

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ „ГОЦЕ ДЕЛЧЕВ“ - ШТИП
ФИЛОЛОШКИ ФАКУЛТЕТ

UDC 81
UDC 82
UDC 008



ISSN: 2545-3998
DOI: 10.46763/palim

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ

МЕЃУНАРОДНО СПИСАНИЕ ЗА ЛИНГВИСТИЧКИ,
КНИЖЕВНИ И КУЛТУРОЛОШКИ ИСТРАЖУВАЊА

PALIMPSEST

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LINGUISTIC,
LITERARY AND CULTURAL RESEARCH

PALMK, VOL XI, NO 21, STIP, 2026

ГОД. 11, БР. 21
ШТИП, 2026

VOL. XI, NO 21
STIP, 2026

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ

Меѓународно списание за лингвистички, книжевни
и културолошки истражувања

PALIMPSEST

International Journal for Linguistic, Literary
and Cultural Research

Год. 11, Бр. 21
Штип, 2026

Vol. 11, No 21
Stip, 2026

PALMK, VOL 11, NO 21, STIP, 2026

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ

Меѓународно списание за лингвистички, книжевни
и културолошки истражувања

ИЗДАВА

Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Филолошки факултет, Штип

ГЛАВЕН И ОДГОВОРЕН УРЕДНИК

Ранко Младеноски

УРЕДУВАЧКИ ОДБОР

Виктор Фридман, Универзитет во Чикаго, САД
Толе Белчев, Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Македонија
Нина Даскаловска, Универзитет „Гоце Делчев“, Македонија
Ала Шешкен, Универзитет Ломоносов, Руска Федерација
Олга Панкина, НВО Македонски културен центар, Руска Федерација
Астрид Симоне Хлубик, Универзитет „Крал Михаил I“, Романија
Алина Андреа Драгоеску Урлика, Универзитет „Крал Михаил I“, Романија
Сунчана Туксар, Универзитет „Јурај Добрила“ во Пула, Хрватска
Саша Војковиќ, Универзитет во Загреб, Хрватска
Шандор Чегледи, Универзитет во Панонија, Унгарија
Ева Бус, Универзитет во Панонија, Унгарија
Хусејин Озбај, Универзитет Гази, Република Турција
Озтурк Емироглу, Универзитет во Варшава, Полска
Елена Дараданова, Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“, Република Бугарија
Ина Христова, Универзитет „Св. Климент Охридски“, Република Бугарија
Џозеф Пониах, Национален институт за технологија, Индија
Сатхарај Венкатесан, Национален институт за технологија, Индија
Петар Пенда, Универзитет во Бања Лука, Босна и Херцеговина
Данило Капасо, Универзитет во Бања Лука, Босна и Херцеговина
Мета Лах, Универзитет во Љубљана, Република Словенија
Намита Субиото, Универзитет во Љубљана, Република Словенија
Ана Пеличер-Санчез, Универзитет во Нотингам, Велика Британија
Мајкл Грини, Универзитет во Нотингам, Велика Британија
Татјана Ѓурин, Универзитет во Нови Сад, Република Србија
Диана Поповиќ, Универзитет во Нови Сад, Република Србија
Жан Пол Мејер, Универзитет во Стразбур, Република Франција
Жан Марк Веркруз, Универзитет во Артуа, Република Франција
Регула Бусин, Швајцарија
Натале Фиорето, Универзитет во Перуца, Италија
Оливер Хербст, Универзитет во Вурцбург, Германија
Шахинда Езат, Универзитет во Каиро, Египет
Џулијан Чен, Универзитет Куртин, Австралија

PALIMPSEST

International Journal for Linguistic, Literary
and Cultural Research

PUBLISHED BY

Goce Delchev University, Faculty of Philology, Stip

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Ranko Mladenoski

EDITORIAL BOARD

Victor Friedman, University of Chicago, USA
Tole Belcev, Goce Delchev University, Macedonia
Nina Daskalovska, Goce Delchev University, Macedonia
Alla Sheshken, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russian Federation
Olga Pankina, NGO Macedonian Cultural Centre, Russian Federation
Astrid Simone Hlubik, King Michael I University, Romania
Alina Andreea Dragoescu Urlica, King Michael I University, Romania
Sunčana Tuksar, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Croatia
Saša Vojković, University of Zagreb, Croatia
Sándor Czeglédi, University of Pannonia, Hungary
Éva Bús, University of Pannonia, Hungary
Husejin Ozbaj, GAZİ University, Republic of Turkey
Öztürk Emiroğlu, University of Warsaw, Poland
Elena Daradanova, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Republic of Bulgaria
Ina Hristova, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Republic of Bulgaria
Joseph Ponniah, National Institute of Technology, India
Sathyaraj Venkatesan, National Institute of Technology, India
Petar Penda, University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Danilo Capasso, University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina
Meta Lah, University of Ljubljana, Republic of Slovenia
Namita Subiotto, University of Ljubljana, Republic of Slovenia
Ana Pellicer Sanchez, The University of Nottingham, United Kingdom
Michael Greaney, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
Tatjana Durin, University of Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia
Diana Popovic, University of Novi Sad, Republic of Serbia
Jean-Paul Meyer, University of Strasbourg, French Republic
Jean-Marc Vercruysse, Artois University, French Republic
Regula Busin, Switzerland
Natale Fioretto, University of Perugia, Italy
Oliver Herbst, University of Wurzburg, Germany
Chahinda Ezzat, Cairo University, Egypt
Julian Chen, Curtin University, Australia

