Europe, Eurasia, Southeast Europe, and Southeast Asia: on the Question of Areal Linguistics in the 21st Century

Victor A. FRIEDMAN*

Key-words: *Trubetzkoy, Sprachbund, language contact, Eurasia, Southeast Europe, Southeast Asia, typology*

Although Trubetzkoy introduced the term *jazykovoj sojuz* 'language league/union' in Russian in 1923, it was his 1928 formulation in German that brought the concept of *Sprachbund* to Europe's attention, and Trubetzkoy's example of the Balkans is cited *de rigeur* in any general work on language contact. In historiographic terms, the situation resembles that of Sandfeld's 1926 Danish work *Balkanfilologien*, which became a classic in its 1930 French translation as *Linguistique balkanique*. Interestingly enough, it appears that the term *Balkanism* (French *Balkanisme*) has its origins in Seliščev's 1925 programmatic article, itself eclipsed by the translation of Sandfeld's book. As I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 2011), Trubetzkoy's original concept of the linguistic league was intended as a methodological, heuristic, conceptual, and theoretical understanding of the results of language contact as phenomena equally principled as those that had already been identified for the so-called "genetic" or *Stammbaum* model. This stood in vigorous contrast to the previous century's unrealistic, and even racist, insistence on "purity" as a linguistic ideal, a view according to which all language change was corruption and contact-induced language change was the worst, most defiling corruption. It was this latter view that underlies Schleicher's (1850:143) characterization of what he called "das Walachische in der romanischen, das Bulgarische in der slawischen und das Albanesische in der griechischen Familie" as "die verdorbensten ihrer Familie" (the most corrupt in their families). In the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, in anthropological linguistics (or linguistic anthropology), even the fundamental difference of changes arising via transmission ("genetic linguistics") versus diffusion ("areal linguistics") has been questioned, since both necessarily take place at the level of the individual with innovators, early adopters, late adopters, and laggards as the characterizations of the groups of individuals who adopt a change that eventually comes to characterize an aspect of a "language" (cf., e.g. Enfield 2005). For our purposes here, however, I wish to focus on the question of the so-called definition of a linguistic area − now the preferred term in English − as it relates to the Balkan *Sprachbund*. In so doing, I wish to

* University of Chicago.

„Philologica Jassyensia", An VIII, Nr. 1 (15), 2012, p. 113−124

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

examine anxieties and ideologies surrounding borders, boundaries, members, and membership, as well as the definition of "European". In order to do this, it is useful to look beyond the Balkans and even Europe, to other linguistic areas.

Only three years after Trubetzkoy published his German-language definition of the Sprachbund, Jakobson proposed expanding the definition in his articles "Über die phonologischen Sprachbünde" (1931a) and "Kharakteristike evrazijskogo jazykovogo sojuza" (1931b). He concentrated on consonantal timbre (basically palatalization including some correlations with front/back vowel harmony), prosody (presence vs. absence of pitch accent or tone), and, in a footnote to the second article, nominal declension. He sets up Eurasia as the center in terms of all these. For nominal declension, Germano-Romance Europe and South and Southeast Asia are the peripheries; in terms of phonological tone, the Baltic and Pacific areas are the peripheries (with West South Slavic [most of Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian] as a relic island); for palatalization the core is roughly the boundaries of the Russian Empire, with the inclusion of eastern Bulgaria[1]. Jakobson even goes so far as to suggest that palatalization in Great Russian [*sic*] finds its most complete expression, and it is thus no coincidence that Great Russian is the basis of the Russian literary language, i.e. the language with a pan-Eurasian cultural mission (1931b: 191).

The use of a single phonological feature as diagnostic for a linguistic area seems to be justified in the case of South Asia as investigated in Masica (1976, 2001). Masica maps out a number of morphological and syntactic features that are said to be characteristic of South Asia. In the end, he identifies six features whose overlapping isoglosses define a region that I have called the Indo-Altaic hourglass (Friedman 2000 after Masica 1976:181), i.e. South Asia and Central Asia (and Japan and Korea). These features are the following:

1. second causatives (i.e. to make s.o. make s.o. do something)
2. adjective-noun order
3. past gerunds
4. explicator-compound verbs
5. dative-subject constructions
6. OV word order

In order to distinguish South Asia from Central Asia, it is necessary to invoke the areal feature of phonological retroflexion in apicals, which is characteristic of the three unrelated families of South Asia: Indo-European, Dravidian, and Austro-Asiatic (Munda)[2].

