

## Variation and Grammaticalization in the Development of Balkanisms

*CLS 30 Papers from the 30th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society, Volume 2: The Parasession on Variation in Linguistic Theory.* Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 1994. 101-115. (Reprinted in *Studia Albanica*, Vol. 32, 1995-99, 95-110)

Victor A. Friedman  
University of Chicago

As Thomason and Kaufmann (1988:95) have observed, the Balkan linguistic league is both a complex (or *messy* to use their terminology) and a much-studied example of language contact. The earliest effort at elucidating the similarities of structure engendered by multilingualism in this region was Kopitar's (1829), in which the author observed that the Slavic, Romance and Albanian dialects of what was then Turkey in Europe gave the impression of having a single grammar using different lexical material. Approximately a century later, Sandfeld (1926, 1930) gave a definitive formulation to Balkan linguistics by systematizing a number of the most salient shared features among Albanian, Greek, Balkan Slavic (i.e., Macedonian, Bulgarian and the southernmost -- or Torlak -- dialects of Serbo-Croatian), and Balkan Romance (i.e. [Daco-]Romanian, Arumanian, and Megleno-Romanian), e.g. the replacement of infinitives with finite clauses and the development of analytic futures marked with particles derived from verbs meaning 'want'. There are indeed a number of semantic, syntactic and morpho-syntactic similarities among these Balkan languages due to centuries of contact, and proposals for constructing a single Balkan grammar with variable rules have been put forth since the middle sixties (see Kazazis 1968).<sup>1</sup> More recently, however, the Balkan languages have received little or no attention in current literature on variation (but cf. Sarmandu 1981), although the study of Bulgarian has seen an upsurge in discourse-pragmatic based solutions to a number of intractable grammatical problems (e.g. Dyer 1992, Fielder 1990, Leafgren 1992, McClain 1991). In this paper I shall expand on recent work in Bulgarian pragmatics by examining two Balkan linguistic phenomena that show variation in geographical and linguistic distribution from the pragmatically determined through syntactic rules to morphological encoding, viz. object reduplication and the manipulation of auxiliaries in verbal paradigms to express the speaker's attitude toward the information being conveyed (the so-called 'evidential' or 'reported/witnessed' distinction).

My main focus will be on the Balkan Slavic continuum (Macedonian and Bulgarian) and Albanian, although I shall also have occasion to comment on the other Balkan languages. I intend to show that both object reduplication and auxiliary manipulation are variable discourse markers in Bulgarian that become syntactically grammaticalized or replaced in Macedonian and syntactically or morphologically grammaticalized in Albanian. The synchronic distribution and diachronic development of these features suggest that at least some Balkanisms -- i.e. shared structural and other linguistic features among the Balkan languages attributable at least in part to contact -- arose from pragmatic attempts at more effective communication among multilingual speakers, and the distribution of the

continuum suggests that the grammaticalization of discourse functions tends to occur in precisely those regions where multilingualism is most intense and complex. This in turn can serve as evidence that discourse functions are not merely subject to borrowing, as demonstrated by Prince (1988; cf. also Mithun 1992), but actually function as entry points for the development of structural change. The synchronic Balkan situation thus reflects the diachronic development from variation through to complete grammaticalization as a result of grammatical competition.

It was Miklosich (1860) who first noted that the Balkan languages shared the phenomenon usually referred to in Balkan linguistic literature as object reduplication, i.e. the occurrence in the verb phrase of a clitic pronoun agreeing in gender, number, and case or case-function with a direct or indirect object as in the (1a) and (1b) in Macedonian and Albanian, respectively:<sup>2</sup>

- (1a) Na momčeto mu ja davam knjigata.  
to boy-DEF him-DAT it-ACC-FEM give-1SG-PRES book-DEF-FEM
- (1b) Djalit ia jap librin.  
boy-DEF-DAT him-it give-1SG-PRES book-DEF-ACC  
'I give the boy the book.'

