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When examined in its Balkan context, object reduplication tells us a number of things about language contact phenomena in general and Balkan contact phenomena in particular. It provides a striking illustration of the way a pragmatic phenomenon becomes syntactic and finally grammaticalized almost to the point of morphologization. The areal distribution of reduplication and its degree of integration into the various Balkan linguistic systems arguably reflects different diachronic stages as well as different synchronic systems. Of particular importance is the fact that the phenomenon shows varying degrees of encoding (as pragmatic or grammatical devices) on the basis of areal rather than genealogical relations. At the same time, this geographic distribution is additional evidence for the manner in which grammatical change can be triggered by pragmatic devices: object reduplication is more highly grammaticalized in the west Balkans than in the east, and the variations shown by Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian point to the areality of this feature. These data also demonstrate the importance of taking dialectology and less commonly examined Balkan languages (Aromanian, Romani) into account when discussing degrees of Balkanization.

1. Introduction

1.1 Reduplication as a term and as a phenomenon

In Balkan linguistic studies, object reduplication refers to the occurrence of a word or word-like unit (clitic, short or weak form pronoun) that has exactly the same grammatical role in a clause as another word, i.e., a clitic and long form of the same oblique

*Much of the research for this article as well as an earlier draft were completed while I was a visiting fellow at the Research Center for Linguistic Typology at LaTrobe University, whose support I gratefully acknowledge here.
personal pronoun or a clitic agreeing in gender, number, and case with a substantive
direct or indirect object.\textsuperscript{1} The following example from Macedonian is typical:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{(1) mu go davam moliv-ot na monšite-to.} & (Macedonian) \\
\textit{hih.dat il-acc Lgive pencil-dmv to boy-out} & \\
\textit{I give the pencil to the boy.}\textsuperscript{2}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Object reduplication is characteristic of all the Indo-European Balkan languages, albeit
its degree of grammaticalization – and thus its function – differs among these languages.
This paper will give an overview of basic and more recent research on Balkan object
reduplication, bringing together examples from a variety of sources including both
published and unpublished dialect descriptions that have not heretofore been utilized
in the study of object reduplication and the author's own field work (although I have
utilized published examples in most instances, the Albanian, Aromanian, Macedonian,
Megleno-Romanian, and Romani data and the generalizations drawn therefrom were all
checked with and/or collected from native speakers by me in Albania and Macedonia).
In this survey of object reduplication in the Balkan languages I shall attempt to give a more
nuanced account of its Balkan nature than has heretofore been available. Of particular
importance in this regard will be the fact that reduplication phenomena show varying
degrees of encoding (as pragmatic or grammatical devices) on the basis of areal rather
than genealogical relation.\textsuperscript{2} At the same time, this geographic distribution is additional
evidence for the manner in which grammatical change can be triggered by pragmatic
devices (cf. Mithun 1992; Friedman 1994; Fielder 1999; Wertheim forthcoming); object
reduplication is more highly grammaticalized in the west Balkans than in the east, and
the variation shown by Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian points to the areal-
ity of this feature and southwestern Macedonina as the core zone. These data also
demonstrate the importance of taking dialectology and less commonly examined Balkan
languages (especially Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Romani) into account when
discussing degrees of Balkanization. By Balkanization I mean the development and
grammaticalization of Balkanisms in the sense first used by Seličev (1925). Regardless
of whether the mechanism is understood to be what I will call here intrusion (the bor-
rowing, interference, or imperfect learning and subsequent spread of a feature found
in a contact language) or feature selection (the extension or increased development of
a phenomenon known or thought to have been present or potential prior to contact),
of crucial importance is the comparison with related languages outside the Balkans, for
those languages that have such relatives, plus temporal parameters to the extent that we
can determine them (see §7). Insofar as a given phenomenon in the Balkan languages
can be determined to be absent from – or, in the case of morpho-syntactic features, at
least not as fully grammaticalized in – related languages and/or earlier stages, then it
developed under the conditions of multilingual contact that we know existed in the
Balkans for centuries and can be labeled as a Balkanism. The existence of a similar feature
elsewhere in the world in an unrelated language, while interesting from a typol-
ogical point of view, does not change the fact that in the Balkans, given the historical
record that is at our disposal, the feature can be identified as an areal, contact-induced
phenomenon.

1.2 Normative accounts for the Balkan standard languages

In the normative accounts of the standard languages (which differ from actual usage but
nonetheless supply useful baselines), reduplication is required for definite direct and all
indirect objects in Macedonian (Koneski 1967: 335); it is required in similar but more re-
stricted contexts in Albanian, where a newly introduced or emphasized direct object will
not be reduplicated (Demiraj 2002: 227); it is still more limited in Romanian (Grau 1966:
144–147; Farkas 1978: 93–96; Tasmowski 1987: 382–383), where (a) definite direct and
all indirect substantival objects are required to reduplicate in preverbal position; (b) pro-
nominal objects reduplicate if they are definite and/or personal pronouns; but (c) redu-
plication is not permitted with postverbal direct objects not governed by pe (which for
substantives is limited to humans);\textsuperscript{3} reduplication is generally facultative in Greek
except with the pronoun ōlos 'all, everyone/thing' (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-
Warburton 1997: 194–195); it is not prescriptively required in Bulgarian except with
the existential use of ima/nàma literally 'have/not have', although reduplication is also
expected in order to disambiguate case relations (Stojanov 1983: 192–193); and it is
dialectal in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (henceforward BCS).\textsuperscript{4}

\textsuperscript{1} A number of other factors such as partitivity allow for optional reduplication, and Farkas
(1978: 95) notes that contrary to the prescription in Grau (1966) postverbal inanimate indirect
objects do occur as reduplicated:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{(i) l-} & (Romanian) \\
\textit{hez.det I have found some defects this.dat theory.dat} & \\
\textit{'I have found some defects in this theory.'}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{3} Owing to the ethnic basis of the current BCS situation, the same dialect can be claimed
as Bosnian, Croatian, or Serbian depending on the religion of the speakers. This includes the
2. Overview of reduplication in Balkan linguistic studies