Masica's methodology, however, misses two crucial and valid facts of Trubetzkoy's original concept of the *Sprachbund*, one is that of so-called *Kulturwörter* and the other that the *Sprachbund* is an historical and not a typological concept. For the first, the use of Sanskrit in South Asia unifies the region in a way that more or less excludes Central Asia, although, as we shall see in our discussion of Mainland Southeast Asia, Enfield's (2005) concept of Indosphere (in opposition to that of Sinosphere) has overlapping connotations that are not unlike the

[1] Recall here Russian aspiration to a *Zadunajskaja gubernija* 'Transdanubian province' in the nineteenth century (and even the twentieth).

[2] At the peripheries, Sino-Tibetan, Burushaski, and Austro-Tai are also represented. See Masica 2003 for additional commentary.

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

"crossroads of Sprachbünde" that Eric Hamp identified for what is now former Yugoslavia at the AIESEE Congress in Belgrade in 1984 (Hamp 1989). For the second, Masica has failed to keep the distinction between typological and areal linguistics, a distinction on which Hamp (1977) insisted. At that time, Hamp was responding to Joel Scherzer's (1976) conflation of the North American Northwest Coast Sprachbund with the rest of Native North America, in a fashion similar to the conflation of the Balkans and Europe today, albeit with different political implications. In the case of North America, the project of unity (at the expense of the languages of the earlier inhabitants) had already been achieved.

In the case of "Europe" (or, more precisely, the EU), the political project is still *in statu nascendi*. And it may yet be stillborn if my recent experiences and the May 2012 elections in Greece are any indication of the future. On 2 June 2009 I was assaulted in Athens by neo-Nazi thugs from the political party *Hrisi Avgi* 'Golden Dawn' while speaking about the first Modern Greek-Macedonian dictionary to be published in Greece, and the thugs were subsequently accompanied to the nearest metro by the police. On September 16, 2011 Greek border guards, i.e. employees of the Greek government acting on orders, attempted to prevent me from entering Greece in order to speak about the Modern-Macedonian Greek companion volume. As of this writing, that same party – of a type that would be illegal in EU Germany – has 21 seats in Greece's national parliament.

Just as any version of "Eurolinguistics" will require mutual respect among representatives of the languages of "Europe", so, too, areal linguistics requires more than the simple mapping of synchronic linguistic types such as that performed by Masica for South Asia. The individual diachronic developments in the Balkans, such as those for the infinitive mapped in Joseph (1983) or for the future mapped in Asenova (2002), are exemplary. Nonetheless, for languages for which historical records are shallow or lacking, recourse to typology is frequently the only choice. For Europe, however, we have considerable records. I shall return to this subject below.

For Southeast Asia, we can distinguish two areas: Mainland Southeast Asia (MSEA) and Insular Southeast Asia (ISEA). The description of MSEA given here is based largely on Enfield (2005). MSEA covers former Indo-China (Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos) plus Thailand and parts of Burma and China. There are five co-territorial language families: 1) Mon-Khmer (Austro-Asiatic), 2) Tai-Kadai, 3) Hmong-Mien, 4) Sino-Tibetan, and 5) Austronesian (represented by Chamic in Cambodia and Vietnam as well as Malay in Thailand). Mon-Khmer languages are spoken throughout MSEA. Tai languages constitute a spread zone (low structural diversity, shallow time depth, socially dominant), and Kadai a residual zone (high structural diversity, greater time depth, no clear center of innovation). Hmong-Mien languages are spoken by minority communities originally located in China and with more recent migration into Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam. Branches of Sino-Tibetan in MSEA include Loloish languages – spoken in the Burmese highlands, northern Laos and Thailand, and southwestern China – and Sinitic, which is the group of languages often referred to collectively as Chinese. Tai speakers came in search of suitable land on which to work paddy fields. They encountered Mon-Khmer and Sino-Tibetan-speaking communities who either retreated to higher land or became Tai both linguistically and culturally. The result of the Tai migrations is a spread

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

zone covering large areas of MSEA, with residual zones in the highlands where languages of other families are spoken.