The rule as it is usually stated is that definite direct and all indirect objects in Macedonian and Albanian must trigger reduplication. In fact, however, specificity also permits reduplication, although according to the codified norms it is not required or even necessarily desired (cf. Kazazis and Pentheroudakis 1975; Friedman 1993:291; Buchholz and Fiedler 1987:442):

- (2) Barav edna marka no ne najdov.  
search-1SG-IMPF one stamp but not find-1SG-AOR  
'I was looking for a stamp but didn't find one.' (true indefinite)
- (3) Ja barav edna marka no ne ja najdov.  
it-FEM search-1SG-IMPF one stamp but not it-FEM find-1SG-AOR  
'I was looking for a stamp but didn't find it.' (specific indefinite)
- (4) Atëherë po e dredh unë një cigarë.  
then PROG it roll-1SG-PRES I one cigarette  
'Then I'm rolling a cigarette, too.'

Although usually the same, the rules for object reduplication in Albanian and Macedonian differ in certain details. According to Buchholz and Fiedler (1987:443, cf. also Buchholz 1977:180), clitic doubling of Albanian definite direct objects can be facultative if the word order is canonical (SVO) as in (5a), especially if there is lexical emphasis on that object as in (6a). Such omission is not possible for indirect objects as seen in (7a). No such omission is permissible in standard Macedonian as seen in (5b), (6b), (7b):<sup>3</sup>

- (5a) Agimi po Ø/e vështron hënë.  
Agim-DEF PROG Ø/it watch-3SG-PRES moon-ACC-DEF

- (5b) Zoran \*Ø/ja gleda mesečinata.  
 Zoran Ø/it watches moon-DEF  
 'Agim/Zoran is watching the moon.'
- (6a) Në mbledhje Ø/e kritikuan sidomos drejtorin.  
 At meeting Ø/him criticized-3PL-AOR especially director-ACC-DEF
- (6b) Na sostanokot \*Ø/go kritikuvaa osobeno direktorot.  
 at meeting-DEF Ø/him criticized-3PL-IMPV especially director-DEF  
 'At the meeting they especially criticized the director.'
- (7a) Çfaqja \*Ø/i pëlqeu Agimit.  
 show-DEF Ø/him pleased-3SG-AOR Agim-DAT-DEF
- (7b) Pretstavata \*Ø/mu se bendisa na Zoran.  
 show-DEF Ø/him INTRANS please to Zoran  
 'The show pleased Agim/Zoran (= Agim/Zoran liked the show).'

Moreover, according to Buchholz (1977:188-89, even true indefinite direct objects in Albanian can require reduplication if they are preposed as seen in (8a) and (8b):

- (8a) Çdo gjë \*Ø/e duan gati.  
 each thing Ø/it want-3PL-PRES ready
- (8b) Ata Ø/\*e duan gati çdo gjë.  
 they Ø/it want-3PL-PRES ready each thing  
 'They wanted everything ready.'

Albanian also requires pronominal reduplication for clauses after verbs of thinking and perception when the subordinate clause expresses a 'determined' thought (Buchholz and Fiedler 1987:442), as in (9a), whereas the Macedonian equivalent in (9b) is ungrammatical:<sup>4</sup>

- (9a) E dija se do të vonohet.  
 it-ACC knew-1SG-IMPV that FUT SUBJUNCT be-late-3SG-INTR
- (9b) \*Go znaev deka ќе zadocni.  
 it-ACC knew-1SG-IMPV that FUT be-late-3SG  
 'I knew that he would be late.'

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 and Fiedler 1987:445-46). There are about a dozen verbs that behave this way, most of them verbs of motion as in (10) or idiomatic constructions such as (11). Here reduplication appears to be in part a morphologized or lexicalizing signal:<sup>5</sup>

- (10) Ia hipi kalit.  
 it-DAT + it-ACC mount-3SG-AOR horse-DEF-DAT  
 'He mounted the horse.'
- (11) Ia dhamë gazit.

him-DAT + it-ACC gave-1PL-AOR smile-DEF-DAT  
'We burst into laughter.'