2.1 Miklosich and Seliščev

Reduplicative phenomena involving clitic object pronouns have been noted as characteristic of the Balkan languages since Miklosich (1862: 7–8), who added the combination (Verbindung), i.e., co-occurrence, of short (enclitic) and full dative and accusative pronoun forms as a syntactic characteristic (Eigentümlichkeit) of Bulgarian, Romanian, Albanian, and Greek. We can add that the rest of Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance, as well as Romani also participate in this innovation vis-à-vis earlier attested stages of their parent languages. On the other hand, it appears that the phenomenon in Judezmo does not differ significantly from Spanish, nor does West Rumelian Turkish differ from the rest of Turkish.⁵ Seliščev (1918: 246–256, cf. also 1925: 45), extends the observation to the use of a clitic object pronoun to mark the presence of a direct or indirect substantival object in a clause. He notes that this is characteristic of definite or determinate objects, and with regard to Slavic he notes that it is consistently realized in the Macedonian dialects west of the Vardar but becomes rarer to the east. He also identifies object reduplication as one of a number of typically Macedonian features (tipišnomakedonski čerty; 1918: 250). Citing examples from Daniil’s Tetraglosson (cf. Leake 1814: 383–402), he notes that in most but not all cases reduplication in the Slavic (which is Ohríd Slavic) is present also in the Greek, Albanian, and Aromanian examples.⁶

5. In the case of Macedonian Judezmo, we can cite the following proverbs from Bitola with their Macedonian parallels:

(i) il polu tuertas la numeri lu indireche...
the stick crookedness fire ILACC straightens
kriv stap ogn-ot go upravuva
crooked stick fire-DEF ILACC straightens

(A Macedonian)

5.2 Sandfeld

Sandfeld (1930: 192–193) does not accord a particularly prominent place to object reduplication, citing it together with the merger of ubi/quo ‘where/whether’ as phenomena noted by Miklosich and Seliščev that are not essentiellement balkaniques (191). For the first he notes that it is general Romance (and, we can add, English) and that in Greek it is extremely early. For reduplication, however, he observes that while it also occurs in the Romance languages in general, it is more extensive (son extension est plus grande 192) in the Balkan languages.⁶ In fact, there is a fundamental difference between Sandfeld’s (192) French example le le connais, c’est homme-là and its Macedonian equivalent las go znam onoč čovek čovek ‘I know that man there/that man’. In written French the comma is obligatory, indicating a prosodic pause and syntactic clefing, whereas in Macedonian, the clitic pronoun is an obligatory and prosodically integrated part of the clause (cf. Assenova 2002: 106–107). Thus, while superficially similar and even related in their reference to the same object in the respective discourse, they are really quite different.⁸ Sandfeld describes Balkan reduplication as frequent but not obligatory in colloquial Romanian and Greek. He notes that it is more regular in Albanian, at least in some dialects (his examples are all Tosk), and that it is most regular in southwestern “bulgare”, i.e., Macedonian.

2.3 Lopašov

Lopašov (1978) is a landmark work devoted entirely to Balkan object reduplication, and he concludes (1978: 123) that reduplication constitutes, on the whole, the same phenomenon in Macedonian, Albanian, Romanian, Greek and Bulgarian. He notes, however, that while the initial impetus was the same, the ultimate results are not. Citing Orzechowska (1973), he observes that in Bulgarian, for example, the pressure of the standard language, which in this regard attempted to imitate Church Slavonic (and, we might add, Russian) models pushed object reduplication down to the colloquial register thereby retarding its grammaticalization or at the very least its expansion. It is worth noting here that a similar ideology of avoidance of object reduplication was at work among some would-be language planners of Macedonian (Risteski 1988: 421–422), whereas, however, the success of the west-central dialectal base in the establishment of the standard precluded such a

6. In fact, the Tetraglosson contains numerous examples in which definite objects are not reduplicated in any of the parallel texts. We shall return to this point below.


8. Leefgren’s (2002: 164–184) focus on what he calls “clause-level topicality” in Bulgarian is an important methodological point in this respect. For detailed argumentation concerning why it is topicality precisely within a given clause (as opposed to a sentence or larger chunk of discourse) that triggers reduplication in Bulgarian, see Leefgren (loc. cit).
restriction. The success in the case of Bulgarian is illustrated by the fact that Leafgren (1992: 287) found that there was not a single example of object reduplication in the contexts of formal expository prose, (cf. also Friedman 1994). Aside from the evident fact that object reduplication is more grammaticalized in languages in which it has not been actively restricted, Lopaşov notes that both contact and language internal factors have encouraged its grammaticalization. Among the factors he describes as triggering reduplication are the presence of pe or the ontological class (viz. animacy) of the object in Romanian (see §1.2 above). This, in turn, leads to the fact that in each Balkan language, the conditions under which object reduplication occurs differ according to language-specific factors, although Lopaşov (1978: 26, 57, 58) cited in Assenova (2002: 110) adduces the following general conditions or tendencies for reduplication:

i. most often marked with a definite article;
ii. more often pre-verbal than post-verbal;
iii. especially common when the object is a personal pronoun;
iv. indirect objects are more redoubled than direct objects;  
v. objects that are not definite are not reduplicated (but see §3 below).

Lopaşov describes the hypothetical endpoint of the development as the marking of every direct and indirect object, i.e., de facto polypersonal agreement (although the Hungarian definite conjugation arguably gives the model for a different type of grammaticalized end-point), and predicts that the tendency will continue, albeit at different rates of speed. He acknowledges the possibility that the etiology of the phenomenon could, in at least some cases, be independent (see also Keremetić 1993: 297–299), but he contends that language contact led to its expansion. Lopaşov (1978: 122) observes that in terms of degree of grammaticalization of object reduplication, from most to least, the Balkan languages can be ordered Macedonian, Albanian, Romanian, Greek, Bulgarian, and he closes indicating directions for further research, focusing on

statistical issues, colloquial versus literary phenomena, and Balkan versus non-Balkan comparisons.

3. Reduplication in Balkan Slavic, Albanian, and Greek

Point (v) of Lopaşov cited above – that reduplication is not associated with indefinite objects – is a highly problematic generalization and requires special consideration. Such reduplication does occur (Lopaşov 1978: 24–25, 34, 40–41, 48–49, 52 cites examples), and, moreover, supplies the fundamental challenge to traditional and normative accounts of Balkan object reduplication. In the sections which follow, we shall therefore particularly focus on indefinite object reduplication, as this is at once the most problematic and the most revealing. These sections will treat Balkan Slavic, Albanian, and Greek, which represent the full range of degrees of grammaticalization of object reduplication from most to least.

3.1 Reduplication of indefinite objects in Macedonian

Berent (1977) was the first attempt to compare indefinite object reduplication in Macedonian with Albanian and Greek as described in Kazazis & Pentheroudakis (1976; see §3.4). He began by translating example (2) from Kazazis & Pentheroudakis (1976: 400) into Macedonian, given here as (3), and then asking native speakers if they would accept it.

(2) Σού (tò) πλέκει ενα πουλόβερ.  
Greck  
YOU.DAT (ILACC) Knit one sweater

(3) Ti go pletam eden džemper.  
Macedonian  
you it knit one sweater  
'I knit/am knitting you a sweater.'