РЕДАКЦИСКИ СОВЕТ

Луси Караниколова-Чочоровска
Толе Белчев
Нина Даскаловска
Билјана Ивановска
Ева Ѓорѓиевска
Марија Леонтиќ
Јована Караникиќ Јосимовска
Натка Јанкова-Алаѓозовска

ЈАЗИЧНО УРЕДУВАЊЕ

Ранко Младеноски (македонски јазик)
Весна Продановска (англиски јазик)
Толе Белчев (руски јазик)
Билјана Ивановска (германски јазик)
Марија Леонтиќ (турски јазик)
Ева Ѓорѓиевска (француски јазик)
Јована Караникиќ Јосимовска (италијански јазик)

ТЕХНИЧКИ УРЕДНИК

Славе Димитров

АДРЕСА

ПАЛИМПСЕСТ
РЕДАКЦИСКИ СОВЕТ
Филолошки факултет
ул. „Крсте Мисирков“ бр. 10-А
п. фах 201
МК-2000 Штип

<http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index/PAL>

Меѓународното научно списание „Палимпсест“ излегува двапати годишно во печатена и во електронска форма на посебна веб-страница на веб-порталот на Универзитетот „Гоце Делчев“ во Штип: <http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index.php/PAL>
Трудовите во списанието се објавуваат на следните јазици: македонски јазик, англиски јазик, германски јазик, француски јазик, руски јазик, турски јазик и италијански јазик.
Трудовите се рецензираат.

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Lusi Karanikolova-Chochorovska
Tole Belcev
Nina Daskalovska
Biljana Ivanovska
Eva Gjorgjievska
Marija Leontik
Jovana Karanikik Josimovska
Natka Jankova-Alagjozovska

LANGUAGE EDITORS

Ranko Mladenoski (Macedonian language)
Vesna Prodanovska (English language)
Tole Belcev (Russian language)
Biljana Ivanovska (German language)
Marija Leontik (Turkish language)
Eva Gjorgjievska (French language)
Jovana Karanikik Josimovska (Italian language)

TECHNICAL EDITOR

Slave Dimitrov

ADDRESS

PALIMPSEST
EDITORIAL COUNCIL
Faculty of Philology
Krstev Misirkov 10-A
P.O. Box 201
MK-2000, Stip

<http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index/PAL>

The International Scientific Journal “Palimpsest” is issued twice a year in printed form and online at the following website of the web portal of Goce Delcev University in Stip: <http://js.ugd.edu.mk/index.php/PAL>
Papers can be submitted and published in the following languages: Macedonian, English, German, French, Russian, Turkish and Italian language.
All papers are peer-reviewed.

СОДРЖИНА / TABLE OF CONTENTS

11 ПРЕДГОВОР

Ала Шешкен, член на Уредувачкиот одбор на „Палимпсест“

FOREWORD

Alla Sheshken, member of the Editorial Board of “Palimpsest”

ЈАЗИК / LANGUAGE

15 Lilis Handayani Napitupulu, Kristiawan Indriyanto

VERBAL THREATS AS POWER PERFORMANCE: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF JOHN DUTTON'S IMPERATIVES IN *YELLOWSTONE SEASON 1*

27 Şirin Tufan

LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE / SHIFT AND SPEAKERS' ATTITUDES IN TURKEY: THE CASE OF MACEDONIAN IN MUSTAFAPAŞA, CAPPADOCIA

37 Марија Леонтиќ

ИЗВИЦИТЕ ЗА ОБРАЌАЊЕ И ПОВИКУВАЊЕ ВО СОВРЕМЕНИОТ ТУРСКИ ЈАЗИК, НИВНОТО ЗНАЧЕЊЕ И ЕКВИВАЛЕНТИ ВО МАКЕДОНСКИОТ ЈАЗИК

Marija Leontik

INTERJECTIONS OF ADDRESS AND CALLING IN CONTEMPORARY TURKISH, THEIR MEANINGS AND EQUIVALENTS IN MACEDONIAN

49 Mirela Papa

TRADUZIONE INTERSEMIOTICA: LE COPERTINE DEI LIBRI DI BUZZATI IN ALBANIA

Mirela Papa

INTERSEMIOTIC TRANSLATION: BUZZATI'S BOOK COVERS IN ALBANIA

61 Gazi Özdemir

XVII. YÜZYIL OSMANLI SİYASET DİLİNDE DEVLET, HUKUK VE OTORİTE: KOÇI BEY RİSALESİ'NDE KRİZİN VE İHYANIN METAFORİK TASAVVURU

Gazi Özdemir

STATE, LAW, AND AUTHORITY IN 17TH-CENTURY OTTOMAN POLITICAL LANGUAGE: THE METAPHORICAL REPRESENTATION OF CRISIS AND RESTORATION IN KOÇI BEY'S TREATISE