Cross-cutting the upland/lowland (subordinate/dominant, minority/majority) divide is a second major sociocultural distinction of political, cultural, and religious influence from India and China, respectively, which Enfield (2005) labels an Indosphere and a Sinosphere. The Indosphere covers Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Burma as well as much of ISEA, while the Sinosphere affects Vietnam, northern Laos, SW China and most urban centers in MSEA as well as much of urban ISEA. For our purposes here, ISEA consists of Malaysia, Indonesia (except Irian Jaya but with East Timor), and the Philippines[3]. With the exception the Austro-Asiatic (Mon-Khmer) languages in the highlands of Malaysia, all the languages of the region are Malayo-Polynesian, but in socio-linguistic and socio-cultural terms, the region is affected not only by the Indosphere/Sinosphere divide, but also by a variety of processes of ethnonationalism, polycentrism, and a competition between Islam and Christianity that brings to mind Southeastern Europe, a subject to which I shall return.

Phonology plays an important role in characterizing MSEA. Vowel phoneme systems are large, often with nine simple vowels, usually including a high non-front unrounded vowel and a range of complex vowel combinations (diphthongs or /VV/ sequences). Phonotactics include serious constraints on permissible final segments. The languages tend toward monosyllabic "words"; many (mostly Mon-Khmer) languages have an initial unstressed "minor syllable" in which vocalic distinctions are neutralized. Lexical contrasts are made not only by segmental distinctions but also by distinctions in pitch contour (tone) and/or phonation type (register) (Henderson 1965). Going further north to Hmong-Mien, Kadai, and southern Sinitic varieties, vowel and final syllable contrasts decrease, whereas distinctions in initial consonants and lexical tone increase. If a given MSEA language does not use tone for lexical contrast, it will employ some other phonation distinction, such as a voice register or a complex vowel system that results historically from a register system (Matisoff 2001, Thurgood 1999).

MSEA languages are the closest to Sapir's (1921) isolating and analytic type. In such languages the number of morphemes per word approaches one. No language purely embodies this ideal, not even Sinitic, which Sapir said "does not combine concepts into single words at all" (Sapir 1921: 128). We now know that Sapir's claim was an overstatement (Kratochvil 1968, Packard 2000), but no MSEA language has morphological marking for argument structure such as declension or agreement. Moreover, although such functions are often attributed to word order, in fact word order has considerable variability. The typical MSEA language combines noun phrase ellipsis (of definite arguments) with noun phrase movement (out of the clause, e.g. for topicalization), resulting in considerable ambiguity. The information required for resolving grammatical relations is normally available from verb semantics, topic continuity, and pragmatic expectation, demonstrating the redundancy of what Enfield (2005:188) has called the "often baroque morphology in other types

[3] Although a few Austronesian languages are spoken along the coast of New Guinea, and the western half of the island belongs politically to Indonesia, the island is more or less linguistically and culturally an isolate, distinct from ISEA, recent contact with Indonesia notwithstanding.

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

of languages." MSEA languages lack inflectional categories like tense, number, and gender. Aspectual and modal distinctions such as irrealis and imperfectivity are marked using particles and co-verbs in complex verbal phrases. A result of this isolating/ analytic type of morphosyntax is that items such as nouns and verbs perform grammatical functions associated with closed classes such as adpositions (Enfield 2005). Certain items have multiple functions, e.g., as verbs in verb contexts (e.g., "acquire," "finish," "exceed," "strike," "give," and "take") and as grammatical markers in other contexts (e.g., in aspectual, comparative, and valence changing constructions, cf. Central Asian Turkic).

In some cases, lexical borrowing from Mon-Khmer has brought nonproductive morphology into languages of other MSEA families, e.g. in Siamese there are pairs of words like *chan* "to eat (of monks)" and *canghan* "to ritually offer food to monks," or *truat* "inspect" and *tamruat* "police officer," where the complex forms were borrowed from Khmer with the *-aN* infix (Enfield 2005:188). This infix, however, is not synchronically productive in either language. Morphology of this kind has been eliminated from Vietnamese in a process of de-Mon-Khmer-ization. Another example of a morphological pattern in MSEA is a productive associative expression in Lao, usually formed from a noun by reduplication with regular vowel mutation in the repeated syllable. For example, the high back vowel in *patuu* 'door' is reproduced as a front vowel at same height, giving *patuu patii* 'doors and stuff like that (window frames, shutters)'. A highly productive system of such patterns is found in Vietnamese (Thompson 1987 [1965]), despite its relative lack of morphology. Other MSEA languages use tone for similar types of morphological derivation. The productivity and internal complexity of the elaborative morpholexicon in MSEA languages counters the claim that these languages lack morphology. As Enfield (2005:189) writes: "One just has to know where to look."