He reports: “There is no context in which (3), the Macedonian equivalent of (2), can ever be grammatical.” (p.13) Owing to the brief nature of a squib, Berent does not elucidate the contexts he tested, nor do we know how many speakers he asked, their origin or level of education, although they presumably controlled the standard. He goes on to cite the following examples:

(4) Vëra gi vidov edmi/mnogu/nekei/nekolku/troju bagë  
Macedonian  
yesterday them ACC I saw some/many/some/a few/three people

kako odav kon dolina-ta  
Berent 1977: 13  
how they go toward valley-DEF

'Yesterday I saw some/may/some/a few/three people going toward the valley.'
Berent notes that (4) is acceptable only to some speakers, while others judge it ungrammatical, non-literary, or dialectal. He explains the acceptability of (5) by making a distinction between specified and specific, claiming that Albanian and Greek distinguish specified (previous mention) from non-specified (new information), while Macedonian distinguishes specific (having an identifiable referent) versus non-specific (as yet unidentified referent).

Koneski (1967: 262), however, cites the following nineteenth-century example from Marko Cepenkov, which is clearly indefinite, and, moreover, non-specified and non-specific:

\[(7) \text{ Star čovek da go progrnuva vo son [...] boldu si te fati old person so him:ACC you:ACC in sleep [...] IJ illness to you:ACC grab 'If you dream of embracing an old person [...] you'll get sick.'} \]

(Cepenkov in Koneski 1967: 262)

Example (7), whose author was from Prilep, is especially interesting as it is a bare indefinite.

An important example of a non-specified (albeit specific) indefinite is cited by Naylor (1981, 1982: 536):

\[(8) \text{ [Prostranstvenoto opredelenie so clenot ne pretolaga bezdrugo edno realno vospriyemane na prostranstvenite odnosy vo davdnot moment.] Ravnico prevredno vce takvo vospriyemane, toa vo jazik-ot moze developed originally on such conception, that in language-def can da se oddeli same od neko, po da ime prostranstveno sp IT separates completely from it:ACC, and then SP we have spatial opredelenie ne po toa kako vistinski ja dotvorame definition not according to that how truly IT:ACC we experience edno situacija, am po toa kako ja zamislavame, kako si one situation but according to that how it we conceive how self:DAT ja pretstavavame subjektivno IT:ACC we present subjectively.} \]

(The proximal and distal definite articles do not always entail an actual encoding of spatial relations at the moment of speech.) ‘Originally developed on the basis of such a [spatial] conception, [the deictic article] can be completely divorced from it in actual usage, in which case we have spatial reference not in accordance with how we actually O experience a [given] situation, but with how we think of it, how we represent it to ourselves subjectively’ (Koneski 1967: 231-232 = [Del B, $53]$)

The situation ‘situation’ in (8) has not been previously introduced; it means ‘a given’ but not ‘a known’. What makes Naylor’s observation particularly salient is the fact that it was composed by Koneski himself. At issue here is the problem of elicited sentences versus naturally occurring discourse.

In this context, Berent (1977) exemplifies the fundamental problem of using the self-reported judgments of native speakers. Indeed, the recently available corpus of Macedonian (Macedonian Text Corpus) provides a number of other examples of non-specified reduplicated objects, including the following:

\[(9) \text{ Moguva, potrebno e da se naglasi deka jazik-ot e eden od however necessary is SP it stress that language-def is one from gladni-te elementi koi sto ja karakterizira edna zahvda, chief-def elements who what it characterizes one community, ethnička zahvda: ethnic community ‘However, it is necessary to stress the fact that language is one of the chief elements that characterizes a community, an ethnic community.’ (Macedonian Text Corpus)} \]

This example and many others like it demonstrate that potentially specifiable rather than actually specified or specific indefinite objects can indeed trigger object reduplication in Macedonian. On the other hand, Ugrinova (1960/61) cites nineteenth-century examples from Cepenkov’s autobiography and K. Sapkanov (two folktales from Vihbani, Ohrid district) in which definite objects are not reduplicated, but the contexts are insufficient to judge the motivations. It was probably the case that the objects in context were in focus. We shall return to this problem below.

3.2 Reduplication and aboutness in Bulgarian

The issue of usage, especially spoken usage, as opposed to elicitation and self-reporting, is particularly salient for the path-breaking work on Bulgarian in Leafgren (2002), made possible by the technology that enables the creation of computer-searchable corpora from large amounts of recorded data, namely Korpus ot razgovoren bulgarski ezik, originally collected for Aleksova (1994) and made available to the public. Before turning to this work, however, we should mention Guntcheva (1994), which builds crucially on Ivančev (1978: 137-149, 160-166) and discusses examples (10) and (11)

12 The citation in Naylor (1981/82), p. 21, is a typographical error.
with respect to conditioning factors for reduplication often cited for Bulgarian, viz. OV word order and disambiguation of case relations. Example (12) is also relevant here.

(10) Къде то жа гони една котка. (Bulgarian)
dog-DEF il.acc fem chase one cat fem
'It’s the dog that is chasing a cat.' (Guentcheva 1994: 111)

(11) КРУША-ТА risuva dote-to.
pear-DEF draw child-DEF
'The child draws the pear.' (Guentcheva 1994: 109)

(12) Покорена глava сабжа не жа се от.
humble head fem sword-DEM not il fem acc cut
'A bowed head is not cut off.' (Ikonomov 1968: 200)

In example (10) the clitic pronoun refers to a specific but indefinite object and could be used, for example, in answer to the question "What do you see in the picture?" (Guentcheva 1994: 116). In example (11) the order is OVS but unambiguous without reduplication if particular emphasis is placed on the pear (Guentcheva 1994: 109), i.e. if the topic is the child and the pear is clearly focused. Example (12) is actually a proverb (quoted using the participial form pokorna in Konstantinov’s Бял Гармо) using a generic indefinite, although the Turkish of which it is probably a translation has a definite accusative object. It also stands as a counterexample to the claim that object reduplication serves a disambiguating function with regard to case relations, since in (12) both subject and object are feminine and stand before the verb. It is worth noting that both (10) and (11) are likely to be perceived as ungrammatical if cited out of any explanatory context, and Guentcheva supplies contexts for these examples.

---

13. Pace Stoianov (1983: 192), which describes the reduplication in (i) as необходим "necessary":

(i) Дето ио усапало куле
child-DEF il accus bit.neut dog
'A dog bit the child'

it can be argued that context and intonation can be used to disambiguate.

