changes happened in the Istanbul idiom (and in East Trakia) as a consequence of mass migrations along with various dialects, the western part of the "Ottoman" dialect continued to exist in the Balkans where it came into contact with a strong non-Turkish substratum. Later, it was strongly influenced by new Turkish dialects of the Turk population, particularly those from Northwest Anadolia.⁷ In emphasising that the oldest citizens of Istanbul spoke the dialect which was not different from the Balkan dialects "with which it was certainly linked genetically", M. Adamović mentions the following features: a) vocal /ü/ instead of vocal /ö/ in the first syllable, for example *ülmek* (< ölmek); b) palatalisation of /i/ into /i/ in contact with consonants /ç/, /ş/ and /y/, for example *siçan* (< siçan), *çalışmak* (< çalışmak), *çayır* (< çayır); c) closed instead of neutral /e/, for example *bēs* (< beş); d) vowels /u/, /ü/, /i/ may be followed only by /i/ and /e/ (in suffixes), for example *babasi, babasine, babasinden, babaye, babaden*, etc., e) perfect forms of *-di* and *-miş*, for example *buldi, bakti, üldi, çikti, yapmış, bulmuş, ülmüş*; f) the words (bases) ending in /i/, for example *kapi, kuzi, yali: kapiye, kapide, kapiler* etc.; g) vocal /i/ within a suffix becomes a short vowel /è/, for example *evēm, gelēr, gelsēr*.⁸

³ M. Adamović: *Razvitak vokalizma kod nekih osmanskih sufiksa*. In: POF XXII-XXIII/1972-73 (1976), 282.

⁴ M. Adamović: *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden 1985, 324.

⁵ M. Adamović: *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*, 331-332.

⁶ M. Adamović: *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*, 331.

⁷ M. Adamović: *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*, 325-327 (including 2 dialectological maps). The author mentions that there was a new wave of migrations in the 17th century from NW Anadolia (Bolu, Zonguldak, Eskişehir, Kastamonu) toward NE Bulgaria and Dobruja.

⁸ M. Adamović: *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*, 321-323. The author mentions in detail the characteristics of those dialects and it is necessary to consult

III. THE SOURCES OF STUDY OF "BOSNIAN" TURKISH

The texts written in Latin are very important for a diachronic study of the Balkan dialects (the scientific literature often refers to the *western Rumelian dialects*). Those texts were already discussed in numerous papers.⁹ Among them is a small number of texts of which it could be said with certainty that they refer to the so-called Bosnian dialect. In that sense, very important are the papers written by Č. Truhelka, D. Korkut, J. Németh¹⁰ and the manuscripts of Bosnian Franciscans, mainly dictionaries and grammar books.¹¹ Since that is a relatively large material, we are particularly interested in one of them: the manuscript from the library of the Hungarian Count N. Illésházy (Turkish glossary with dialogues from 1668) of which, according to A. N. Kononov, J. Németh established that it had been written on the basis of the Bosnian language material, which points to a mutual relatedness between the Turkish language in Hungary and Bosnian Turkish dialect.¹² The author of the manuscript (believed to have been done at the order of Count Illésházy) and the place of its origin are unknown, although it is close, in terms of language, "to the present Turkish dialect of Kosovo, with a strong influence of the Serbo-Croat pronunciation".¹³ After it was published by J. Németh, it arouse a great interest of Turkologists.¹⁴ Recently M. Mollova used the same material and published a study on syntax of the old Turkish in Bosnia.¹⁵

his studies. The following should be consulted as well: A. Caferoğlu: *Die anatolischen und rumelischen Dialekte*. In: *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta* I, 239-261; J. Németh: *Zur Einteilung der türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens*. Sofia 1956; J. Németh: *Die Türken von Vidin*. Budapest 1965. See also remark number 9.

⁹ For details see also G. Hazai: *Kurze Einführung in das Studium der türkischen Sprache*. Budapest 1978, 115-125.

¹⁰ Č. Truhelka: *Jedan zanimljiv zapis, pisan bosanicom*. In: GZM 1906, 34-39; D. Korkut: *Turske ljubavne pjesme u Zborniku Miha Martelinija Dubrovčanina iz 1657. g.* In: POF VIII-IX/1958-59 (1960), 37-62; J. Németh: *Die Türkische Sprache in Ungarn im siebzehnten Jahrhundert*. Budapest 1970. See remark number 14.