71 Катерина Видова

ЗА НЕКОИ КАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ НА ЛЕКСИКАТА ВО СОВРЕМЕНАТА МАКЕДОНСКА ПОЕЗИЈА

Katerina Vidova

ABOUT SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LEXIS OF THE MACEDONIAN CONTEMPORARY POETRY

КНИЖЕВНОСТ / LITERATURE

- 83** **Бојана Костова, Ранко Младеноски**
ФОЛКЛОРНИОТ ХИПОТЕКСТ ВО РОМАНОТ „СИНОТ НА КРАЛОТ“ ОД
СЛАВЧО КОВИЛОСКИ
Bojana Kostova, Ranko Mladenovski
THE FOLKLORIC HYPOTEXT IN THE NOVEL *THE KING'S SON* BY
SLAVCHO KOVILOSKI
- 93** **Vagif Sultanlı**
XX. YÜZYIL GÖÇMEN NESRİNDE ZAMAN VE MEKÂNIN
DEKONSTRÜKSİYONU (AZERBAIJAN VE MAKEDON EDEBİYATI
BAĞLAMINDA)
Vagif Sultanly
DECONSTRUCTION OF TIME AND SPACE IN THE PROSE OF EMIGRATION
OF THE 20TH CENTURY (IN THE CONTEXT OF AZERBAIJANI AND
MACEDONIAN LITERATURE)
- 105** **Mümin Ali**
DİJİTALLEŞEN EDEBİYAT VE DİJİTAL EDEBİYAT
Mumin Ali
DIGITALIZING LITERATURE AND DIGITAL LITERATURE
- 117** **Natalija Pop Zarieva, Krste Iliev**
REIMAGINING HOME: LITERARY ENCOUNTERS WITH DEEP
ECOLOGICAL THOUGHT
- 129** **Zekiye Tunç**
ESKİ TÜRK DESTANLARINDA FETİH POLİTİKASI
Zekiye Tunç
THE POLICY OF CONQUEST IN ANCIENT TURKİC EPİCS

КУЛТУРА / CULTURE

- 143** **Сања Ристески, Сашка Голомеова Лонгурова, Силвана Жежова, Соња
Јордева, Ванѓа Димитријева Кузманоска**
КНИЖЕВНИТЕ ДЕЛА НА ЛЕО ТОЛСТОЈ И ОСКАР ВАЈЛД КАКО МОДНА
ИНСПИРАЦИЈА
**Sanja Risteski, Saska Golomeova Longurova, Silvana Zhezhova, Sonja
Jordeva, Vanga Dimitrieva Kuzmanoska**
THE LITERARY WORKS OF LEO TOLSTOY AND OSCAR WILDE AS
FASHION INSPIRATION
- 153** **Ruska Ivanovska-Naskova, Marija Pandeva, Ema Lakinska, Davor
Jankuloski**
A SERIES OF ARTICLES ON KONESKI IN THE FOREIGN PRESS

МЕТОДИКА НА НАСТАВАТА / TEACHING METHODOLOGY

- 165 Simona Serafimovska, Nina Daskalovska**
STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE INTEGRATION OF THE DUOLINGO APPLICATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING
- 177 Vesna Prodanovska-Poposka**
BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE: A POST-LECTURE ANALYSIS OF COMMON-LAW DEFENCES
- 187 Branka Grivčevska**
MOTIVAZIONI, PERCEZIONI E RISULTATI DEI PARTECIPANTI ALLA SPERIMENTAZIONE DEL MOOC *ITALIANO ACCADEMICO PER STUDENTI SLAVOFONI*
Branka Grivčevska
MOTIVATIONS, PERCEPTIONS AND RESULTS OF THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE EXPERIMENTATION OF THE MOOC *ACADEMIC ITALIAN FOR SLAVIC-SPEAKING STUDENTS*
- 197 Özlem Kurt**
YABANCILARA TÜRKÇE ÖĞRETİMİ İÇİN HAZIRLANMIŞ YEDİ İKLİM TÜRKÇE DERS KİTABININ ETKİLEŞİM ODAKLI İNCELENMESİ
Ozlem Kurt
AN INTERACTION-FOCUSED ANALYSIS OF THE YEDI IKLİM TÜRKÇE TEXTBOOK FOR TEACHING TURKISH TO FOREIGNERS
- 209 Весна Кожинкова**
РАЗВИВАЊЕ НА КОГНИТИВНИТЕ СПОСОБНОСТИ КАЈ УЧЕНИЦИТЕ ВО НАСТАВАТА ПО ЛИТЕРАТУРА
Vesna Kozhinkova
DEVELOPING COGNITIVE SKILLS IN STUDENTS IN LITERATURE TEACHING
- 223 Tilen Smajla**
DIE MEINUNGEN SLOWENISCHER UNIVERISTÄTSSTUDIERENDER ZUM EINSATZ VON KÜNSTLICHER INTELLIGENZ IN EINEM SPRACHKURS FÜR FACHFREMDSPRACHE
Tilen Smajla
THE VIEWS OF SLOVENIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS ON THE APPLICATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LSP TEACHING
- 233 Nensi Gjetani, Ema Kristo**
INDIVIDUELLE LERNWEGE IM DEUTSCHUNTERRICHT: DIFFERENZIERUNG UND PERSONALISIERUNG
Nensi Gjetani, Ema Kristo
INDIVIDUAL LEARNING PATHWAYS IN GERMAN LANGUAGE TEACHING: DIFFERENTIATION AND PERSONALIZATION

- 245 Erta Spaho-Herri, Migena Sejdini**
DIE ROLLE DER ÜBERSETZUNG IM DaF-UNTERRICHT: DIE SITUATION
IN ALBANIEN
Erta Spaho-Herri, Migena Sejdini
THE ROLE OF TRANSLATION IN TEACHING THE GERMAN LANGUAGE
(SITUATION IN ALBANIA)
- 257 Jonida Bushi, Alma Kosova**
GESUNDHEIT ALS SCHLÜSSELTHEMA IM FREMDSPRACHEN-
UNTERRICHT: EINE ANALYSE AUSGEWÄHLTER LEHRWERKE
Jonida Bushi, Alma Kosova
HEALTH AS A KEY TOPIC IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING: AN
ANALYSIS OF SELECTED TEXTBOOKS