Reduplication is especially relevant in comparing SEE and SEA. Consider in this regard reduplicative formations in *m-* (Turkish *mülheme*) found in many languages of the Balkans and the Caucasus (as well as Basque; Grannes 1996), Turkish initial syllable reduplication of the type *kara* 'black', *kapkara* 'pitch black' (Muller 2004; cf. also Serbo-Croatian *go-golest* 'stark naked' and similar forms in Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Romanian cited by Ivić 1984), etc. The status of reduplication as an areal feature in the Balkans has been the subject of considerable speculation since Seliščev (1925) and Sandfeld (1926/1930). To be sure, reduplicative phenomena occur in many parts of the world. At the same time, however, the specific types of reduplication do appear to spread areally, and Southeast Asia and Southeast Europe both appear to be such regions.

As indicated above, nouns in MSEA languages are not inflected, and there is widespread ellipsis of definite arguments. Pronoun systems often encode distinctions of politeness comparable with European T/V systems, but with more distinctions made in first and third-person reference as well as second (Cooke 1968). This feature extends well beyond MSEA, with its most complex realization being Javanese (Errington 1988), and its northernmost extension being Japanese. MSEA languages also make extensive use of numeral classifier systems. The existence of numeral classifiers is typologically related to the less hierarchical and more appositional structure of noun phrases in these languages (Gil 1987). MSEA

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

languages also feature topic-comment organization, a mode of structuring sentences that is an alternative to the subject prominence familiar from European languages (Li & Thompson 1976). Like complex pronominal systems, topic prominence goes well beyond MSEA, occurring throughout East Asia and beyond.

Another feature of sentential organization in MSEA is the use of sentence-final particles as a basic mode of distinguishing illocutionary force at the utterance level. Enfield (2005:190) cites the example of Lao *man2 kin3 nam4* '3sg drink water' which can be modified by a variety of particles, e.g. *man2 kin3 nam4 bòò3* 'Will he drink water?'; *man2 kin3 nam4 vaa3* 'Oh, he'll drink water, will he?'; *man2 kin3 nam4 dêj2* 'He'll drink water, you know'; *man2 kin3 nam4 dee4* 'He'll drink water, y' hear!' As a contact phenomenon, such particles are also important in ISEA codeswitching, as seen in Errington's (1998:98) observations on *Bahasa gadho-gadho* 'salad language', a term used by Javanese speakers to describe a kind of code-mixing of Javanese and Indonesian[4]. We can also note here *La Macédoine*, which in French means both Macedonia and a salad of mixed fruit precisely owing to Macedonia's ethnolinguistic complexity. Errington (1998:116) writes of *Bahasa gadho-gadho* that "the leakage of discourse particles mutes the felt difference between Javanese and Indonesian syncretism without shift. Their lexical, non-referential, and so unglossable meanings – conative and expressive – are intrinsically and existentially bound to a sense of 'we-ness', which they modulate". This focus on discourse particles has relevance for the Balkan languages in general, and Turkish in particular, since shared discourse particles, especially those of Turkish origin (although Greek and other languages also figure into the complexity) attest to precisely the kind of conversational interaction – since discourse particles, owing to their very nature, only spread via ordinary conversation – that gave rise to the Balkan *Sprachbund* (see, e.g. Hauge 2002, Matras 2000)[5]. We shall return to this point below.

For those familiar with both Southeast Europe and Greater Europe, there are clear parallels in many of the types of shared features found in MSEA, although the details are quite distinct. A vital difference, however, is that while MSEA involves five language families in multi-millennial contact, most of Europe involves only one of similar time depth, namely Indo-European. To be sure, Basque, Uralic, and Altaic languages do add to Greater Europe's complexity – and with current migration patterns, the complexity has increased enormously, but many of MSEA's clearly diffusional features can be treated as inherited in Greater Europe unless they cross language family boundaries, which, in fact, they do, e.g. in the West Rumelian dialects of Turkish, whose clause structure is Indo-European precisely in the Balkans (Friedman 2003).

Missing from Enfield's account is any discussion of *Kulturwörter*. Presumably these are divided between the Indosphere and the Sinoshpere, but it is precisely in this respect that ISEA has an opposition that not only mirrors that of Southeast Europe but even has lexical commonalities, namely the Islamosphere and

[4] *Gadho-gadho* is a Javanese salad of lightly fried mixed vegetables.

