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Reviewed by Jouko Lindstedt

The southernmost Slavic dialects, spoken in Albania and Greece, offer interesting material for the study of historical linguistics and language contacts. Most of these dialects are now endangered or moribund and therefore urgently in need of documentation. Field work among Slavic speakers was impossible for a long time both in Albania, which was a closed society, and in Greece, where a policy of aggressive Hellenization prevailed (see, e.g., Karakasidou 1997). Dialect monographs written by Macedonian and Bulgarian dialectologists (both groups regarding this area as theirs) have been based mainly on interviews with refugees from the region who now live in various Slavic countries.

Evangelia Adamou’s synchronic description of the local Slavic dialect of the village of Liti, only 10 km north of Thessaloniki, is exceptional in that it is based on fresh material she started to collect in the village in 2002. She writes that in the 1990s this kind of field work would still have been practically impossible (11). The oldest of her informants was born in the 1910s, the youngest in the 1940s, but only those born in the 1930s or earlier have Slavic as their mother tongue, since the transmission of the dialect has been halted. Adamou makes it clear that this is a dialect bound for extinction. Her description (8–11) of the kind of situations in which Slavic speech can still be heard in this locality is sociolinguistically interesting and could be fruitfully compared with several other endangered languages that have become what I would like to call in-group second languages.

In the Ottoman era (which in this region lasted up to the Balkan Wars of 1912–13), Liti was called Ajvaiti (7); Simovski’s (1997: 4, 209) valuable atlas (not mentioned by Adamou) records the Slavic name Ajvatovo for it. For centuries, Thessaloniki was a truly multinational city, not particularly Greek (Mazower 2004), and the surrounding countryside has been largely Slavic-speaking for more than a millen-
nium. Today, Slavists (outside Bulgaria) usually consider the dialects around Thessaloniki to be part of the Lower Vardar dialect group of the Macedonian language. Adamou prefers simply to call the dialect Nashta ‘ours’ according to the local practice, and she repeatedly points out how it differs from both the Macedonian and Bulgarian standard languages in several respects. This is somewhat beside the point because in every language area it is easy to find dialects that clearly differ from the corresponding standard language. It would have been better to compare the dialect of Lití with other Macedonian (and Bulgarian) dialects.

After an introductory chapter about the sociolinguistic situation of Nashta, there are three major chapters on the phonology, morphology, and syntax of the dialect. At the end there is a folktale transcribed from a male speaker born in 1925 and a vocabulary list based on the Intercontinental Dictionary Series.

Nashta has a typical Lower Vardar system of six accented vowels /i e a o u/ that tend to neutralize into a three-vowel system in unaccented syllables with /e a o/ clearly rising towards /i a u/ and the latter vowels lowering, though to a lesser extent. For unaccented, non-final syllables Adamou (13) posits the three archiphonemes /l a U/, but she does not actually use these symbols in her IPA-based transcription of the dialect material, instead always writing one of the six full vowels. Thus, we find ‘goreme ‘nous brûlons’ (24), fto’deno ‘froid’ (102, etymologically stu-), kalbo’lak ‘foule, monde’ (31). Also, the marking of the schwa next to the former syllabic r is inconsistent: krast ‘croix’ (100), kraf ‘sang’ (93) but on the one hand va’rna ‘il revient, il devient’ (67) and on the other hand ‘tsrkota ‘l’église’ (25, 104; on the latter page glossed as indefinite).

Adamou does not posit a palatal series of consonants but writes a consonant + j in certain words, for example, ‘ljudje ‘hommes, gens’ (fn. on 34; 104), ni’dalja ‘dimanche’ (102; cf. na ni’delje ‘le dimanche’ [74], but u ‘ndelte ‘idem’ [41]). The plural of gu’dina ‘année’ (102) appears as gu’dine (23), but also as gu’djine (29, 30) and gu’djini (lower on 30); the singular too is given with -dj- on pages 29 and 30. Such variation is to be expected as a result of language attrition, but the source of palatality in this particular word is difficult to see. The discussion of the phonological status of /h/ is mistakenly placed in the section on the
phoneme /k/ (19). Under /k/ there is no discussion of its palatal allo-
phone, though under /g/ there is a cross-reference to it.

Apparently under Greek influence, the opposition between the
hissing and hushing sibilants and the corresponding affricates (which
Adamou analyzes as bifonemic) has been weakened in Nashta. The
author does not mention this fact, but examples are easy to collect in
her material: ‘jiskas ‘tu veux’ but da-me-du ‘nefif ‘apporte-moi’ (both on
30), ‘nôfê ‘apporta’ (45), ‘felo ‘village’ (31, 104; definite ‘fêto [48]),
‘flonte ‘soleil’ (31; also ‘flente [91]), ‘fekor ‘beau-père’ (32; also ‘fekor
[92]), fa, a variant of the reflexive clitic sa (36), sa ufranò ‘ti ‘avoir honte’
(36), ‘fetam ‘je m’assois’ (40, 41), fto’deno ‘froid’ (102), ‘fetam ‘sept’,
ojam ‘huit’, ‘defat ‘dix’ (all on 101), fto ‘cent’ (22), ‘setse ‘tranche’ (77),
‘fêi ‘descendre’ (79; if this is < *solêzetv), zì’vaxa ‘ils vivaint’ (38), mas
‘mari’ (31, 68; but definite ‘mazet [36], i.e., -z-), ‘zema ‘terre, sol’ (i.e.,
zêma [91]). I find it difficult to believe that in all these cases the
unetymological sibilant or affricate—sometimes hissing, sometimes
hushing—would have been lexicalized as the sole form in Nashta; I
assume that the (younger) speakers may simply be uncertain of which
phoneme to use and Adamou’s material reflects this free variation.