ПРИКАЗИ / BOOK REVIEWS

- 271 Даниела Андоновска-Трајковска**
ВАЛЕНЦИЈА НА ЛИРСКОТО ЈАС: АКТАНТНА АНАЛИЗА НА „ЧОВЕЧКИ
ТИШИНИ“ ОД БОРЧЕ ПАНОВ
Daniela Andonovska-Trajkovska
THE VALENCY OF THE LYRICAL SUBJECT: ACTANTIAL ANALYSIS OF
HUMAN SILENCES BY BORCHE PANOV
- 283 Lucia Ráčková**
L'AMALGAME LEXICAL – FRÉQUENT DANS L'USAGE, RARE DANS LE
DICTIONNAIRE DE RÉFÉRENCE
Lucia Ráčková
LEXICAL BLENDS: FREQUENT IN USE, RARE IN REFERENCE

ДОДАТОК / APPENDIX

- 295 ПОВИК ЗА ОБЈАВУВАЊЕ ТРУДОВИ**
ВО МЕЃУНАРОДНОТО НАУЧНО СПИСАНИЕ „ПАЛИМПСЕСТ“
CALL FOR PAPERS
FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL “PALIMPSEST”

**LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE / SHIFT AND SPEAKERS'
ATTITUDES IN TURKEY: THE CASE OF MACEDONIAN
IN MUSTAFAPAŞA, CAPPADOCIA**

Şirin Tufan

Istanbul Atlas University, Türkiye
sirin.tufan@atlas.edu.tr

Abstract: This study examines the language attitudes and choices of the Macedonian-speaking Muslim community of Mustafapaşa, Cappadocia, nearly a century after their forced resettlement during the 1923 Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey. The community, descendants of approximately 400 immigrants from Jerveni (Agios Antonios) near Kastoria, Greece, has since integrated into Turkish society while retaining symbolic ties to their heritage language. Although the community expresses strong affective attachment to Macedonian, this attitude does not consistently translate into active maintenance. Drawing on Fishman's (1964) framework of language maintenance and shift, findings indicate that Turkish, reinforced through education, socioeconomic prestige, and intermarriage, has become the dominant language across generations. Macedonian persists mainly among older speakers and in receptive multilingual exchanges, but younger generations acquire only fragments, often framed as nostalgic "words from grandmothers." Within international frameworks, the community is situated between "threatened" and "shifting" on the EGIDS scale (Lewis & Simons, 2010) and between "vulnerable" and "definitely endangered" in UNESCO's (2011) classification. The case demonstrates that positive attitudes toward a heritage language alone are insufficient to ensure intergenerational transmission. Unless Macedonian is repositioned as a second language with educational support, it risks survival only as cultural memory, rather than as a living medium of communication.

Keywords: *Macedonian; Mustafapaşa Village; Language Attitude; Language Choice; Language Maintenance.*

1. Introduction

This study examines the socio-psychological context shaping language choice among the Macedonian-speaking Muslim community of Mustafapaşa, a village in Cappadocia, Central Anatolia. It argues that linguistic practices within this bilingual community do not necessarily align with the affective components of their attitudes toward Macedonian (the heritage language) and Turkish (the dominant societal language). While positive feelings toward Macedonian persist, they do not consistently translate into sustained efforts of language maintenance. The inhabitants of Mustafapaşa are largely descendants of immigrants who arrived following the 1923 Population Exchange between Greece and Turkey. The

continuity between the Ottoman millet system and the minority regime established by the Treaty of Lausanne is particularly visible in Cappadocia, where religious affiliation historically functioned as the primary marker of communal belonging. Under the millet system, this confessional logic enabled multilingualism and shared cultural practices to persist (Bayar, 2018). This principle was later preserved by the Treaty of Lausanne, which defined minorities exclusively in religious terms and recognized only non-Muslims as minorities (Republic of Turkey, 1923). As a result, Turkish-speaking Orthodox populations were expelled to Greece, while Muslim communities, regardless of linguistic repertoire, were incorporated into the Turkish nation-state (Gürel, 2025). This process rendered the region's ethno-linguistic plurality politically invisible, although material and cultural traces continue to testify to a plural past (Canpolat, 2023). Within this context, the Macedonian-speaking Muslim community of Mustafapaşa is distinguished by its migration history, religious affiliation, and linguistic repertoire. Today, community members are predominantly bilingual, speaking Turkish alongside their dialect of the South Slavic language, Macedonian, a dialect locally referred to as *nashta* or *nashki* ("our language"), originating from the village of Jerveni near Kastoria in northern Greece. Despite near-complete social and economic integration, Macedonian lacks official recognition; in Turkey's 1969 census, it was excluded from minority language categories, likely subsumed under Pomak, rendering the community statistically invisible. Against this backdrop, this study examines language maintenance and shift among the Macedonian-speaking Muslims of Mustafapaşa using Fishman's (1964) framework and a domain-based approach, demonstrating how affective attachment to a heritage language can coexist with a gradual shift toward the dominant national language, shaped by forced migration, religious affiliation, and historical memory.