Although object reduplication is grammaticalized in both Macedonian and Albanian, the process can be said to have been carried further in Albanian than in Macedonian, insofar as clauses (and topicalized indefinite direct objects) as well as definite or specific direct and all indirect objects can trigger reduplication. Moreover, to the extent that 'empty' clitic objects are used with certain verbs and idioms in Albanian, the process of reduplication has passed from morpho-syntax into the level of morphology and/or the lexicon. Although there is some variation in object reduplication in these languages which requires further study, the phenomenon is essentially a grammaticalized norm.

Unlike Macedonian and Albanian, however, Bulgarian object reduplication is entirely facultative and thus subject to discourse-bound variation. Although (1a) could also be an acceptable Bulgarian sentence, the reduplicated pronouns *mu* and *ja* would not normally be present, i.e. (12) is normal Bulgarian but dialectal, substandard or ungrammatical Macedonian:<sup>6</sup>

- (12) Na momčeto davam knjigata.  
to boy-DEF give-1SG-PRES book-DEF-FEM  
'I give the boy the book.'

In the fairly extensive literature on object reduplication in Bulgarian (see Leafgren 1992 and Guentchéva 1993, cf. also Ilievski 1962/63, 1973) a variety of proposals have been made to define the contexts in which the phenomenon is at least acceptable, if not obligatory, but until recently none could account for the actually occurring data. Among the factors that have been cited are definiteness, specificity, and OV word order (which is marked in relation to basic SVO order). Examples (13) through (16) from Guentchéva (1993:112-116) and Leafgren (1992:105-106) counter these various claims:

- (13) Kučeto ja goni edna kotka.  
dog-DEF-NEUT it-FEM chase one cat-FEM  
'The dog chases a cat.'
- (14) Krušata risuva deteto.  
pear-DEF draw child-DEF  
'The child draws a pear.'
- (15) Pokorena glava sabja ne ja seče.  
humble head-FEM sword-FEM not it-FEM-ACC cut  
'A bowed head is not cut off.'
- (16) Na kogo mu se jade nešto vkusno?  
to whom him-DAT INTRANS eat-3-SG something tasty  
'Who feels like eating something tasty?'

In example (13) the proleptic pronoun refers to a specific but indefinite object. In example (14) the order is OVS but unambiguous without reduplication.

Example (15) is actually a proverb using a generic indefinite, although the Turkish of which it is probably a translation has a definite accusative object.<sup>7</sup> It also stands as a counterexample to the claim that object reduplication serves a disambiguating function with regard to case relations, since in (15) both subject and object are feminine and stand before the verb.<sup>8</sup> Example (16), according to Leafgren (1992:105) is the one true indefinite in his corpus, but it is a pronoun, which as a class is more likely to trigger reduplication.

Leafgren (1992) demonstrates that when object reduplication does occur in Bulgarian, it is used to mark topicality, which he defines as the speaker's directing the attention of the addressee to the object in question rather than to the subject of the sentence, which is ordinarily (although not necessarily always) its topic, i.e. what the speaker is talking about (cf. also Guentchéva 1993:163, who uses the term *thématisation*). While topicality often coincides with such features as definiteness, specificity, animacy, and unusual word order (e.g., pre-verbal objects), these latter factors do not determine the use of reduplication in Bulgarian. In Leafgren's (1992:360-65) corpus, reduplicated clitics occur in only 2%-3% of those contexts in which they would be possible at least in principle. Moreover, indirect objects are reduplicated 2.5 times more than direct objects. This correlates with Givón's (1976:152) claim that indirect objects are more likely to be topics than direct objects. It also reflects the fact that in Macedonian and Albanian grammaticalized reduplication applies to all indirect objects but to only definite direct objects, and that in Albanian reduplication is facultatively omitted for direct objects under certain circumstances but not for indirect objects.