There seem to be no examples of decomposed nasal vowels in this
dialect apart from gle ‘ndalo ‘miroir, glace’ (97). This may be a borrow-
ing from some neighboring dialect: the corresponding verb is ‘gledam
‘regarder’ in Nashta (102), but decomposed nasality has been observed
farther to the northeast of Thessaloniki, as attested in Malecki’s (1934,
1936) classical studies—to which Adamou does not refer, though she
does mention the first of Golab’s (1960/61, 1962/63) two studies based
on Malecki’s material.

Nashta has entirely lost the Slavic l-participle and the old perfect
tense (49–51). The explanation given by Adamou is probably correct:
the new resultative form composed of the auxiliary ‘jima ‘to have’ and
the past participle passive of the main verb took over the perfect / an-
terior function and the old Slavic perfect became a “médiatif,” that is,
an indirect evidential (as has happened in some Macedonian dialects,
see Graves 2000 and Lindstedt 2000) and was subsequently lost, lack-
ing support in the Greek verb system.

According to Adamou (52), Nashta differs from Standard Macedonian
in using the imperfective aspect also in the past tense. This must
be due to a misunderstanding. She refers to “Friedman 1999,” which is
missing in her bibliography, but Friedman (1993) would be the best reference. What Macedonian has lost is the imperfective aorist, but the imperfective imperfect is just as frequent a past form in Standard Macedonian as it is in Nashta, though Adamou (58) mistakenly identifies Nashta’s past tense as a continuation of the old aorist only. The paradigms she gives on pp. 59ff. suggest that the opposition between the old aorist and imperfect has been lost through merger, the perfective verbs now only taking the aorist endings and the imperfective verbs only take the imperfect endings in their past tense (as in Sorbian); cf. the third person singular past forms of the verb ‘acheter’: ku’puvafe (imperfective) and ku’pi (perfective). In the second person singular of the perfective past (old aorist) there is an interesting innovation ku’pij, distinguished from the perfective present (ki) ‘kupi’ by the place of the accent. Accent is also amply used in Nashta to distinguish the two aspects, even in borrowed verbs, as in these first person plural past forms: *isixa’saxme* (perfective), *isi’asaxme* (imperfective) ‘calmer’ (54).

The most common locative prepositions in the dialect are *u* and *na*, which are often used interchangeably, cf. *ki’pojam* na *solun ~ ki’pojam u *solun* ‘j’irai à Salonique’ (42). I do not agree with the author’s interpretation of the history of *u*. She writes (41): “On peut donc considérer l’emploi régulier de *u* et l’absence de *v* en nashta comme un trait archaïque, que l’on retrouve aussi en vieux bulgare” (41). But what has really happened in my view is that *u* and *v* (which was, of course, a preposition much used in “Old Bulgarian”) have merged so that Nashta’s *u* is the continuation of both. In the two important Gospel manuscripts from the Lower Vardar dialect area, the Konikovo Gospel (end of 18th / beginning of 19th c., see Lindstedt, Spasov, and Nuoruoto 2008) and the Kulakia Gospel (from 1863, see Mazon and Vaillant 1938), the reflex of the old *v* appears as *uf*, occasionally *u*. Mazon and Vaillant (1938: 182–83), whose monograph is mentioned in Adamou’s bibliography (under Vaillant [109]), actually note the variation between *uf* and *na* in the Kulakia Gospel and also explain the historical merger of *u* and *v*.

The proclitic dative and accusative pronouns that reduplicate indirect and direct objects, respectively, are analyzed by the author as personal prefixes, on a par with personal endings that indicate the person and number of the subject (34, 46, 63–64). This is a refreshingly novel approach. If the ending *-m* shows that the subject is first person singu-
lar, why couldn’t we indeed say with Adamou that the prefix me-
shows that the object is first person singular, given the obligatoriness
of this element in Nashta and many other Macedonian dialects (see her
table on p. 46)? But I assume it would then no longer be correct to call
this phenomenon _redoublement de l’objet_, as the author does on page 77,
because we do not call -m subject reduplication. The correct term
would rather be verb agreement with the object and subject. Still more
mistaken in my view is it to say that 72 percent of the transitive utter-
ances in the material are of the type OVS (70), as this only means that
utterances of the type _ki-g(u)-u’biam ‘I’ll kill him’, with the object pro-
noun _gu_ before the verb and the personal ending -(a)m after it, are
common. This is misleading since the word order typology which is
associated with the schemes like OVS, SVO, and others, universally
pertains to the order of major sentence constituents, not of clitics and
affixes.

To sum up, this is an important and valuable piece of field linguis-
tics that documents an interesting disappearing dialect. The author is
strong in descriptive linguistics but less so in Slavic studies. Her main
source on Macedonian dialect divisions (6) is half a page in Friedman’s
short grammar (2002: 8), written for entirely other purposes. Vidoes-
ski’s dialectology (1998–99) and his easily accessible shorter dialect
survey (Vidoeski 1983), for instance, are missing. It remains for other
researchers to place Nashta into its proper dialectological and histori-
cal context.
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