2. Literature Review

Attitude occupies a central place in social psychology and is commonly understood as an individual's tendency to respond positively or negatively toward objects, people, institutions, or events. Rather than being a fixed mental state, attitude is generally described as an evaluative orientation that develops over time. Ajzen (2005, p. 3) emphasizes this evaluative dimension, while Krech and Crutchfield (1948, p. 52) define attitude as "an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual, and cognitive processes." Zimbardo and Leippe (1991) further argue that attitudes emerge through the interaction of cognition, emotion, behavioral intentions, and experience. From this perspective, attitudes are dynamic and multidimensional, shaped by broader social and motivational contexts (Miserandino, 2007, p. 65). Within sociolinguistics, language attitudes refer to speakers' evaluations of their own language varieties, those of others, and the communities associated with them. Appel and Muysken (1987, p. 16) distinguish between a behaviorist approach, which focuses on observable linguistic behavior, and a mentalist approach, which examines internal beliefs guiding language use (Fasold, 1984). These perspectives are complementary. Language attitudes are also shaped by social hierarchies: languages associated

with socially dominant groups tend to acquire greater prestige (Feifel, 1994, p. 55), reinforced by political, economic, and cultural power (Grenoble, 2011, p. 32). The concepts of language maintenance (LM) and language shift (LS) provide key frameworks for linking attitudes to practice. Language maintenance refers to the continued use of a minority or heritage language across domains despite the presence of a dominant language (Pauwels, 2005, p. 719). Research highlights the central role of intergenerational transmission within the family (Fishman, 1991; Clyne & Kipp, 1999). Language shift, by contrast, unfolds gradually and becomes visible through reduced proficiency, narrowing domains of use, and declining speaker numbers (Dorian, 1982, p. 44). Pauwels (2016) identifies duration of use, domain range, and exclusivity as key indicators of maintenance and shift. Studies conducted in Turkey provide important insights into these processes. Research on Bosnian Turks (Karahana, 2004) and the Kabardian community under urbanization (Alagözlü, 2002) demonstrate how attitudes, social networks, and language ideologies shape everyday linguistic practices. More recent work on Hemshin, Romeyka, and Lazuri offers detailed accounts of language use, transmission, and speaker attitudes (Akın, 2023; Akkuç, 2024; Ünlü & Hewitt, 2023). In parallel, sociological and historical studies of Balkan-origin Muslim communities emphasize migration, identity, and memory, while often treating language as a secondary concern (Dikici, 2014; Günçen, 2013; Svetieva, 2009). Situated at the intersection of these strands, the Macedonian-speaking Muslim community of Mustafapaşa provides a valuable case for examining the relationship between language attitudes and linguistic practice. Adopting a behaviorist perspective (Appel & Muysken, 1987; Fasold, 1984) and drawing on Pauwels's (2016) framework and Dorian's (1982) model of gradual language loss, this study addresses a recurring gap in the literature: the coexistence of positive attitudes toward a heritage language with declining everyday use in contexts where overt language repression is absent.

3. Adopted Methodology: Data Collection and Data Analysis

Data were collected through a questionnaire-based survey conducted in Mustafapaşa, during fieldwork in 2018-2019. Participants were recruited using purposive and community-based sampling, with initial contacts established through local networks and additional informants reached via snowball sampling. This approach was particularly suitable given the village's close-knit social structure and the sensitivity surrounding language use and identity. The questionnaire was administered in person to ensure accessibility across age groups and educational backgrounds and to allow clarification where necessary. Participation was voluntary, and informants were informed about the purpose of the study and the academic use of the data prior to participation. Informed consent was obtained orally from all participants, with family consent sought for younger informants when required, in line with local norms. The study does not claim strict statistical representativeness; however, care was taken to include participants of different ages, genders, and neighborhoods in order to capture a broad range of language practices. In total, 64 informants participated in the study, representing over

10% of the village's year-round population, estimated at around 600 residents. Participants ranged in age from 12 to 80 and included both women and men. The inclusion of a wide age range reflects contemporary sociolinguistic approaches that emphasize synchronic variation and everyday language use. The questionnaire was structured into eight sections: (1) demographics, (2) language awareness, (3) language use across contexts, (4) language use in governmental and public domains, (5) education, (6) ethnic identity and religion, (7) motivations related to language maintenance, and (8) open-ended questions and comments. The data were analyzed using SPSS (version 22). Cross-tabulations were employed to explore relationships between demographic variables, such as age, gender, number of children, occupation, educational background, and parental migration history and linguistic factors, including languages spoken, distinctions between mother tongue and additional languages, and patterns of language use across different domains. Sociocultural dimensions, such as religion and cultural identification, were also taken into consideration. Informants were drawn from six neighborhoods: Yeni Mahalle, Hamam, Manastır, Yukarı Mahalle, Davutlu, and Kırkdokuz Evler, and included 43 men and 21 women. The age distribution comprised 11 participants aged 12–24, 15 aged 25–44, 16 aged 45–54, and 22 aged 55 and above. Responses to the optional open-ended questions were systematically coded and numbered, allowing for a more nuanced qualitative interpretation alongside the quantitative analysis. This combined quantitative and qualitative approach provides a robust framework for examining the interplay between language attitudes, usage patterns, and social factors within the Mustafapaşa community.

3.1. Demographic Variables

The participants in this study were drawn from Mustafapaşa's Macedonian-speaking Muslim community, focusing on individuals with ancestral ties to Jerveni. Informants were grouped into four generations: second (50–80 years), third (45–54 years), fourth (24–44 years), and fifth (12–24 years), while the first and sixth generations were excluded due to age considerations. Age distribution shows 17.2% aged 12–24, 23.4% aged 25–44, 25% aged 45–54, and 34.4% aged 55+, making the second generation the largest group. Immigrants predominantly reside in clusters within the village, though many live alongside longstanding local families. All informants practice Islam, the only commonality with local inhabitants upon initial settlement. Only 4.7% of respondents are illiterate, while the remainder received at least primary education in the Turkish system.