[5] At the same time, as Fielder (2008a, 20008b) observes, usages can vary and etymologies can become laden with modern nation-state ideologies.

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

the Chritianosphere (itself dividable in SE Europe into Romanosphere and Byzantinosphere, which, however, with Protestantism becomes a putative Eurosphere). In a sense Southeast Europe and ISEA represent the two tips of an Islamic crescent in Eurasia: the Balkans at the northwest and Malaysia and Indonesia and parts of the Philippines at the southeast, and this fact helps bring out linguistic and other comparisons not usually made.

Beg's (1979) sample of words of Arabic origin shared by Turkish, Swahili, and Malay is illustrative of the impact of Arabic on the Balkans via Turkish, e.g. Turkish/Malay *haber/kabar* 'news', *saat* 'hour', *sabah/suboh* 'morning', *kitap/kitab* 'book', *hesap/hisap~b* 'account', *dükkân/dukan* 'shop', *inshallah/insyAllah*, etc. All of these words can be found in the various dictionaries of Balkan Turkisms. The issue of routes of transmission is also complex, insofar as Arabisms entered Malay not only directly but also via Persianisms in Indic. The vocabulary of Arabic origin that entered the Balkan languages via Turkish, however, was accompanied by the conversion of significant numbers of speakers of all the Balkan languages to Islam, and, moreover, the vocabulary was shared by their Christian neighbors.

Since the dissolution of the second Yugoslavia, the standardization of Bosnian out of the former Serbo-Croatian by Bosniac language planners has involved, among other things, a major revival of Turkisms, especially those of Arabo-Persian origin. The result then is to bring the most Muslim-identified of the Slavic languages in the Balkans lexically closer to Malaysia at the other end of Eurasia. The parallel does not stop there, however. Just as Malay can serve the language of Islamic identity and instruction in Southeast Asia outside the *Bahasa* region – [the Bahasa ('language' from Sanskrit) region refers to those polities where one or more of the official languages is based on Riau or Riau-Johor Malay] – e.g. in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and the Philippines, so, too, Bosnian is being promoted as the Muslim language of choice even in communities where the local dialects are closer to Standard Macedonian than to any of the Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian-Montenegrin (BCSM) standards. In the Goran villages of Kosovo, whose dialects were recognized as part of Macedonian in the 1980s, schools now teach standard Bosnian. In Albanian Gora, only Albanian is taught in the schools. In Greece, Turkish competes with Greek and Pomak. Among Slavic-speaking Muslims in Macedonia and Kosovo, Albanian competes with Turkish as well as Macedonian and Bosnian. We can also note, on a cultural level, that the so-called stricter forms of Islam are stamping out local Muslim customs in both the Balkans and in Malaysia, in much the way that Saudi (or Wahabi or Saläfi) Islam is threatening folk Islam elsewhere in the world. Be that as it may, a nuanced comparative study of precisely the common layer of vocabulary of Islamic origin in ISEA and Southeast Europe is a desideratum that would help shed light on cultural and social factors in lexical diffusion.

In a sense, the imposition of Standard Bosnian on speakers whose dialects are closer to Standard Macedonian is a reenactment of the Second Yugoslav period, when Serbo-Croatian (whose dialectal base is identical to that of the BCSM standards) was obligatory for all Slavic speakers, regardless of religion, as the first or second school language and the first language in the army. In another sense, however, given the post-1991 emphasis on Turkish (i.e., Islamic) vocabulary in the Bosnian standard, the connection between lexicon and religion trumps similarities of

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

grammar for some speakers whose dialects are closer to Macedonian. This is also the case in popular perception, which focuses on, as linguistic anthropologist Suzanne Wertheim (2003) puts it, "sounds and nouns".

This emphasis on lexicon can be compared to the kind of differentiation in the languages of Indonesia, where the choice of lexical item is crucial in indexing social, ethnic, and political positions and relationships. While such distinctions are not as thoroughly integrated into the grammar and grammatical lexicon of languages in Southeastern Europe, the differentiation of key lexical items in the former Serbo-Croatian does play a kind of indexing role comparable to what occurs in Indonesia. At the same time, as Kalogjera (2002) makes clear, a large part of the controversy over the Serbo-Croatian/Croato-Serbian dictionary published jointly by Matica Srpska and Matica Hrvatska was precisely the demonstration that such lexical differentiation was not as emblematic as some nationalist linguists would have it. At issue was the citation of examples from Serbian authors for lexical items more frequently associated with Croatian and Croatian authors for lexical items more commonly associated with Serbian. The lack of differentiation so enraged Croatian linguists and language planners that they withdrew from the join project upon the publication of the first two volumes (A-K) in 1967, and the remaining four were published only by Matica Srpska (1969-1976).