¹¹ V. Boškov: *Katalog turskih rukopisa franjevačkih samostana u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo 1988. Although in general terms they represent excerpts from the well-known dictionaries and grammars from the previous times, the texts are important because of the Ottoman words which are almost as a rule written (also) in Latin.

¹² A. N. Kononov: *Očerk istorii izučenija tureckogo jazyka*. Leningrad 1976, 29-30.

¹³ M. Adamović: *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*, 1985, 16.

¹⁴ J. Németh: *Die Türkische Sprache in Ungarn im siebzehnten Jahrhundert*. Budapest. The manuscript consists of four parts: a) Latin-Turkish dictionary; around 650 words; b) Latin-Turkish conversational dictionary; c) Records of various contents in Latin, German and Italian languages; d) *Brevi Rudimenti del parlare Turchesco* (Brief Turkish Grammar in Italian) which also includes a Turkish text with Italian translation.

¹⁵ M. Mollova: *Syntaxe de l'ancien Turc en Bosnie*. In: POF XXXVII/1987 (1988), 9-72.

In addition to the above mentioned, J. Németh included in his "Bosnian-Turkish" texts the manuscripts of Bartolomei Djurdjević (Bartholomaeus Georgievits), a Croat who had spent about a decade in Turkish prison.¹⁶ Stressing that Djurdjević's dialect is represented by other West Rumelian dialects, this Turkologist concludes that the basis of Djurdjević's records is a "Turkish dialect of his homecountry which was also known in Hungary, i.e. a special Ottoman Turkish dialect, Bosnian-Turkish".¹⁷ It would be interesting to mention that H. J. Kissling was sceptical toward some Latin texts primarily Djurdjević's and said that Djurdjević, as a Croat, knew Turkish in its "primitive" form and that his texts were written in a "Barbarian Turkish language (based) on the Serbo-Croat basis".¹⁸ Noticing that it would mean that this and any similar text should be deleted from the list of sources for diachronic study of Turkish dialects, G. Hazai suggests rightfully that the truth is somewhere between and that both sources bring the Balkan space or the West Balkan language area together.¹⁹ It is important to stress that G. Hazai mentions important methodological principles of the study of Latin texts of which we shall quote only few: a) systematic analysis of the texts according to the periods of their writing; b) selection per type (prose is in the forefront); c) establishment of origin of the author (primarily whether the text was written by a non-native speaker and a level of his knowledge of the Turkish language); d) establishment of the milieu in which the writer lived (Turkish or non-Turkish citizens, mono-language or multi-language area); e) establishment of the level of the presence of Turkish component in an authentic form or a degree to which another language (non-Turkish) influenced the text (the writer's language).²⁰ All these elements and particularly those under d) and e) are very important for us, since M. Mollova based her work on a partial comparison of the Bosnian Turkish with the syntax of the modern Turkish language.

IV. DIALECTOLOGICAL FEATURES OF THE "BOSNIAN" TURKISH

In addition to the above phonetic and phono-morphological features of the West Rumelian dialects in the manuscript of Count Illésházy, the following also attract attention²¹: a) velarisation of vowel /ü/ into /u/ (not complete),

¹⁶ J. Németh: *Die Türkische Sprache des Bartholomaeus Georgievits*. In: *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, Tomus 18 (3-4), 1968, 263-271.

¹⁷ "... dass die Grundlage seiner Aufzeichnungen die türkische Mandart seiner Heimat, die auch in Ungarn bekannte, spezielle osmanisch-türkische Mundart, die Bosnisch-türkische war": *Die türkische Sprache des Bartholomaeus Georgievits*, 264.

¹⁸ H. J. Kissling: *Bemerkungen zu einigen Transkriptionstexten*. In: *ZBalk* 6 (1968), 119-127.

¹⁹ G. Hazai: *Kurze Einführung in das Studium...*, 33-34.

²⁰ G. Hazai: *Kurze Einführung in das Studium...*, 34.