3.2. Language Repertoire and Self-Identification

All informants were born in Turkey and speak Turkish. Survey results indicate that 65.6% consider Turkish their mother tongue, while 40.6% view it as a second language. Mother-tongue Turkish increases progressively with each generation, reaching 100% in the fifth generation. Conversely, 85.9% reported speaking Macedonian, though only 40.6% consider it their mother tongue, with 59.4% regarding it as a second language. By the fifth generation, Macedonian is no longer considered the native language; Turkish has become their mother tongue.

3.3. Language Choice and Context

This section of the survey examines language choice across interlocutors through open-ended questions, which resulted in multiple responses as well as some non-responses. When overall language use is considered without age differentiation, neither Turkish nor Macedonian is used exclusively in any context. At the intimate level, exclusive use of Turkish remains limited (35.9%), while exclusive use of Macedonian is marginal (6.3%). The highest rate of exclusive Turkish use occurs in interaction with other Turkish speakers (76.56%), whereas exclusive Macedonian use is most frequent within the family (40.63%) and with relatives (43.75%). Overall, language use at home is predominantly bilingual, combining Turkish and Macedonian. Communication with children reveals a marked asymmetry in language transmission. The lowest rate of exclusive Macedonian use is observed in interaction with children (1.6%), while exclusive Turkish use with children is notably high (54.7%). These patterns indicate that although the heritage language continues to be used among adult members of the community, it is not effectively transmitted to the younger generation. Bilingual use with children suggests limited exposure to Macedonian, raising questions about the long-term viability of the heritage language within the community. When language choice is analyzed across generations, all age groups primarily use Turkish in communication with children. While some informants report using only Macedonian or both languages with children, particularly in the second, third, and fourth generations, these practices remain marginal. Outside the home, bilingual language use predominates in interactions with neighbors and in coffee houses, whereas Turkish dominates institutional domains such as school, the market, and the workplace. These findings collectively point to a shift toward Turkish in both private and public spheres, with Macedonian increasingly confined to restricted and symbolic contexts. The data summarized above are presented in Table 1 and Table 2 below:

Table 1. Language Choice and Context

N=64, Frequency %	Age Distribution	Only Turkish	Only Macedonian	Both (Turkish and Macedonian)
Which language(s) do you prefer speaking to ...? (Q13)	<i>Mother / Father</i>			
	55 +	2 (9.1)	12 (54.5)	8 (36.4)
	54-45 yrs	3 (18.8)	4 (25.0)	9 (56.3)
	44-25 yrs	6 (40.0)	4 (26.7)	5 (33.3)
	24-12 yrs	9 (90.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.)
	<i>Children</i>			
	55 +	15 (71.4)	1 (4.8)	5 (23.8)
	54-45 yrs	11 (73.3)	0 (0.0)	4 (26.7)
	44-25 yrs	8 (72.7)	0 (0.0)	3 (27.3)
	24-12 yrs	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)

N=64, Frequency %	Age Distribution	Only Turkish	Only Macedonian	Both (Turkish and Macedonian)
Which language(s) do you prefer speaking to ...? (Q13)	<i>Siblings</i>			
	55 +	10 (45.5)	7 (31.8)	5 (22.7)
	54-45 yrs	7 (43.8)	2 (12.5)	7 (43.8)
	44-25 yrs	8 (53.3)	1 (6.7)	6 (40.0)
	24-12 yrs	9 (90.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (10.0)
	<i>Spouses</i>			
	55 +	8 (38.1)	6 (28.6)	7 (33.3)
	54-45 yrs	7 (46.7)	0 (0.0)	8 (53.3)
	44-25 yrs	8 (66.7)	1 (8.3)	3 (25.0)
	24-12 yrs	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
	<i>Relatives</i>			
	55 +	0 (0.0)	4 (18.2)	18 (81.8)
	54-45 yrs	2 (12.5)	1 (6.3)	13 (81.3)
	44-25 yrs	3 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	12 (80.0)
	24-12 yrs	8 (72.7)	0 (0.0)	3 (27.3)

Table 2. Language Choice and Context

N=64, Frequency %	Age Distribution	Only Turkish	Both (Turkish and Macedonian)
Which language (s) do you prefer speaking in... ? (Q14)	<i>Neighbors</i>		
	55 +	5 (22.7)	17 (77.3)
	54-45 yrs	6 (37.5)	10 (62.5)
	44-25 yrs	5 (33.3)	10 (66.7)
	24-12 yrs	8 (72.7)	3 (27.3)
	<i>In the Market</i>		
	55 +	11 (50.0)	11 (50.0)
	54-45 yrs	13 (81.3)	3 (18.8)
	44-25 yrs	11 (73.3)	4 (26.7)
	24-12 yrs	9 (81.8)	2 (18.2)
	<i>In the Coffee Houses</i>		
	55 +	4 (23.5)	13 (76.5)
	54-45 yrs	5 (38.5)	8 (61.5)
	44-25 yrs	5 (41.7)	7 (58.3)
	24-12 yrs	7 (77.8)	2 (22.2)
	<i>At Work</i>		
	55 +	6 (35.3)	11 (64.7)
	54-45 yrs	13 (81.3)	3 (18.8)
	44-25 yrs	8 (57.1)	6 (42.9)
	24-12 yrs	6 (85.7)	1 (14.3)
	<i>At School</i>		
	55 +	15 (88.2)	2 (11.8)
	54-45 yrs	13 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
	44-25 yrs	13 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
	24-12 yrs	11 (100.0)	0 (0.0)