Here we can also note that the observed tendency of Malay to use Arabic and Indonesian to use Sanskrit for vocabulary enrichment has cultural-religious overtones that mirror Bosnian vis-à-vis Serbian. For both Bosnian and Malay, the Arabo-Persian vocabulary functions as a kind of international lexicon in contrast to the Greco-Latinate "international" vocabulary of Serbian (and much of Europe and its colonies) and the similarly archaeo-prestigious Sanskritic vocabulary of South and Southeast Asia. Taken together with our observations on discourse particles noted above, we can say that a comparison of Southeast Europe and both MSEA and ISEA helps us see that in addition to the *Kulturwörter* identified by Trubetzkoy (1928) as characteristic of the *Sprachbund*, (and as opposed to the *Elementarwörter* of the *Sprachfamilie*), shared discourse particles can constitute an additional signal of contact-induced change precisely because, unlike *Kulturwörter*, they are lexical but non-referential.

Returning now to Europe, we can note that while Jakobson located Russia at the center of his Eurasian Sprachbund, Haspelmath (1998) revives Whorf's "Standard Average European" with French, German, Dutch and North Italian as its center and the rest of Europe as the periphery of a putative European Sprachbund. Moreover, just as Jakobson's formulation coincided fairly closely with Russia's perceived geopolitical sphere of interest, so, too, Haspelmath's version of the development of a European sprachbund coincides with EU relations of core and periphery. His "nucleus" languages cover the territory of the Holy Roman Empire and also of the original European Economic Community. This is not to say that either linguist was attempting to act as a tool of foreign policy (although Jakobson's advocacy of a Russian cultural mission could be read that way), but at the same time, once such works are published they can be adopted and adapted by those with policy goals. An added factor in this project is the conflation of typological and areal

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

linguistics as seen, for example, in the EUROTYP project. As Anna Siewierska, may she rest in peace, wrote in 1998:

> Language typology is the study of regularities, patterns and limits in cross-linguistic variation. The major goal of EUROTYP was to study the patterns and limits of variation in [...] the languages of Europe [...] by characterizing the specific features of European languages against the background of non-European languages and by identifying areal phenomena (*Sprachbünde*) within Europe [...] and thus contribute to the characterization of Europe as a linguistic area (*Sprachbund*).

As Hamp (1977) points out, however, unlike genetic and areal linguistics, which are, as he puts it, "twin faces of diachronic linguistics" that elucidate sources of similarities and differences, typology is achronic and seeks to explain resemblances among languages through the nature of language itself, the ideal realizations of which are universals, although the complex realities of which are usually tendencies. In that same article, Hamp cautions against the conflation of areal and typological linguistics. We have, then, a fundamental problem of slippage not unlike that occasioned by Jakobson's extension of Trubetzkoy's concept from the Balkans to all of Eurasia except the eastern and western extremities. Whereas Trubetzkoy's model envisioned an area in which attested multilingualism resulted in structural change (as exemplified at the morphosyntactic level but including lexicon and phonology), Jakobson's concept involved vast areas where such levels of multilingualism do not occur. Rather, Jakobson's more general phenomena were phonological or typological (palatalization, monotonic prosody, the existence of case in nominal inflection) that could be attributed to (remote) genetic inheritance, universal tendencies, or possibly a 'chain' of overlapping areas of convergence. Jakobson's work also contained explicitly ideological underpinnings as well, insofar as his formulation not only placed the Russian Empire at the center of this putative Sprachbund but also attributed a "mission" to that empire.

Returning now to the problem of Balkan linguistics and Eurolinguistics, or, as I have called it elsewhere (Friedman 2011), Eurology, from the foregoing we can argue that the Eurological project represents a political framework not unlike that represented in previous centuries by the Ottoman Empire, with English as the Turkish of the 21st century. In the five hundred or so years of Ottoman rule in Southeastern Europe, as Olivera Jašar-Nasteva (1990) has expressed it, with one *teskere* one could travel the entire peninsula. As a result, linguistic communication was facilitated at a time when Western Europe was broken up into dozens of warring polities. We can thus argue that typological similarities between, e.g. English and Macedonian, are not areal but typological. On the other hand, if the EU project turns out to be as long-lasting as the Ottoman Empire, then Europe might indeed become a Sprachbund. At the moment, however, this is a desiderative rather than an indicative proposition.