²¹ We mention all examples from the said (Illésházy's) text on the basis of the materials collected in the study of M. Mollova *Syntaxe de l'ancien Turc en Bosnie*. This is why the number in brackets indicates the page of her study.

for example *çupek balugi* (13), *dun yarsi* (13), *çarşambah éuni* (13), but *istersünüs* (24); b) velarisation of /ö/ into /o/, for example *dort* (38), *bisden oturi* (42); c) velarisation of /ü/ (< ö) into /u/, for example *açluktan ulurum* (39, 43), *çumlegun* (43); d) transformation of palatal /k/ into /ç/, /g/ into /ç/ and /g/ into /ç/, for example, *kapu dirseçi* (13), *çul rençi*, *cece espabi* (13), *eçer* (34), *çidelum* (38) and *cidelum* (57); e) voicelessness of final /z/ into /s/, for example *haturunus* (43), *çelmes* (41), *kalunus* (28), *yusinden* (43); f) gemination of nasal /n/, for example *banna* (15), *benni* (15), *benum yanumnda* (17); g) deletion of combining geminates, for example *yedi saaten evel* (17), *aldati* (19), *çitimi?* (24); h) present tense forms *çeliur* (27), *bulamayurum* (32), *yalan suyley* (30);²² i) drop of possessive suffix for 3rd person in the so-called second genitive relation, for example *ahçi baş* (12), *saliçun* (12), *yeniçar aga* (12); j) at morpho-syntactic and syntactic levels, frequently made mistakes in the verbal relations and congruention.²³

Other texts which, we could say with certainty, belong to the "Bosnian" dialect (for example, Turkish love poems in the collection works of Miho Martelini), contain the same features. However, the velarisation of vowels /ö/ and /ü/ into /o/ and /u/ was consistent²⁴. The same was with the Latin texts of Bosnian Franciscans from the first half of the 19th century. We find a very strong influence of the "Bosnian" pronunciation in the first printed Grammar of the Turkish language here. It is the grammar *Kavā'id-i Osmanije ili pravila otomanskoga jezika*, the authors of which were Mehmed Fuat and Ahmed Cevdet. It was translated and published in 1870 (?) by J. Dragomanović.²⁵ We shall give only some examples: *duşunmek*, *duşmek*, *duşkun* (pages 129, 146), but: *mühürlemek* (129), *iki üç giunden sonra* (page 217); *dort* (96), but *ja şöjle ja böjle* (170), *çok öksürüjormüsünüz?* (216); *hem jazdi hem okudi* (169) but *džumlesini furçaladym* (210); *jazmiş idugi*, *açik*, *buni biri etmiştér*, *giuzel adam dèr* (142, 146, 173, 169) etc. Devoting the translation to Friar Angel Kraljević, Dragomanović wrote the following: "(...) Your tireless effort toward its (people's, remark by the author) progress and education, made me translate this book and thus satisfy the needs of your and many other priests who strive toward education of the

²² On the development of present on -(i)+yor and its dialectical variants, see an extraordinary study of M. Adamović: *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*, 116-171.

²³ For details see the study of M. Mollova *Syntaxe...*, 15-16.

²⁴ D. Korkut: *Turske ljubavne pjesme ...*, 45-61.

²⁵ *Kavaid-i Osmanije ili pravila otomanskoga jezika*. Written by Mehmed Fuat and Ahmed Cevdet. J(ozip) D(ragomanović) translated from Turkish". The remark by the translator Friar Angel Kraljević ends with a reference to the place and date: In Mostar, 30 July 1870. It is interesting that this grammar appeared some twenty years after the original (Istanbul, 1851) and it was translated into Bulgarian (1864) and German (1855). The transcription in German corresponds to the rules of a Turkish idiom. See: *Grammatik der Osmanischen Sprache-Kavaid-i Osmanijyye. Deutsch bearbeitet*: H. Kellgren. Helsingfors 1855.

youth...".²⁶ It is clear that a considerable interest in the Turkish language existed even before the end of the Ottoman Empire and that the "Bosnian" dialect disappeared definitely somewhere between the 19th and the 20th century, along with the last orators and major social and political changes which took place in Bosnia after the establishment of the Austro-Hungarian rule.