14. The Turkish version is the following (Ikonomov 1968: 200):

(i) yıwaş baj-t kışć kemen.
gentle head acc def sword it does not cut

15. The disambiguating function is seen in examples such as that cited for Macedonian by Golšić (1953: 285; cf. Ilevski 1973: 209):

(i) Јакуф жа закопа јена-та.
Jakup fem buried wife-DEF
'Jakup buried his wife.'

If go ‘him’ replaces жа ‘her’ the sentence means ‘The woman buried Jakup.’

According to Assenova (2002: 113–115), however, reduplication in Bulgarian is impossible when true indefiniteness is involved, i.e., with bare indefinites as in (13):†

(13) Приказка О/‘ja наказвале въжка веер.
story О/def-fem acc tail-3sg:impf every evening
'She used to tell a story every evening.' (Assenova 2002: 114)

Guentcheva uses the term thematisation, which we can translate as "topicalization" to describe the function of reduplication. Assenova (2002: 113–115) argues that in Bulgarian pronouns are not reduplicated when they bear the logical stress and that any object accompanied by any sort of опредеletel 'identifier' (including, e.g., ‘one’ used as an indefinite article) has the potential to be reduplicated. In general, these studies are consistent with Kalluli (1999, 2000), who argues that for Albanian and Greek, reduplication marks topicalization, and topicalization is in complementary distribution with focus. Crucially, Albanian requires such reduplication in some contexts where it is optional in Greek (and in Bulgarian). We shall return to these points in our discussion of Albanian and Greek.

As indicated above, Leagren (2002) is unique among the sources on Balkan object reduplication in that it analyzes a huge corpus of colloquial data. This has enabled him to make arguments based on actual usage that until now had to depend on speaker judgments, which are not always reliable guides to what people actually say, as opposed to what they say that they say. With regard to object reduplication, Leagren’s main thesis (2002: 197) is that it marks what he calls aboutness, usually contrastive aboutness. He demonstrates that object reduplication in Bulgarian is almost always used as an overt marker of topicality when the clause-level aboutness of the object is unexpected owing to its not being a theme (or stable theme) at the discourse level. Thus, for example, in (14) the discourse theme, i.e., the topic of the context, is a philosopher, but in the clause with reduplication, the topic is adolescent greed:

(14) Но изведнаж здат гђрб-а му остана лёжиписто-то кћм
but suddenly behind back def kim day remained curiosity def to
žensko-то тжало, няма да се появява та натрупа
female def body not have it more adolescent def greed sp accumulate
opit i тoj се кува да цака na prijatel-ti te si...
experience and he it heard sp says to friends def self dat

‘But all of a sudden he lost his curiosity about the female body, the adolescent voracity for accumulating experience was now gone, and he was heard to say to his friends…’ (Leagren 2002: 180)

†. In the context of reduplication, Assenova (2002: 115) treats the presence of any опредеletel “defines,” including any sort of article or pronoun whether definite or indefinite, as неволно na opredelenost “equivalent to definiteness.” In this sense the term “referential” could be used. But the argument becomes circular when she continues: ako se suočavamo e възможно, dopolnitelno da se vidi за gramatički opredeleno i obratno; “if reduplication is possible, the object/complement should be considered definite, and vice-versa.”
The concept of *aboutness* enables Leaflgren to account for the fact that topicality and focus are not always in complementary distribution. This fact, which is also recognized by Guentcheva (cited in Leaflgren 2002: 177) and others, is illustrated in (15):

(15) – Na piano svirja veče i dve rike. – Na pianoto! – Da. – I kakvo on piano. I play already with two hands. on piano-DEF. yes and what kind sviriti? – Razni pjeski. Ama edna ošt ce sam ja naučili, zaitoto e you play different pieces but one still not am it learn-PT because is mnogo trudna. very hard

‘– I already play the piano with two hands. – The piano! – Yes. – And what do you play? – Various pieces. But one I haven’t learned yet because it’s very hard.’ (Leaflgren 2002: 149)

Leaflgren also makes the point that while reduplicated topics are usually specific, they need not be so, and cites an example from the oral corpus in which the discussion was concerned with markets:

(16) *Banan ne običam da go jem.* banana not LIKE SP ACC Leat ‘I don’t like to eat bananas’ (Leaflgren 2002: 176)

As in the Macedonian example in (7) and the Bulgarian example in (12), the reduplicated direct object here is a bare indefinite, which contradicts the assertion that reduplication does not occur with bare indefinites (see [13]). While it could be argued that these are all generics and that generics sometimes occur as indefinites, the fact remains that here the reduplicated object is a bare indefinite. Thus, (13) could occur with reduplication, although its interpretation would differ from the interpretation without reduplication.

### 3.3 Reduplication in dialectal Balkan Slavic

Keremedchieva (1993: 297–299) surveys much of the available Bulgarian dialect literature, which, unlike studies of the standard language, does make extensive use of spoken narrative, albeit not as spontaneous as in some of the modern urban corpora. Nonetheless, her observations are consistent with the previous observations, namely that object reduplication occurs relatively infrequently in eastern Bulgarian, and, moreover, the frequency seems to decrease as one moves east. In Macedonian, the standard language reflects its western dialectal base in this respect, whereas the situation in the eastern dialects is more like that in Bulgarian (Vidoeski 1960/61: 23). In this, as in many other crucial features, the BCS dialects of Gora (southwesternmost Kosovo) go with Macedonian. The Torlak dialects have pronominal reduplication, but the reduplication of nominal objects does not occur in the dialect literature, although speakers report that it is possible. Pronominal reduplication also occurs in southern Montenegrin dialects (Ivić 1958: 17). It is worth noting in particular that the BCS dialects of Srećečka Župa, just to the east of Gora in Kosovo lack the definite article (and other features) connecting Gora with Macedonian, but do display some substantial object reduplication as seen in (17) and (18) in opposition to (19):

(17) Traživ nekoj koj može da mu odgovori ruskomu cursu. he sought someone who can SP HIL DATE respond RUSSIAN DATE KING DATE ‘He sought someone who could respond to the Russian king.’ (Pavlović 1939: 256–57)

(18) pa de će vidjet dukat − sgori− dok gi zbrali sve dukati, so where you see dukat step-IMP until them ACC they gathered all ducats ‘and where [ever] they saw a dukat [they would] step on it until they had gathered all the ducats.’ (Pavlović 1939: 289)

(19) On ne čav da ide sa magare da potraži, teke žena otišla te he not wanted SP go for donkey SP seek and so wife went and mu dovela magare. him brought donkey [The wife has told him to go to the neighbors to borrow a donkey in order to get wood] ‘He didn’t want to go ask for the donkey, so the wife went and brought him the donkey’ (Pavlović 1939: 252)

The Slavic dialects of the Balkans suggest that the current areal situation reflects the historical spread of reduplication, from the regions with the most consistent and grammaticalized reduplication of substantival objects, in Macedonian, to their pragmatic encoding in Bulgarian and finally their general restriction to pronominal objects in dialectal BCS.