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

References

Asenova 2002: P. Asenova, *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, Sofia, Faber.

Beg 1979: Muhammad Abdul Jabbar Beg, *Arabic Loan-Words in Malay: A Comparative Study*, 2nd ed., Kuala Lumpur, University of Malaya.

Cooke 1968: J.R. Cooke, *Pronominal Reference in Thai, Burmese and Vietnamese*, Berkeley, University of California.

Enfield 2005: N.J. Enfield, "Areal Linguistics and Mainland Southeast Asia", in *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 34.181–206.

Errington 1988: J. Joseph Errington, *Shifting Languages: Interaction and Identity in Javanese Indonesia*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania.

Errington 1998: J. Joseph Errington, *Structure and Style in Javanese: A Semiotic View of Linguistic Etiquette*, Cambridge, Cambridge University.

Fielder 2008a: G.E. Fielder, "Macedonian discourse markers in the Balkan Sprachbund", in *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 61(2).105−19.

Fielder 2008b: G.E. Fielder, "The Status of Discourse Markers as Balkanisms in South Slavic", in *American Contributions to the 14th International Congress of Slavists, Ohrid, September*. Vol. 1: Linguistics, ed. C.Y. Bethin, 111–29, Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

Friedman 2000: Victor A. Friedman, "Romani in the Balkan Linguistic League", in *Valkanikē Glōssologia: Sygkhronia kai Diakhronia/Balkanlinguistik: Synchronie und Diachronie*, ed. by Chr. Tzitzilis and Kh. Symeonidēs, 95−105, Thessaloniki, University of Thessaloniki.

Friedman 2003: Victor A. Friedman, *Turkish in Macedonia and Beyond*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Friedman 2011: Victor A. Friedman, "The Balkan Languages and Balkan Linguistics", in *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 40. 275−291.

Gil 1987: D. Gil, "Definiteness, noun phrase configurationality, and the count-mass distinction", in *The Representation of Indefiniteness*, ed. by E. Reuland and A.G.B. ter Meulen, 254–69, Cambridge, MIT.

Grannes 1996: Alf Grannes, *Turco-Bulgarica*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Hamp 1977: Eric P. Hamp, "On some questions of areal linguistics", in *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. by K. Whistlers et al., 279−282, Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistic Society.

Hamp 1989: Eric P. Hamp, "Yugoslavia – A Crossroads of Sprachbünde", in *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, 25(1).44−47.

Haspelmath 1998: Martin Haspelmath, "How Young is Standard Average European?", in *Language Sciences*, 20.271–287.

Hauge 2002: Kjetil Rå. Hauge, "At the Boundaries of the Balkan Sprachbund: Pragmatic and Paralinguistic Isomorphisms in the Balkans and Beyond", in *Mediterranean Language Review*, 14.21–40.

Henderson 1965: E. Henderson, "The Topography of Certain Phonetic and Morphological Characteristics of South East Asian Languages", in *Lingua*, 15.400–34.

Ivić 1984: Milka Ivić, "On an Expressive Adjective Formation in Balkan Slavic Languages and Roumanian", in *Cinquième Congrès international d'études du sud-est européen: Linguistique, Résumés*, ed. by M. Miroslav Vukelić, p. 3, Belgrade, Yugoslav Committee of AIESEE.

Jakobson 1931a/1962/1971: Roman Jakobson, "Über die phonologischen Sprachbünde", reprinted in *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1, 2nd ed., 137−143, The Hague, Mouton.

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

Jakobson 1931b/1962/1971: Roman Jakobson, "Kharakteristike evrazijskogo jazykovogo sojuza", reprinted in *Selected Writings*. Vol. 1, 2nd ed., 143-201, The Hague, Mouton.

Jašar-Nasteva 1990, Olivera Jašar-Nasteva, "Mestoto na makedonskiot jazik vo balkanskata jazična sredina", *Predavanja na XXII Seminar za makedonski jazik, literatura i kultura*, 23−27, Skopje, "Univerzitet Kiril i Metodij".

Joseph 1983: Brian D. Joseph, *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kalogjera 2002: Damir Kalogjera, "Misunderstandings about the Role of a Monolingual Dictionary", in *Lexical Norm and National Languages*, ed. by R. Lučić, 111−119, Munich, Otto Sagner.