Of course, we are also interested in the extent at which the Bosnian Turkish was influenced by the phonetic and phonological system of the Serbo-Croat language. In writing about the Turkish Vidin dialect, J. Németh stresses that the only authentic influence of the Slavic substrate is the introduction of /c/ (as in the Serbo-Croat word "crn") or the sounds /č/ and /đ/ in the "Bosnian" dialect, while all other phonological characteristics of the Turkish dialects in the Balkans are mainly a reflection of *Anatolian dialects*.²⁷ This goes for the velarisation of the vowel /ö/ and /ü/ (they become /o/ and /u/ respectively) which, according to Németh, do not occur only in the West Rumelian *but also in Northeast Anatolian dialects* which are historically related. The same goes for the features which were listed in detail by M. Adamović. In addition, the velarisation of vowel /e/ and its change into /a/ (for example, *čitma* < *gitme*) occurred in the dialects of Central Anatolia²⁸ and the change of /k'/ into /č/ and /g'/ into /c/ is *typical* of the dialects of Rize and Trabzon wilayets, "*which had numerous similarities with the West Rumelian dialects and may be freely considered as closely related dialect*".²⁹ For example, *čendi* (< *kendi*), *čedi* (< *kedi*), *bečar* (< *bekâr*), *celin* (< *gelin*), *cerdek* (< *gerdek*), etc.³⁰ It is easily noticeable that the Anatolian dialects (including Rize and Trabzon) contain a prothetic (non-etymological) /h/ in front of the words beginning with a vowel and the elimination of etymological /h/ from a middle position, for example *haşlama* (< *aşlama*, Serbo-Croat Turkish word *haşlama*), *hayva* (< *ayva*), *hambar* (< *ambar*), *havlu* (< *avlu*), *tuaf* (< *tuhaf*), *muallebi* (< *muhallebi*), *Memet* (< *Mehmet*, personal name), etc.³¹ It has been established with certainty that in adapting the Serbo-Croat Turkish words, the "Bosnian" Turkish language, as one of the West Rumelian dialects, was a kind of a filter and phonetic changes in the words of Turkish origin cannot be ascribed to an absolute influence of the Serbo-Croat language. In that sense, there is a necessity for a scientific revision of all the conclusions made so far by our Serbo-Croatists who dealt with this issue and who based their researches of A. Škaljić's dictionary of Turkish words. We know that Škaljić did not have pretensions to deal with the language history. As a consequence, the Turkish words in his dictionary are always interpreted from the aspect of the modern Turkish language.

²⁶ *Kavaid-i Osmanije ili pravila otomanskoga jezika*, 3.

²⁷ J. Németh: *Die Türken von Vidin*, 8.

²⁸ Consult: A. Caferoğlu: *Die anatolischen und rumelischen Dialekte*, 245.

²⁹ M. Adamović: *Razvitak vokalizma...*, 291.

³⁰ A. Caferoğlu: *Die anatolischen und rumelischen Dialekte*, 252-253.

³¹ T. Banguoğlu: *Türkçenin Grameri*, İstanbul 1974, 62, 66.

V. AUTHENTIC FEATURES OF THE "BOSNIAN" TURKISH

The West Rumelian dialects underwent the strongest and most typical influences of the non-Turkish substrate at the level of syntax. J. Németh noticed in the dialect of Vidin Turks, for example, the use of interrogative pronoun *ne* as a relative pronoun, the word order in the sentence, typical for the Bulgarian language, the use of imperatives with phase verbs (for example, *başlar ağlasın* "beginning to cry", *kalk*, close to the Serbo-Croat way of expression), for example, 'imam, *ne qızı braqmış-di*', meaning 'imam to whom he gave his daughter' (Bulgarian relative pronoun *što*); *imam alir sepedi, başlar ağlasın maqsım içinde* "imam is taking a basket, a child in it begins to cry".³² The examples show that the word order is influenced by a non-Turkish substrate, i.e. the Bulgarian language. We find many such examples also in the works of S. Kakuk. She did a research into the Turkish speeches of Küstendil and Mihailovgrad, for example *Söylärlar çobana gütürsın onları ävinä*. "They are telling the shepherd to take them to his house".³³ Although N. A. Baskakov and A. N. Baskakov say that the Kipchak languages (Ukraine, including Krim, Moldova) and Uyghur Turkic (Gagauzes and all ethnic groups of the Balkan Turks), although they belong to various groups, are similar to each other because of the direct communication among the peoples and their shared (Slav) substrate,³⁴ it is undeniable that each of them shows its own peculiarities, based on the specific features of the substrates on which those speeches continued to exist. We shall quote some examples from the materials from the published manuscript of Count Illésházy in which the influence of the Slavic (more generally, the influence of the Slav, i.e. Serbo-Croat syntax) and Serbo-Croat substrates is more than evident:

- a) inversion of the predicate at the beginning of a sentence,³⁵ for example:
Vardur sizunile birşey suylema (18) "I have to talk to you", *Nice korkarsün buni suylema?* (24) "Why are you afraid to say that?"; *Ben zanetmemişim buyle çeç olduguna* (38) "I did not think it was so late".
- b) word order identical to that in the Serbo-Croat language (see examples above), for example:
Bu karadur ocak éibi (43) "This is as black as a chimney"; *Üçrenmişim evde yema* (50) "I am used to eating at home"; *Oyledur nezaman Adam ister sefere éitma* (62) "This is how it goes when someone wants to make war"; *Nere istersün éitma?* (24) "Where do you want to go?"