### 3.4 Reduplication as Topicalization in Albanian and Greek

The basic facts as reported in standard reference grammars are these. According to Buchholz & Fiedler (1987: 443, cf. also Buchholz 1977: 180), ditic doubling of Albanian definite direct objects can be faculative if the word order is canonical (SVO) as in (20), but such omission is not permitted for indirect objects as seen in (21):

(20) *Agim i po Oše vishtron hënë-n.* *Agim-DEF PROG Ošit watches MOON-ACC-DEF* ‘Agim is watching the moon.’
Moreover, according to Buchholz (1977: 188-89), even indefinite direct objects in Albanian can require reduplication if they are presupposed, as seen in (22) and (23).  

(22) Çdo gjë 'O/e duan gati, every thing O/t they want ready  

(23) A to Ó/e duan gati, they O/t they want ready every thing  

They wanted everything ready' (Buchholz 1977: 188-89)

Example (24) illustrates a typical use of reduplication for topicalization in Albanian. In the opening sentence of the article, Afërdita Aliu is introduced and is therefore part of the new information. In the later sentence, however, Afërdita is the topic and triggers reduplication:

(24) Në qendër të qyrit-të, dy persona të panjohur, që filmin in center PC.IF.ACC city-DAT.DEF two persons PC.IF.PL unknown that spoke

serbisht, Ó submuar dhe tentuan të Ó rrëmbejtë studente-n

Serbian Ó attacked and attempted SF Ô kidnap student-DEF.ACC

Afërdita-a Aliu (1973) nga Kaçanik u i Vjetër [...]. Njër-i

A.DEF. A. (1973) from K.DEF PC.M old one-DEF

nga persona-i e panjohur e paska submur ëvërdiri-n dhe from persons-DEF PC.PL unknown her.ACC have.AD attack.DEF.ACC and

ë paska kërcënuar me revo edhe mit 17 janar.

her.ACC have.AD threaten.DEF with and on 17 January

17. Albanian also has a series of constructions in which the verb takes only an indirect object, but both accusative and dative reduplicative pronouns (Buchholz 1977: 183; Buchholz & Fiedler 1987: 445-46). There are about a dozen verbs that behave this way, most of them verbs of motion as in (i) or idiomatic constructions such as (ii). Here reduplication appears to be in part a morphologized or lexicalizing signal (in the motion verbs, the reduplication is facultative, but in the idiom it is obligatory):

(i) la hipi kal-it. (Albanian)

il.DEF.ACC mounts horse-DEF.DAT

'H he mounted the horse.'

(ii) la dhâmë gazi-it. (Albanian)

him.DEF.ACC we gave smile-DEF.DAT

'We burst into laughter.'

It is worth noting that in southwestern Macedonian, the same kind of construction can occur:

(iii) mu go udrówma na scma (Macedonian)

him.DEF.ACC we hit on/to laughter

We burst into laughter.'

As noted above § 1.2, object reduplication in Greek is usually facultative except with 'everything' as in (25)

(25) Ola ta kseerei. (Greek)

all r.ACC.PL knows

'S he knows everything.'

It was Kazazis & Penthoudakis (1976) who first attempted to account for such instances. Basing their work on Greek and Albanian, they conclude that indefinite direct objects can, or even must, be reduplicated if they are specific, thematic, or contrastive. This foreshadows later studies that identify topicalization or "aboutness" as a conditioning factor. The authors also note that Romanian behaves similarly but has the additional complicating factor of animacy. Their key Greek example is (2) repeated here:

(2) Sou (to) plako éna poulòber. (Greek)

you.DAT (r.ACC) I knit one sweater

'I'm knitting you a sweater.' I'll knit you a sweater.'

(Kazazis & Penthoudakis 1976: 400)

Kazazis & Penthoudakis observe that the reduplication is unacceptable if (2) is the answer to questions such as "What are you doing?" or "What are you knitting [for me]?" but it would be expected if sweater is already the topic of conversation, e.g., as part of a conversation about sweaters or in reply to a request for a number of knitted items. They reach the same conclusion for Albanian, where reduplication can also be expected in cases of topicalization. Kühnle's (2000: 218-219) comparison of Albanian and Greek highlights the similarities and differences, as seen in the relationship of examples (26a-f) to the questions in (27a-d). By way of comparison, we have added the Standard Macedonian and Bulgarian equivalents:

(26) a. Ana Ó lexi libir-in.

A. read book-DEF.ACC

(b) Ana Ó dhiaorave to vivlio.

A. read the.ACC book.ACC

c. Ana e lexi libir-in.

A. it read book-DEF.ACC

d. Ana to dhiaorave to vivlio.

A. it read the.ACC book.ACC

e. Ana Ó pröčete kniga-ta.

A. read book-DEF

(Albanian)

(Bulgarian)
Kallulli makes the point that (26a) and (26b) answer questions (27a) or (27b) whereas (26c) and (26d) answer questions (27c) and/or (27d). A key difference between Albanian and Greek is that Albanian requires the clitic if the sentence is an answer to (27c) or (27d) whereas Greek permits the omission of the clitic regardless of the question, although it prefers the clitic in the same contexts where Albanian requires it. Example (26f) illustrates the fact that the reduplicated object is the only acceptable possibility in Standard Macedonian whereas the Bulgarian norm would prescribe the unreduplicated version of (26e). As Leafer’s (2002) data demonstrate, however, colloquial Bulgarian can be expected to pattern like Albanian and Greek.

Kallulli further makes a similar point using lexical focus, which, in the context of a simple SVO sentence means that the nonfocused item is the topic. Here we see that a focused object cannot be doubled in Greek and Albanian, while topical direct objects must be doubled in Albanian and can be doubled in Greek.