Kratochvil 1968: P. Kratochvil, *The Chinese Language Today*, London, Hutchinson.

Li, Thompson 1976: C.N. Li, Sandra S. Thompson, "Subject and topic: a new typology of language", in *Subject and Topic*, ed. by C.N. Li, 457–89, New York, Academic Press.

Masica 1976: Colin Masica, *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*, Chicago, University of Chicago.

Masica 2001: Colin Masica, "The definition and significance of linguistic areas", in *South Asia yearbook 2001: Papers from the symposium on South Asian languages: contact, convergence and typology*, ed. by P. Bhaskararao and K.V. Subbarao, 205–67, Delhi, SAGE Publications.

Masica 2003: Colin Masica, "South Asian Languages", in *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 2nd ed., ed. by William Frawley, 119−123, Oxford, Oxford University.

Matisoff 2001: J. A. Matisoff, "Genetic versus contact relationship: prosodic diffusability in Southeast Asian Languages", in *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics*, ed. by A. Aikhenvald, R.M.W. Dixon, 291–327, Oxford, Oxford University.

Matras 2000: Yaron Matras, "How Predictable is Contact–Induced Language Change in Grammar?", in *Time Depth in Historical Linguistics*, ed. by C. Renfew, A. McMahon, and L. Trask, 563–583, Cambridge, UK, MacDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Müller 2004: Hans-Georg Müller, *Reduplikationen im Türkischen: morphophonologische Untersuchungen*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

Packard 2000: J. L. Packard, *The Morphology of Chinese*, Cambridge, Cambridge University.

Sandfeld 1926/1930: Kristian Sandfeld, *Balkanfilologien*, Copenhagen, Luno/ *Linguistique balkanique*, Paris, Klincksieck.

Sapir 1921: E. Sapir, *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*, New York, Harcourt Brace.

Scherzer 1976: Joel Scherzer, *An Areal-Typological Study of American Indian Languages North of Mexico*, Amsterdam, North-Holland.

Schleicher A. 1850. *Die Sprachen Europas.* Bonn: König

Seliščev 1925: A. Seliščev, "Des traits linguistiques communs aux langues balkaniques: Un balkanisme ancien en bulgare", in *Revue des études slaves*, 5.38–57.

Siewierska 1998 : A. Siewierska (ed.), *Constituent Order in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter

Thompson 1987 (1965) : L.C. Thompson, *A Vietnamese Grammar*, Honolulu, University of Hawaii.

Thurgood 1999: G. Thurgood, *From Ancient Cham to Modern Dialects: Two Thousand Years of Language Contact and Change*, Hawaii, University of Hawaii Press.

Trubetskoy 1923: N.S. Trubetskoy, "Vavilonskaja bašnja i smešenie jazykov", in *Evrazijskij vremennik*, 3.107−24.

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)

Trubetskoy 1928: N.S. Trubetskoy, "Etablissement et délimitation des termes techniques, Proposition 16", in *Actes du Premier congrès international des linguistes*, p. 18, The Hague, A.W. Sijthoff.

Wertheim 2003: Suzanne Wertheim, *Linguistic Purism, Language Shift, and Contact-Induced Change in Tatar*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Abstract

Although Trubetzkoy introduced the term *jazykovoj sojuz* 'language league/union' in Russian in 1923, it was his 1928 formulation in German that brought the concept of *Sprachbund* to Europe's attention, and Trubetzkoy's example of the Balkans is cited *de rigueur* in any general work on language contact. Jakobson (1931) took Trubetzkoy's idea and ran with it, positing a Eurasian *Sprachbund*, with Russian at its center. One is reminded of Haspelmath's (1998) suggestion that the "core" of a posited European linguistic area is made up of the countries along the Romance-Germanic divide, which, we can observe, happens to coincide with the core countries of the EU, i.e. the countries of the former EEC. Meanwhile, the Caucasus, South Asia, and Southeast Asia have all also been posited as *Sprachbünde.* As it turns out, Southeast Europe and Southeast Asia have a remarkable number of both historical and typological similarities that have so far gone unnoticed. In this paper, therefore, I examine how the Southeast European and Southeast Asian *Sprachbünde* can illuminate one another vis-à-vis "Europe" and "Eurasia" and can also indicate fruitful new directions for research.

BDD-A1047 © 2012 Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.77 (2026-11-18 10:57:48 UTC)