³² J. Németh: *Die Türken von Vidin*, 112-113.

³³ Zs. Kakuk: *Constructions hypotactiques dans le dialecte turc de la Bulgarie Occidentale*. In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae XI* 1960, 251.

³⁴ N. A. Baskakov – A. N. Baskakov: *Sovremennye kypčakskie jazyki*. Nukus 1987, 7.

³⁵ This is an inversion into the so-called neutral word order of the sentence constituents which was obviously the result of the Serbo-Croat syntax. This excludes the inversion caused by expressiveness or modality (exclamatory, commanding, interrogative, etc.).

- COMMENT: *nezaman* “whenever” comes with an indicative as in the Serbo-Croat language, while conditional is obligatory in Turkish. Besides, interrogative adverb *nere* corresponds to the Serbo-Croat *where* (“gdje”, indeclinable); it must be in dative (*nereye*) with the verb *gitmek*.
- c) for all Turkish sentences, dependent elements are typically placed in anteposition to the governing element (i.e. “left-hand stringing”). In the Bosnian Turkish verbal complements are as in the Serbo-Croat language in postposition to the predicate, for example:
- d) verbal suffixes are attached to the verbs, although it is typical for Turkish to add suffixes to the left side, for example:
 Acceptur sizi çorducumuze (33) “It is strange to see you”; Nice korkarsün buni suyleme (24) “Why are you afraid to say that?”
- e) formation of questions by intonation, without an interrogative word *mi* or interrogative pronouns or adverbs, for example:
 Hiç sende haber yoktur? (18) “Do you not have any news?”; Istermisün buçün çismeleri taşerma papuçi? (48) “Will you wear boots and shoes today?”
- REMARK: When an alternative is expressed, an interrogative word must be repeated, for example Evi *mi* satmış, yahut bahçeyi *mi*? “Did he sell a house or a garden?” Taşerma is interesting, as it stands in stead of *giymek*.
- f) Omission of personal suffixes of auxiliary *imek* “to be” in the first and second person (personal pronoun as in the Serbo-Croat language), for example:
 Şindi sen ei hismeçar (28) “You are a good servant now”.
- g) Additions, suffixes and extended verbal adverbs after predicates, without lexical and grammatical indicators of subordination, for example:
 Ciderum bazorčanlara çoha satun alma bennum için (31) “I am going to the trader’s to buy cloth”; Sultanum hasretleri biliur *ugur cumle Adamlara beraber deçildur* (59) “His Highness Sultan knows that not everyone can be lucky”.
- h) Use of interrogative pronouns *nice* (how), *hançisi* (which)³⁶ and adverb *nere* “where” etc., as conjunctions, for example:

³⁶ We find an identical use of an interrogative pronoun *hangi* in the Gagauz Turkic as well. There is another similarity as well: infinitive ending in *-ma* (always velarised form), for example *gitma* (Gag.) and *çitma* (“Bosnian” Turkish). This infinitive or more precisely, a verbal noun, is very productive and is used obviously in place of an infinitive or a supine in the Slav substrate, which is why it is *indeclinable*. Our examples are more than obvious syntactic models of the Serbo-Croat language, for example Bir ei dostun *ziaret etme* çiderum (37): “I am going to visit a good friend of mine”; Munçin deildur oyle behaye *verma* (37) “It is not possible to give (it) for that price”; Ben uçrenmiş deçulim sabah *yema* (442) “I am not used to *eating* in the morning”, etc.

Bir saatür nice seni araurler (62) "One hour has (already) passed *since* they started looking for you"; Ben biliurum bier terzi *hanćisi* dogrilugile işler (28) "I know of one tailor who sews well"; (...) hiç Adam bilmes, *hanćisena* inanur (20) "(...) one does not know *whom* he could trust"; Şindi haturuma ćelmes *nere* anahtari komişim (59) "I cannot remember *where* I left the key"; Oyle oldukta ćideros *nezaman* isterşünüş (24) "If that is so, we shall go *whenever* you want to."

- i) Inversion of the main and dependent clauses under a Serbo-Croat pattern, for example:

Tes ćideros *ećer* isteros vaktuna ćelma (60) "We shall leave soon if we want to arrive on time".