3.4. Ethnic Identity and Cultural Affiliation

Ethnic and cultural self-identification reveals a complex pattern. The second and third generations predominantly identify ethnically as Turkish (68.2% and 75%, respectively) but culturally as both Turkish and Macedonian (86.4% and 87.5%). The fourth generation shows a shift toward dual ethnic identification (60%), while the fifth generation largely identifies as ethnically and culturally Turkish (81.8% and 54.5%). Despite this, Macedonian remains an important cultural reference, though only a small minority identifies solely with it. Overall, 73.5% of respondents acknowledge language as significant for maintaining ethnic identity. See Tables 3 and 4 below:

Table 3. Ethnic Identity, Cultural Affiliation and Language

N=64, Frequency %	Age Distribution	Only Turkish	Only Macedonian	Both (Turkish and Macedonian)
How do you describe yourself ethnically? (Q15)	55- +	15 (68.2)	0(0.0)	7 (31.8)
	54-45 yrs	12 (75.0)	0(0.0)	4 (25.0)
	44-25 yrs	6 (40.0)	0(0.0)	9 (60.0)
	24-12 yrs	9 (81.8)	0(0.0)	2 (18.2)

Table 4. Ethnic Identity, Cultural Affiliation and Language

N=64, Frequency %	Age Distribution	Only Turkish	Only Macedonian	Both (Turkish and Macedonian)
How do you describe yourself culturally? (Q16)	55- +	3 (13.6)	0 (0.0)	19 (86.4)
	54-45 yrs	2 (12.5)	0 (0.0)	14 (87.5)
	44-25 yrs	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)	14 (93.3)
	24-12 yrs	6 (54.5)	1 (9.1)	4 (36.4)

3.5. Education, Language Proficiency, Government and Public Use

Turkish is the primary language of education for nearly all informants, with minimal exceptions. However, 82.8% expressed a preference for bilingual education. While written Macedonian in Cyrillic is rarely used, spoken proficiency persists, particularly among older generations. Across generations, competence in Turkish dominates in all skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing), whereas Macedonian proficiency is largely oral and limited.

Table 5. Language Proficiency Rates

N=64, Frequency %				
Proficiency Rate in Turkish (Q24)	Very Well	Well	Not Well	Not at All
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Speaking	33 (51,6)	28 (43,8)	3 (4,7)	0 (0.0)
Listening	34 (53,1)	27 (42,2)	3 (4,7)	0 (0.0)

Reading	32 (50,0)	25 (39,1)	4 (6,3)	3 (4,7)
Writing	32 (50,0)	24 (37,5)	4 (6,3)	4 (6,3)
Proficiency Rate in Macedonian (Q25)	Very Well	Well	Not Well	Not at All
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
Speaking	14 (21,9)	15 (23,4)	27 (42,2)	8 (12,5)
Listening	18 (28,1)	26 (40,6)	13 (20,3)	7 (10,9)
Reading	1 (1,6)	2 (3,1)	3 (4,7)	58 (90,6)
Writing	0 (0,0)	2 (3,1)	3 (4,7)	59 (92,2)

When asked about the use of Macedonian in public institutions, 60.9% supported it. Generational differences emerged, with the highest support among the fourth generation (73.3%) and the lowest in the fifth generation (45.5%). The absence of a standardized written form of Macedonian in public contexts may contribute to the community's limited institutional use.

3.6. Language Perception and Motivation for Language Maintenance

Perceptions of Macedonian are largely positive: 62.5% perceive it as sincere, 28.1% as friendly, and 35.9% as traditional. Turkish, by contrast, is associated with education, conservatism, and religiosity. Overall, respondents demonstrated a nuanced view, attributing distinct social and emotional values to each language. Over generations, attitudes toward bilingualism are predominantly positive. Older generations overwhelmingly support teaching Macedonian to younger generations (>80%), while the fifth generation shows moderate support (>50%). Some respondents link Macedonian knowledge to potential employment opportunities and cultural engagement, particularly in cultural institutions. Social considerations, such as historical integration and group esteem, influence whether respondents feel comfortable using Macedonian in public, with most reporting no reluctance to use it in front of local Turks.

4. Conclusion

This study has explored the relationship between language attitudes and language practices within the Macedonian-speaking Muslim community of Mustafapaşa, focusing on the tension between Turkish as the dominant societal language and Macedonian as a heritage language. The findings demonstrate a clear disjunction between strong affective and cognitive attachment to Macedonian and the lack of sustained practices ensuring its intergenerational transmission. Although Macedonian-speaking *muhacirs* (Turkish borrowing meaning “migrants”) are fully integrated into local social and economic life and often describe themselves as Turkish or as both Turkish and Macedonian, linguistic practices reveal an unmistakable shift toward Turkish. Turkish has become the first language of younger generations, while Macedonian is no longer transmitted as a native language, largely due to schooling and the socioeconomic prestige attached to Turkish. Fieldwork findings suggest that this language shift did not result primarily from overt coercion or direct experiences of linguistic repression, such as the “*Vatandaş Türkçe Konuş!*” (“Citizen, Speak Turkish!”) campaign, but rather from the gradual internalization of language hierarchies that confined

Macedonian to private and affective domains. While emotional attachment to Macedonian remains strong and bilingualism is often framed as a potential asset, this attachment rarely translates into concrete action. As a result, Macedonian persists mainly through receptive multilingualism, particularly among older speakers, and continues to circulate informally in everyday interactions without institutional reinforcement. Within established frameworks of language vitality, Macedonian in Mustafapaşa occupies a fragile position between vulnerability and endangerment. For older generations, however, the language retains profound moral significance and is frequently conceptualized as an *amanet* (Turkish borrowing meaning “trust”), capturing both a sense of intergenerational responsibility and the increasing fragility of linguistic inheritance. Thus, this study reveals a clear mismatch between positive language attitude and actual maintenance practices, though it is constrained by its single-community scope and time-bounded design. Future research could adopt longitudinal and comparative perspectives across similar communities. Overall, the findings challenge linear models of language maintenance, demonstrating that strong symbolic attachment does not necessarily inhibit language shift under sustained sociolinguistic and structural pressures.