    Pope-REAL visited even Tirana
    ‘The Pope visited even Tirana’ - Tirana is focus

b. O Papas Ø epishteke akoma ke ta Tirana.
    the Pope Ø visited even and the the ACC Tirana
    (Kallulli 2000: 222(22))

c. Papa-ta go poseti duri i Tirana.
    Pope-REAL visited even and Tirana
    ‘The Pope visited even Tirana.’ - Tirana is focus

    even Pope-REAL visited Tirana-REAL
    ‘The Pope visited Tirana’ - Tirana is focus

b. Akoma ke o Papas (ta) epishteke ta Tirana.
    even and the Pope (the ACC) visited the ACC Tirana
    (Kallulli 2000: 223)

c. Duri i Papa-ta go poseti Tirana.
    even and Pope-REAL visited Tirana
    ‘Even the Pope visited Tirana’ - Pope is focus, Tirana is topic

3-5 Albanian and Greek dialects

With regard to Albanian dialects, Central Gëg as represented by Muhurr (Jully & Sobolev 2002: 63, 69-70) and Northern Tosk as represented by Leshnja (Jully & Sobolev 2003: 42-48) show differences that pattern with neighboring (and also contact) languages. Muhurr, which is in the Dibra region (Macedonian Debar) patterns like Macedonian, whereas Leshnja, in the Skrapar region tends to pattern more like Greek. According to Ilievski (1988[1973]: 164) reduplication is also particularly characteristic of northern Greek dialects.

4. Topicalization and factive Verbs

In one respect, however, Albanian and Greek have reduplication where Macedonian normally does not, namely with complement clauses of factive verbs or in factive contexts. According to Buchholz & Fiedler (1987: 442), Albanian requires pronominal reduplication for clauses after verbs of thinking and perception when the subordinate clause expresses a "determined thought", as in (30), whereas the Macedonian equivalent in (30b) is marginal.18

(30) a. E disa se do të vonobet.
    ilACC I knew that ru ss be late (Albanian)

b. [tOgo] znaev deka ke zadoci.
    ilACC I knew that ru ss be late (Macedonian)

    ‘I knew that he would be late.’

According to Kallulli (this volume), a reduplicated complement is a topic treated as a presupposition and therefore a fact. Thus, for example, while the clitic could not be omitted with di ‘know’, it would not occur with beson ‘believe’ unless the belief were accepted as fact. So, in (31a-b) the reduplicating pronoun would only be used if the object of belief were being presented as a fact, which would then make subsequent contradiction (e.g., ‘... but I could be wrong’) infelicitous:

(31) a. (E) besona se Jan-i shkoi.
    it I believed that J-REAL left (Albanian)

b. (To) pistepra oti o luvis efge
    it I believed that the I left (Greek)

    ‘I believed that John left.’

Albanian di ‘know’ and Greek ksero ‘know’ will normally be preceded by a reduplicative clitic pronoun when followed by a factive complementizer such as Albanian se

18. The Bulgarian equivalent would also be unacceptable. Some speakers of Macedonian from the southwest will accept (30b), but this is not sanctioned in the literary norm. In fact, it appears to be an elliptical version of Go znam faktot deka ‘I know the fact that …’ Smith (1999) makes related observations connected with German and colloquial English, which suggests interesting avenues for further comparative research but goes beyond our focus here.
'that' or Greek ἐτι 'that' but not when followed by the subjunctive complementizer (Albanian ḫet, Greek ἐτι), in which latter case the verb means "know how to" and does not, therefore, refer to an actual fact. It is also worth noting, however, that here, as in examples (26)–(27), Greek treats the reduplication as facultative whereas in Albanian it is expected. Moreover, in Greek, whereas a clause such as μετένωσα που 'I regretted that' will take a reduplicated clitic, a verb such as λυπώμαι που 'I feel sorry that' will not (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 1997: 453), Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton (1997: 453) describe this latter type as "a verb of strong emotion," but it appears that further research is needed on this matter. We can add that although Kalluli (2000: 231) judges reduplicated bare indefinites in Albanian and Greek as ungrammatical, in view of Leaflgren (2002), it may well turn out that spoken corpora for Greek and Albanian will provide additional and different insights.

5. Lability and genitive/dative differentiation

As already noted above, reduplication is not generally needed to disambiguate case roles, e.g., in example (12) (see note 13). Nonetheless, there are two phenomena connected with the disambiguation of syntactic roles (case relations) that are attributed to reduplication: the disambiguation or marking of labile verbs and the differentiation of indirect objects (dative) from possessors (genitive).

In Bulgarian, Leaflgren identifies one small class of exceptions to topicality as the trigger of reduplication, namely indirect objects without the prepositional marker na. Such constructions are highly colloquial, but occur in literature as well as speech, and although many of these occurrences are also topics, there are some instances where they are not, in which case, argues Leaflgren, case marking does appear to be the sole motivation:

(32) Какво mi дринкаi ti mene za turci-te, če bili pomilavti. (Blg) what me.dat you.jabber you me.osp for turk-def that were.I more-merciful 'Why are you jabbering to me about the Turks, that they're [supposedly]more merciful.' (Konstantinov cited in Leaflgren 2002: 136)

In Macedonian, the reduplicating pronoun makes the difference between an intransitive and a causative in (33a) and (33b) and between an indirect object and a possessor in (34a) and (34b):

(33) a. Дете-to спие. / spie dete-to.
   child-def sleep /sleeps child-def 'The child sleeps/is sleeping.'

   b. Дете-to go спие. / Go spie dete-to.
   child-def it.acc sleep /it.acc sleeps child-def 'S/he is putting/puts the child to sleep.'

   (Macedonian)

(34) a. Go pročita pismo-to na dete-to.
   it.acc read letter-def to child-def 'S/he read the child's letter.'

   b. Mu go pročita pismo-to na dete-to.
   him.dat it.acc read letter-def to child-def 'She read the letter to the child.'

The differences in word order in (33a) and (33b) can convey differences in focus and topicality that in English could be rendered by intonation or lexical means, and there are means of expressing possession other than the na-clause in (34a), but the basic point that the reduplication marks transitivity or the indirect object remains. It is important to note that when labile verbs function as transitives, the direct object must be a pronoun or definite substantive, or at least determined. Lopaskov (1978: 105–107) and Assenova (2002: 109) adduce similar examples from Bulgarian, Greek, and Romanian. Examples (35)–(38) illustrate the same point as (33a–b) using Bulgarian and Greek, while (39)–(40) is a Romanian example similar to (34a–b). Note that (35) could be interpreted with the meaning of (36) if it were clear from the context that 'trees' were the focus (e.g., instead of shrubbery). Without a special context, however, it will be interpreted as intransitive. Examples (38) and (40) require reduplication for their interpretation.

(35) Đärva-ta gorjat.
   trees-def they.burn 'The trees are burning'

   (Bulgarian)

(36) Đärva-ta gi gorjat.
   trees-def them.acc they.burn 'They burn the trees.'

   (Bulgarian)

(37) To paidi pége sto skoleio.
   the child goes.to the school 'The child goes to the school.'

   (Greek)

(38) To paidi to pége sto skoleio.
   the child him.acc goes.to the school 'S/he took the child to school.'

   (Greek)

(39) Ion a citit scrisoarea Mariel.
   John has read letter-def Mary-def.dat 'John read Mary's letter.'