It is also clear from Leafgren's (1992:287) data that Bulgarian reduplication is more characteristic of colloquial style and virtually never occurs in scientific prose. The historical and dialectal evidence indicates that this restriction is due at least in part to the northeastern dialectal base of literary Bulgarian (Asenova 1989:83). Although, as Leafgren (1992:65-66) admits, in the end the decision about what is a topic is a subjective one, nonetheless the situation in Bulgarian is quite different from Macedonian and Albanian, where reduplication is the norm.<sup>9</sup>

The dialects reflect in synchronic spatial terms the diachronic development. Just as earlier Slavic documents that show reduplication began first with pronouns and earliest in southwest Macedonia and latest in northeast Bulgaria, so too in the modern northern and eastern Macedonian dialects that are transitional to Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian, e.g. in Kumanovo and Kukuš/Kilkis, object reduplication occurs with less consistency than in the west-central dialects on which literary Macedonian is based, and in the Serbo-Croatian dialects adjacent to Balkan Slavic and Albanian the phenomenon is limited to pronouns (cf. Vidoeski 1962:246, Peev 1987:294-96 and note 2).

To sum up thus far, Bulgarian variation in object reduplication constitutes a type of mirror image of the Albanian and Macedonian phenomenon. In Bulgarian, object reduplication is a discourse-bound pragmatic device characteristic of colloquial style and used to topicalize an object, whereas in Albanian and Macedonian the same basic rule has been grammaticalized to

mark definite direct and all indirect objects, with pronouns above substantives in the hierarchy. Just the opposite from Bulgarian, it is the omission of the clitic pronoun that is characteristic of certain levels of colloquial style and possibly pragmatically conditioned in Macedonian and Albanian. Macedonian is more consistent in reduplicating definite direct objects, while Albanian has extended reduplication to clauses and idiomatic constructions that look almost morphologizing.<sup>10</sup>

While variation in object reduplication is a morpho-syntactic phenomenon of the nominal system that results in the grammaticalization of topicalization via the addition of a new element, in the verbal systems of the languages under consideration there is variation in auxiliary usage through both omission and creation to instantiate new pragmatic and grammatical oppositions.

The omission or inversion of auxiliaries in perfects (or paradigmatic sets descended from them) to indicate speaker attitude toward the narrated event, e.g. surprise, doubt, non-confirmativity, the so-called witnessed/reported distinction, evidentiality, etc. -- a verbal category that, following Aronson (1977), I have called status (Friedman 1977) -- was first observed for Albanian by Dozon (1879), who introduced the term *admirative*, and for Bulgarian by Trifonov (1905).<sup>11</sup> The manipulation of perfects to indicate status is limited to the Central Balkan zone stretching from the Adriatic to the Black seas and bordered by Greek on the south and Romanian on the north.<sup>12</sup> Connected with this innovation is the preservation of resultativity either by discourse-bound variation or by the creation of new constructions and paradigms. In traditional Bulgarian grammar, reportedness is treated as expressed in special paradigms derived diachronically from the past indefinite -- i.e. the old perfect using the auxiliary meaning 'be' and the resultative participle in *-l* -- the only difference being the presence versus the absence of the auxiliary in the third person as in the old perfect of (17) versus (18), which is treated as marked for status:<sup>13</sup>

(17) Toj e bil v Sofija  
he is- AUX was-PT in Sofia  
'He has been/was in Sofia.'

(18) Toj bil v Sofija  
he was-PT in Sofia  
'He has been/was/is in Sofia [apparently, supposedly, astoundingly].'

In Friedman (1980b), based on numerous texts where the third person auxiliary could be either present or absent in the same narrative -- and even in the same sentence -- describing the same type of event, I argued that absence of the auxiliary in the past indefinite did not in fact mark a grammatical category but was only contextually linked to meanings associated with non-confirmative status. In subsequent work, Fielder (1990, 1994, forthcoming) convincingly argued that the omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the past indefinite is a discourse function, i.e. a pragmatic device, characterizing the narrator's psychological distance from the narrated events with omission of the auxiliary signaling foregrounding and presence of the auxiliary indicating backgrounding.

Examples (19) and (20), from Roth (1979:177-79), are from narratives of events that occurred before the speakers were born and are thus by definition reported. In both examples, the presence of the auxiliary signals backgrounding or resultativity while the absence marks a foregrounded event in the narrative.<sup>14</sup>

- (19) Vednăž **e pātuval** ot Burgas nadolu, kăm granicata - sela Fakija - i **pātuval** toj...  
 'Once he **was traveling** (+AUX) from Burgas down toward the border - [to the] village of Fakija - and [so] he **was traveling** (-AUX) ...'
- (20) Toj si ja **e viždai** tam i nakraja se **zapoznali** na ski - **bili sa** na ski.  
 'He **had seen** (+AUX) her there and finally they **met** (-AUX) one another skiing; they **were** (+AUX) on a ski trip.'