On the basis of these and numerically limited number of examples, it is still possible to conclude that the Serbo-Croat language had a strong influence on the "Bosnian" Turkish, much more on the syntax than on the phonetics and phonology. The question is how it is related to other West Rumelian dialects. First, although it developed on the basis of the West Rumelian dialects, to which it belongs in terms of its genesis, the "Bosnian" dialect is also typical by its use by non-native (bilingual) citizens of Bosnia and Hungary. It served the purpose of oral communication between *ethnically non-Turkish* (probably by the majority of Islamised) population of Bosnia with ethnic Turkish and other non-Slav subjects of the Ottoman empire and in all probability the language of a certain status or prestige. This is why it cannot be equalised with older or still living dialects used by ethnic Turkish population or the converted Turks (Gagauzes, Karamanis, etc.). We can assume for the same reason that the influence of the *mother language*, Serbo-Croat, at the level of syntax was intensive, which is why Kissling's caution and Németh's opinion, no matter how opposing they may seem at surface, must be recognised. However, regardless of the fact that the influence of the substratum on an authentic Turkish component (syntax) was very strong, this dead dialect belongs historically to the West Rumelian dialects and its syntax gives one the right to call it "Bosnian" not only in terms of its geographical but also, we shall dare to say, of its variant and typological features.

"BOSANSKI" TURSKI I NJEGOVA AUTENTIČNA OBILJEŽJA

SAŽETAK

Dijalektološke karakteristike turskih govora Balkana formirale su se tokom vrlo složenih migracionih kretanja i pod znatnim utjecajima neturskog (pretežno slavenskog) jezičkog supstrata. Ti su utjecaji naročito očigledni na nivou sintakse. Pored velikog broja zajedničkih crta koje se, generalno uzevši, mogu identificirati kao "slavenske", neosporno je da svaki od tih dijalekata nosi i zasebnosti koje se baziraju upravo na specifičnostima supstrata na kojima su

nastavili svoju egzistenciju. Analizirajući neke utjecaje srpskohrvatskog jezika na "bosanski" turski, koji su na nivou sintakse očigledni ne samo u poretku rečeničkih konstituenata nego i u konjunkcionalizaciji turskih zamjenica, priloga i priloških izraza (svojevrzni kalkovi sh. veznika!), autor zaključuje sljedeće: a) da je "bosanski" dijalekat osoben po tome što su se njime služili nenativni (bilingvalni) govornici i da je on bio sredstvo usmenog sporazumijevanja etnički neturskog stanovništva Bosne s etnički turskim i drugim neslavenskim podanicima Osmanskog Carstva; b) da je, iz tog razloga, utjecaj maternjeg jezika, tj. srpskohrvatske sintakse, bio intenzivniji; c) da je "bosanski" dijalekat neosporno pripadao zapadnorumelijskim (balkanskim) dijalektima turskog jezika, te da njegovo sintaktičko ustrojstvo daje za pravo da bude nazvan "bosanskim", ne samo u smislu njegovog geografskog nego i varijantno-tipološkog određenja.

"BOSNIAN" TURKISH AND ITS AUTHENTIC FEATURES

SUMMARY

Dialectological characteristics of Turkish dialects in the Balkans were formed during the complicated migration processes and under the strong influences of non-Turkish (mainly Slavic) language substratum. These influences are especially visible in syntax. Apart from the large number of common characteristics which, generally speaking, can be identified as "Slavic", it is indisputable that each one of the dialects has its own characteristics based on the peculiarities of substratums throughout which the dialects continue to exist. Influences of Serbo-Croatian on "Bosnian" Turkish in matters of syntax are visible not only in the sentence word order but also in the process of conjunctionalization of Turkish pronouns, adverbs and adverbial expressions (specific calques (loan translations) of Serbo-Croatian conjunctions). After analysing these influences the author brings the following conclusions: a) Peculiarity of "Bosnian" dialect is that it was used by non-native (bilingual) speakers and that it was used by ethnically non-Turkish population of Bosnia as a mean of oral communication with Turkish and other non-Slavic subjects of Ottoman Empire; b) For that reason the influence of native language, i.e. syntax of Serbo-Croatian language was more intensive; c) "Bosnian" dialect undoubtedly was one of West Rumelian (Balkanian) dialects of Turkish language, and according to its syntactic characteristics it could be called "Bosnian", not only in sense of its geographical determination, but also in sense of its variant-type determination.