   (Romanian)

(40) Ion i- a citit scrisoarea Mariel.
   John hef-def has read letter-def Mary-def.dat 'John read the letter to Mary.'

   (Romanian)

It should be noted, however, that while these subject/direct object and possessor/indirect object distinctions are disambiguated for Balkan Slavic, Greek, and Balkan Romance by reduplication, in the case of Albanian (and to some extent in Greek) the
6. Balkan Romance and Romani

Thus far we have concentrated our attention on those Balkan languages that represent the range and spread of object reduplication from the grammaticalization of Macedonian through the grammatical/pragmatic conditioning of Albanian to the pragmatic conditioning of Bulgarian and Greek. From a strictly phenomenological point of view, Balkan Romance and Romani are needed to complete the general picture of object reduplication as a Balkanism, but, especially in the case of South Danubian Balkan Romance, these languages also offer additional sociolinguistic and areal insights.

6.1 Romanian

As indicated above, Romanian is more restricted than Albanian in its requirements for reduplication, and word order, partitivity, and humanness all participate as defining factors (Farkas 1978: 93–96). In addition to the contexts requiring reduplication described above, there are also contexts where it is normatively prohibited, e.g., with non-personal indefinite pronouns, and non-personal substantive unless pre-verbal and marked as both specific and partitive (Farkas 1978: 93–96; Tasmowski 1987: 382–383). Tasmowski (1987) makes the point that a purely formal syntactic treatment cannot account adequately for actual usage, i.e., the presence or absence of reduplication can be pragmatically conditioned by the discourse context. Thus, for example, in a formal invitation sent by an embassy, an expression such as (41) would be used and reduplication would not be used:

(41) X are onoarea de a invita pe doamna profesor YZ. (Romanian)
X has honor-the of to invite pe Mrs. professor YZ.
X has the honor of inviting Professor YZ... (Tasmowski p.c.)

This stricture is reminiscent of Bulgarian, which, as we have seen, avoids reduplication in formal contexts. Liliane Tasmowski (1987) however argues that the formality is itself the result of the fact that reduplication entails some sort of familiarity with the topic, i.e., having a referent in mind beforehand (which she calls anaphoricity). The situation for Romanian as described by Tasmowski (1987), in which topicality is a factor but not a sole determiner, is in fact reminiscent of explicitness and aboutness as described by Leagren (2002) for Bulgarian.

6.2 Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian

Missing from all these accounts, however, is South Danubian Romance, and it is precisely these languages and their dialects that show most clearly the contact nature of reduplication. Macedonia-Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian patterns with Macedonian, and thus, for example, in contrast to Daco-Romanian, all definite direct objects are reduplicated. The Aromanian of Metsovo (Aminciu) in Greece, however, have the same pragmatic constraints as in Greek, rather than the grammatical requirements found in Macedonian. Thus, examples (42a), (43a), and (44a) show reduplicated direct objects in Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian with Macedonian translations (42b–43b) in contexts where Romanian would not reduplicate. Note in particular in (43a) that even the possessive construction, which in other Aromanian dialects would be a aistului om, in the Ohrid dialect (Frasheriot variety) also patterns like Macedonian by using a prepositional construction. On the other hand, examples (45)–(47) show that the Aromanian of Metsovo/Aminciu patterns with Greek.

(42) a. Așă-lu nu vrea s-i u-aspară kifé-(a) a fiitor-lui.
old-DEF not wanted s sp him it spoil pleasure-DEF to child-DEF-DAT
(Aromanian Krușevu)

b. Stâri-ot ne sakaie da mu go raziipe kef ot na dete-to.
old-DEF not wanted s sp him it spoil pleasure-DEF to child-DEF
(Macedonian)
‘The old man did not want to spoil the child’s pleasure.’ (Golaş 1974: 37)

(43) a. U vădžaj kas-a al aist om.
(Aromanian Ohrid)
It I saw house-DEF to that man/person

b. Ja vidov kukja-nu ao ovoj čovek.
(Macedonian)
It I saw house-DEF to that man/person
‘I saw the house of that man.’ (Marković 2000: 58)

(44) lâ loa bucium-ul, lâ turi shi ziizi . (Megleno-Romanian)
it,ACC took log-DEF it,ACC threw and said ‘he took the log, threw it[away] and said:...’ (Papatsaia 1997: 27/1999: 15)

(45) kinele muke florulu. (Aromanian Metsovo/Aminciu)
dog-DEF bit boy-DEF
‘the dog bit the boy.’ (Beis 2000: 382)

(46) florulu lu muke kinele. (Aromanian Metsovo/Aminciu)
boy-DEF him,ACC bit dog-DEF
‘As for the boy, the dog bit him.’ (Beis 2000: 232)

(47) tute nu līi shiu. (Aromanian Metsovo/Aminciu)
everything not in,ACC-PL I know
‘I don’t know everything.’ (Beis 2000: 449)
Example (47) reflects the same type of agreement as (25), viz. a plural for 'everything', as in Greek, but also as in Daco-Romanian El e stie pe toate 'He knows everything' (literally he ilacc.pl, knows on all.pl). In this respect, Balkan Romance is closer to Greek than to Balkan Slavic. See (52a–d) below with regard to the Romani of Agia Varvara.

6.3 Romani

The importance of Romani as a participant in the Balkan Sprachbund is increasingly recognized (Matras 1994; Boretzky & Igl 1999). This is especially the case in terms of phenomena such as modality and subordination. In terms of the morphosyntax of object reduplication, Romani occupies a middle position similar to that of Greek, which was its earliest and most significant Balkan contact language historically. Thus, Romani object reduplication tends to occur with preverbal objects and topocalized object pronouns. Examples (48) and (49) are typical in this respect:

(48) O melalo pansi na piina le ni o dzungale ruva.

O melalo pansi na piina le ni o dzungale ruva.
the dirty water not drink ilacc nor the bad wolves
'The dirty water does not drink nor the bad wolves.' (Jusuf 1996: 125)

(49) E Bifatos pendzaran, e dhaja da pendzaran, ama man the ACC Rifat. I know the ACC daughter ACC and know but me
ma aemize man kidsave bueende ridzaj kerav take.
not embroil me this work. ilacc request I make you dat
'I know Rifat and I know his daughter, but don’t mix me up in this business, I beg of you.' (Jusuf 1974: 14)

Example (50a–b) demonstrates that Romani in the dialects of Skopje does not correspond to the strong grammaticalization of the Macedonian system with which it is in intimate contact. Examples (50a–b), were recorded in July 1994 from a single broadcast of a Skopje Romani radio music-request program (Gili pil gili 'Song after song') in which the announcer switched freely back and forth between Romani (50a) and Macedonian (50b). The announcer consisted reduplicated when he spoke Macedonian, but not in Romani:

(50) a. O Ajnuri thaj o Dzemo tari i Svetska bahitaren the Ajnur and the Dzemo from the Sweden congratulate e pranden e Ramijeske thaj e Mirsadake the marriage. ACC the Raml the DAT and the Mirsadak DAT thaj e Safeteke thaj e Sadijahe bahitarena o bijan ... and the Safet. DAT and the Sadija DAT congratulate the wedding ...