In Literary Macedonian and the western dialects, the auxiliary never occurs in the third person of the past indefinite, so there is no opposition conditioned by its presence versus its absence. Rather, a new paradigmatic perfect using the auxiliary *ima* 'have' and the neuter verbal adjective (the old past passive participle) has arisen in the southwest and gradually spread north and east. In the extreme southwest of Macedonian-speaking territory, i.e. in southeastern Albania (around Korča/Korçë) and adjacent parts of northwestern Greece (around Kostur/Kastoria), the past indefinite (the old perfect using 'be' + resultative participle in *-l*) has been completely replaced by the new perfect in 'have'. As one moves north and east, the old perfect becomes more common and less restricted. Thus, for example, in the Ohrid-Struga region in the extreme southwest of the Republic of Macedonia the old perfect is restricted to non-confirmative contexts, but in the Prilep-Veles region the old and new perfects are in competition, with the old one having assumed the role of unmarked past in opposition to the marked confirmative synthetic pasts (imperfect and aorist) and the new resultative perfect (see Friedman 1977 for details). East of an isogloss running along the rivers Vardar and Crna the auxiliary begins to appear in the third person of the old perfect, and, as one moves further north and east, the paradigmatic perfect decreases in frequency. Finally in Bulgaria the paradigmatic perfect using 'have' ceases to occur, although resultative syntactic constructions using 'have' plus the past passive participle of a transitive verb agreeing with a direct object do occur (see Kostov 1972). In morpho-syntactic terms, the gradation is illustrated in Table One.<sup>15</sup>

	K-K	O-S	P-V	E.-Mac	Bulg.
1. <i>ima bideno</i> 'has been' (new perfect of auxiliaries)	+	+	-	-	-
2. <i>ima dojdeno</i> 'has come' (new perfect of intransitives)	+	+	+	+	-
3. <i>ima dadeno kniga</i> 'has given a book' (new perfect of transitives)	+	+	+	+	-
4. <i>ima dadena kniga</i> 'has given a book' (syntactic perfect of transitives)	+	+	+	+	+
5. <i>bil/došol</i> 'was/come' (no auxiliary in old perfect)	-	+	+	+	+
6. <i>e bil/došol</i> 'has been/come'	-	-	-	+	+

(auxiliary can occur in old perfect)

TABLE ONE

We thus have a gradation from variation in the presence or absence of the auxiliary in the old perfect in Bulgarian indicating the speaker's attitudinal foregrounding and backgrounding of narrated events to the creation of a new perfect that entirely replaces the old one in the extreme southwest of Macedonian-speaking territory. In between, there are zones where the auxiliary is entirely absent and also where the old perfect is in competition with the new one. As one moves further south and west, the old perfect becomes increasingly restricted to non-confirmative contexts and is eventually completely replaced by the new perfect. Here again, pragmatically conditioned variation in Bulgarian appears as grammaticalization in Macedonian in progressive stages visible along an existing dialectal continuum. In Bulgarian, the absence or presence of the auxiliary in the old perfect as well as the syntactic 'have' construction pragmatically signal status or resultativity without encoding these categories grammatically, while in western Macedonia auxiliary omission is completely eliminated and the 'have' perfect is extended and paradigmaticized resulting in the grammaticalization of both status and resultativity.

Albanian has gone one step further in the grammaticalization of non-confirmativity by using an inverted perfect to create a separate series of paradigmatic sets, called in Albanian *habitorja* 'the admirative', which express meanings such as reportedness, surprise, doubt, etc. The progression can be seen in the following examples, where (19) uses a plain perfect, (20) has a present admirative, which in diachronic terms is derived from the inverted perfect and has taken on present meaning, and (21) illustrates a perfect admirative in which the admirative of 'have' functions as the auxiliary to form a non-confirmative (admirative) perfect:<sup>16</sup>

- (19) Ai ka qenë në Tiranë.  
He has-PRES been-PT in Tirana  
'He has been in Tirana.'
- (20) Ai qenka në Tiranë.  
he is-ADM in Tirana  
'He is [apparently, supposedly, astoundingly] in Tiranë!'
- (21) Ai paska qenë në Tiranë.  
he have-AUX-ADM been-PT in Tirana  
'He has been in Tirana [apparently, supposedly, astoundingly].'

