Recent research on language change and language contact has challenged Balkan linguistics from two opposing directions. On the one hand, arguments that structural borrowing does not occur or is extremely rare are bolstered by phonological data (Labov 2007), although the reliance of some approaches on the notion of “imperfect learning” (Myers-Scotton 2002) locates structural change in a realm perilously close to nineteenth-century ideas of “impurity.” On the other hand, typological approaches to areal linguistics that I call “Eurological” argue for Europe as a convergence area of which the Balkan Sprachbund is a periphery (Heine and Kuteva 2006).

Balkan Slavic dialectological data show that precisely the superficiality of morphosyntactic phenomena makes them amenable to structural borrowing, while at the same time phonological diffusion takes place without the transmission of structural constraints. Examples occur along the Albanian-Slavic contact zone. In morphosyntax, the spread of object reduplication and future marking with ‘will’ (and the relative grammaticalization of the future marker) serve as Balkan boundary markers that nonetheless operate along a cline. In phonology, Albanian alveo-palatal /l/ competes with Slavic clear and velar /l/ differently in eastern Montenegro, in southwestern Kosovo, and in western Macedonia. The factors involved include religion, clan, and urban/rural distinctions. Thus, while we can speak of a shared Balkan morphosyntax, it is more appropriate to speak of Balkan phonologies rather than Balkan phonology. Finally, the dialectology and history of these phenomena demonstrate that while Eurological approaches to language contact have ideological value and current interest, an attempt to project the present onto the past by conflating areal and typological linguistics obscures the role of the Ottoman Empire in Balkan linguistic convergence.