'Ajnur and Dzemo from Sweden congratulate Rami and Mirsada on their marriage, and they congratulate Safet and Sadija on their wedding.'

IglŽ notes that the use of the plural accusative resumptive pronoun in Romani makes this a literal loan-translation rather than a reflection of the Romani system, which in this context would treat sa like English 'everything', i.e., as a singular.

Most Balkan Romani dialects lack a lexical verb meaning 'have', and those dialects use an existential construction that requires an accusative clitic pronoun. The possessor is in the nominative if it is a substantive but in the accusative if a pronoun, as in (53) and (54). This type of reduplication is unique to Romani in the Balkans.

(53) 

I daj si la duj tware. (Romani)

The nom mother is he ACC two children

'I have two children.'

(54) 

Man si ma[n] duj tware.

me ACC is me ACC two children

'I have two children.'
This same type of possessive construction also calques the existential use of ima “have” in Balkan Slavic, where reduplication is required in Bulgarian as well as Macedonian, as in the Romani of (55a) and its Macedonian equivalent in (55b):

\[
\begin{align*}
(55) \hspace{10pt} & \hspace{10pt} \text{a.} & \text{O virusi isi} & \text{le ko rat.} & \text{(Romani)} \\
& & \text{the virus} & \text{is II,ACC in blood} \\
& \hspace{10pt} & \text{b.} & \text{Virus-ot go ima vo kry-ta.} & \text{(Macedonian)} \\
& & \text{virus-DEF II,ACC has in blood-DEF} \\
& & \text{“The virus is in the blood.” (Friedman 2000: 192–193)}
\end{align*}
\]

7. The diachrony of object reduplication in the Balkans

With regard to the history of object reduplication in the Balkans, Ilievski (1988[1973]: 164) notes that the construction is attested at its earliest in Vulgar Latin. Even if there are hints of the construction in New Testament Greek (see note 7), this dates from a period when contact with Latin was already becoming significant. In the case of Albanian, we cannot know what the situation was before the sixteenth century, and object reduplication in the earliest texts is not well established (Assenova 2002: 105). In the case of Slavic, the phenomenon may well date back to the Old Church Slavonic period (Ilievski 1988[1973]), but it clearly does not become well established until the early modern period, and indeed the evidence from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries indicates that pragmatic factors still had some influence even in western Macedonian (Ugrinova 1960/61). Ilievski (1988[1973]) also makes the valuable point that even if internal factors played a part in the rise of object reduplication in Balkan Slavic, the fact that the phenomenon is absent from Slavic outside the Balkans points to language contact as a contributing or decisive factor. We can add that the dialectal pattern of degree of grammaticalization in Balkan Slavic also points to language contact as the chief factor in the spread and establishment of object reduplication.

8. Conclusion

When examined in its Balkan context, object reduplication tells us a number of things about language contact phenomena in general and Balkan contact phenomena in particular. It provides a striking illustration of the way a pragmatic phenomenon becomes syntactic and finally grammaticalized almost to the point of morphologization. Here the areal distribution of reduplication and its degree of integration into the various Balkan linguistic systems arguably reflects different diachronic stages as well as different synchronic systems.

The center of innovation is clearly the area where Central Gag Albanian, Western Macedonian, and Northern Aromanian, which overlap precisely in Western Macedonia, have been in intensive contact for many centuries. The situation to the south of that region, in Northern Tosk, Northern Greek and Southern Aromanian, taken in light of the reduplicating core to the north, suggests that, in view of the early historical attestations in Balkan Latin (and admitting the inadequacy of any speculation concerning the ancestor of Albanian), the process in this region advanced along a similar path, but has been retarded by influence from Greek, which has been more conservative in this respect.

To the east of the core, Eastern Macedonian as well as Bulgarian show a similar development that has only gone as far as topicalization, although, as was noted above (example (32)), the beginnings of a purely case-marking function are present in Bulgarian. We can add that it is also precisely in Eastern Macedonian that synthetic dative pronouns are replaced by na plus the accusative, as in Bulgarian, creating a similar possibility for a pure case-marking function of reduplication.

As we move further north to Romanian, on the one hand, and BCS on the other, the phenomenon becomes more restricted. Such features as humanness and parti
tivity for Romanian and the restriction to object pronouns (which also often denote humans) in BCS correlates with a higher degree of topicality.

The relative marginality of reduplication in Judozevo and Romani arguably corresponds to the marginality of those languages in the Balkans. As Topolnitska (1994: 121) writes: “Under such circumstances [the need to be understood in the process of oral communication in a multilingual environment] the primary candidates for grammaticalization are also those signals that will guarantee successful reference”. Unlike the classic Balkan languages, speakers of Romani and Judezmo learned others’ languages but their languages were not used by others, making the multilingualism unidirectional in this respect. This could well have contributed to the relative rarity of object reduplication, since such referentiality would not be taken place cross linguistically, although habits from speaking other languages were at least partially imported.

Second, despite the possibilities of parallel development and the operation of universal principles, the patterns of convergence in Western Macedonia, especially the evidence of Northern Aromanian, Western Macedonian, and Central Gag, are too striking to be attributed to mere parallelism, especially when known patterns of multilingualism are taken into account. The paralles of Tosk, Southern Aromanian and Greek also point to a secondary level of contact convergence. The process clearly began as one of contrast and topicalization and in the core became grammaticalized while remaining a pragmatic device encoding explicitness in the periphery.

Third, the differing treatments in Bulgarian and Macedonian also illustrate how standardization, and, perhaps, language ideology (§2.3), can influence usage. Reduplication is thus seen as classically Balkan, with Romani and Judezmo on the
margins, and its differing degree of grammaticalization in the various languages and dialects reflects the history of its incorporation into the different systems under diverse contact situations. Moreover, the core of the phenomenon is seen in Western Macedonia, but the evidence of Megleno-Romanian suggests a South Danubian Romance impetus.

### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>INF</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>PT</th>
<th>PROG</th>
<th>SP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
<td>intransitive marker</td>
<td>verbal-form/past indefinite</td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>particle of concord</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>subordinating modal particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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