References

- Agheysi, R., & Fishman, J. A. (1970). Language attitude studies: A brief survey of methodological approaches. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12(5), 137–157.
- Akın, G. (2023). *Ethnolinguistic vitality of the Hemshin language* (Doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University.
- Akkuç, M. (2024). Romeykanın etnobilimsel canlılık kuramı çerçevesinde incelenmesi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 64(2), 1661–1691.
- Alagözlü, N. K. (2002). *Code-switching patterns and underlying sociopsychological configurations in the Kabardian speech community: The probable effects of urbanization*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe Üniversitesi
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language contact and bilingualism*. Edward Arnold.
- Aytaş, S. (2007). *Bitmeyen muhacirlik*. Lozan Mübadilleri Vakfı Yayını.
- Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, personality and behavior* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.
- Bayar, Y. (2018). In pursuit of homogeneity: The Lausanne Conference, minorities and the Turkish nation. *Nationalities Papers*, 46(1), 24–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2017.1354362>
- Boix, E. (1993). *Triar no és trair*. Edicions 62.
- Canpolat, M. D. (2023). The identity of Lausanne exchangees across generations: The case of Mustafapaşa village. *Ankara Anadolu ve Rumeli Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(7), 37–65.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (1999). *Pluricentric languages in an immigrant context: Spanish, Arabic and Chinese*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cohen, A. (1974). Mexican American evaluative judgments about language varieties. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (3), 33–52.
- Dikici, A. (2014). Türkiye’deki Balkan muhacirleri arasında kaybolan bir topluluk: Torbeşler. *Avrasya Etüdleri*, 46(2), 123–165.
- Fasold, R. (1984). *Sociolinguistics of society*. Blackwell.
- Feifel, K. (1994). *Language attitudes and identity in Taiwan: A social evaluation of language in social change*. Crane.

- Ferrer, R. C., & Sankoff, D. (2003). Identity as the primary determinant of language choice in Valencia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7(1), 50–64.
- Fishman, J. A. (1964). Language maintenance and language shift as a field of inquiry. *Linguistics*, 2(9), 32–70. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1964.2.9.32>
- Fishman, J. A. (1985). *The rise and fall of the ethnic revival: Perspectives on language and ethnicity*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Multilingual Matters.
- Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. Academic Press.
- General Directorate of State Institute of Statistics. (2006). *Statistical indicators 1923–2005*. Republic of Turkey Prime Ministry. (Original census data from 1969.)
- Günçen, A. (2013). Pomaks as a Balkan community and evidence of Turkishness in their perceptions of identity. *Balkan Araştırma Enstitüsü Dergisi* (Trakya Üniversitesi), 2(1), 35–54.
- Gürel, O. (2025). Identity and diplomacy: The construction of Turkish national identity during the population exchange process under the Treaty of Lausanne. *Türkiyat Mecmuası*, 35(1), 173–195. <https://doi.org/10.26650/iuturkiyat.1607270>
- Karahan, F. (2004). Ethnolinguistic vitality, attitude, social network and code-switching: The case of Bosnian Turks living in Sakarya, Turkey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*.
- Krech, D., & Crutchfield, R. S. (1948). *Theory and problems of social psychology*. McGraw-Hill.
- Lambert, W. E., Hodgson, R. C., Gardner, R. C., & Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evolutional reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 66(1), 44–51.
- Lewis, M. P., & Simons, G. F. (2010). Assessing endangerment: Expanding Fishman's GIDS. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, 55(2), 103–120.
- Lieberman, D. (1975). Language attitudes in St. Lucia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 6(4), 471–481.
- Miserandino, M. (2007). Attitude formation. In R. F. Baumeister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of social psychology* (pp. 66–68). SAGE Publications.
- Pauwels, A. (2005). Maintaining the community language in Australia: Challenges and roles for families. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2–3), 124–145.
- Pauwels, A. (2016). *Language maintenance and shift*. Cambridge University Press.
- Republic of Turkey. Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1923). *Convention concerning the exchange of Greek and Turkish populations* (Lausanne, 30 January 1923). https://www.mfa.gov.tr/lausanne-peace-treaty-vi_-convention-concerning-the-exchange-of-greek-and-turkish-populations-signed-at-lausanne_.en.mfa
- Svetieva, A. (2009). On the migration of the Balkan Muslims and of the “Nashinci”: The Torbesh, Pomaks and other (Turks) in Turkey. **EthnoAnthropoZoom*, *(6), 39–67.
- UNESCO. (2011). *UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* (online edition). Paris: UNESCO.
- Ünlü, Z., & Hewitt, B. G. (Eds.). (2023). *Lazuri: An endangered language from the Black Sea*. Vernon Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1992). Language ideology: Issues and approaches. *Pragmatics*, 2(3), 235–250.
- Zimbardo, P. G., & Leippe, M. R. (1991). *The psychology of attitude change and social influence*. McGraw-Hill.

ГОД. 11
БР. 21

ПАЛИМПЕСТ

PALIMPSEST

VOL. XI
NO 21