One point particularly worthy of note is the connection between stative resultativity and present reference in the grammaticalization of non-confirmativity in perfects. As indicated in example (18), non-confirmative usage of the old perfect can be translated by an English present (the example would be the same in both Macedonian and Bulgarian). This is especially frequent in expressions of surprise. Such usage, however, is limited almost entirely to verbs of state, particularly the verb 'be'. These expressions of surprise refer to the previous existence of a state of affairs that the speaker would have been unwilling to vouch for prior to the moment of discovery, hence the meaning of

surprise and the use of a perfect to refer to a present resultative state. This same association led to the present meaning in Albanian admiratives derived from an original inverted perfect, which in turn led to the creation of an entire new paradigmatic series. It is particularly significant that in Albanian, any admirative tense form can be used precisely in those contexts in which the Balkan Slavic old perfect has an apparent present meaning, i.e. refers to the present discovery of a previously existing state. Examples (22a) and (22b) are both Albanian translations of the original Bulgarian of (22c), and (23) is a similar expression. While the Bulgarian of (22c) uses the old perfect without auxiliary, the Albanian examples have a perfect (22a), pluperfect (22b) and imperfect (23) admirative, respectively, in the same meaning (see Friedman 1982):

- (22a) Bre! gomar i madh **paska qenë** ky njeri!  
 (22b) Ore, fare gomar **paskësh qenë** ky njeri!  
 (22c) Brej, hepten magare **bil** tozi čovek.  
 'What an ass that guy **is**!'  
 (23) Ama njerëz fare pa mend **qenkëshin** këta...  
 'What fools **are** these...'

As in the case of object reduplication, so too in the relationship of resultativity to status Bulgarian shows discourse-bound variation while Macedonian and Albanian grammaticalize the phenomena in question.

Expressions of topicalization and status/resultativity in the Balkan Slavic continuum and Albanian demonstrate how one language's variation can be another's grammar. Moreover, this grammaticalization is reflected even more strongly in one of the contact languages, and this continuum of variation in synchronic space reflects diachronic developments. The evidence presented here primarily from Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Albanian suggests that classic Balkanisms such as object reduplication began with pragmatically conditioned constructions that became grammaticalized to varying degrees in different languages.<sup>17</sup> The motivation for the differentiating factors can be sought at least in part in the complexity of language contact.<sup>18</sup> Multilingual contact was more complex in southwestern Macedonia than in northeastern Bulgaria. Northeastern Bulgaria was dominated by Bulgarian and Turkish, with other Balkan languages represented only by a few villages or urban quarters. In southwestern Macedonia, relatively compact Macedonian, Albanian, Greek, and Arumanian speaking areas all converged along with significant populations speaking Turkish, Romani, and Judezmo. It can thus be suggested that the more complex multilingualism of southwestern Macedonia and the resultant greater need for clarity in communication contributed to the strengthening of pragmatic devices into grammaticalized features. In terms of historical developments, it can be also be argued that the dialects of the Slavs who dominated the territory of Bulgaria replaced the languages of the populations previously settled there, while Macedonia represents the periphery of the dominance of Balkan Slavic and the linguistic process was one of prolonged multilingualism among compact masses of different populations.<sup>19</sup>

It is worthy of note that this continuum of variation to fixed structures is reflected at other linguistic levels as well. Thus, for example, of all the South Slavic dialects, it is only in those of western Macedonia that the historically mobile stress of Slavic becomes phonetically fixed, usually on the antepenultimate syllable. As one moves north and east of this region stress becomes less predictable and more variable. In Albanian, stress is generally morphophonemically predictable, being fixed on the last syllable of the stem, although there are certain classes of exceptions. Similarly, in western Macedonian as in Albanian clitics occur at the head of a finite verb phrase, even in absolute initial position, whereas in eastern Macedonian, as in Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, older rules forbidding such a shift are still in force.<sup>20</sup>

It can thus be argued that the structural convergences known as Balkanisms must have begun as discourse-bound variations that resulted in part from communicative needs and desires and in part from competing grammatical systems. Balkanisms began as variation when speakers of different languages attempted to communicate more effectively and mediated between the languages of their interlocutors and the structures of their native languages. The place of these Balkanisms in the systems of the various languages can be described in terms of a continuum from pragmatically conditioned variation to grammaticalization, which in turn suggests, as indicated at the beginning of this paper, that discourse functions are not merely subject to borrowing but actually serve as entry points for the development of structural change (cf. Prince 1988). The grammaticalization of discourse functions tends to occur in those regions where multilingualism is most complex. Moreover, the process of the grammaticalization of pragmatic devices is itself reflected in dialectal variation. This degree of grammaticalization constitutes an additional category of isoglosses requiring further study. In focusing on variation in two morphosyntactic phenomena shared by the Balkan Slavic continuum and Albanian I have tried to show how a synchronic continuum from discourse-based variation in Bulgarian through grammaticalization in Macedonian and Albanian can be interpreted as reflecting the diachronic development of grammatical competition through language contact.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The Balkan dialects of Romani, although not usually considered in this context, display many typical Balkan features. Judezmo and the Rumelian dialects of Turkish also need to be considered in the broader Balkan context (cf. Friedman 1986b, Joseph 1983:252-53).

<sup>2</sup>In diachronic terms, pronominal objects occur earlier than other types of objects as triggers of reduplication in those languages with sufficient documentation (Greek, Romance, and Slavic, see Ilievski 1962/63, 1973). Synchronically, object reduplication in a sense defines the Balkan linguistic area (cf. Mascia 1976) in that reduplication of substantival objects is found only in the "classic" Balkan languages, whereas reduplicated pronouns extend into the areal periphery, namely the neighboring Serbo-Croatian dialects -- both the Torlak dialects bordering on Macedonian and Bulgarian and the southern

Montenegrin dialects bordering on Albanian -- as in (i) from Ivić (1958:17):

- (i) *Ñemu smo mu kazali.*  
him-DAT be-AUX-1PL him-DAT told-PAST  
'It was him that we told.'

<sup>3</sup>According to Ugrinova-Skalovska (1960/61), however, facultative omission of both accusative and dative doubled clitics does occur in nineteenth-century folklore texts, especially with imperatives and non-confirmatives (old perfects).

<sup>4</sup>The Bulgarian equivalent would also be unacceptable. Some speakers of Macedonian from the southwest will accept (4b), but this is not sanctioned in the literary norm.

<sup>5</sup>In the motion verbs, the reduplication is facultative, but in the idioms it is obligatory.

<sup>6</sup>Because Bulgarian and Macedonian are so closely related, it is possible to construct sentences that look identical on paper, although they differ phonologically.

<sup>7</sup>The Turkish version is the following (Ikonov 1968:200):

- (ii) *yavař bařı kılıç kesmez.*  
gentle head-ACC-DEF sword cut-NEG-PERM

<sup>8</sup>The disambiguating function is seen in examples such as that cited for Macedonian by Goľab (1953:285; cf. Ilievski 1973:209):

- (iii) *Jakuf ja zakopa řenata.*  
Jakuf her buried-AOR-3SG wife-DEF  
'Jakuf buried his wife.'

If *go* 'him' replaces *ja* 'her' the sentence means 'The woman buried Jakuf.'

<sup>9</sup>According to Geuntchéva (1993:164) and Asenova (1989:81) reduplication in Bulgarian is impossible when true indefiniteness is involved while it is required in one context, viz. with the definite object of the existential *ima/nema* 'there is/is not' as illustrated in (iv) and (v):

- (iv) *Prikazka Ø/\*ja razkazvaře vsjaka večer.*  
story Ø/it-FEM-ACC tell-3-SG-IMPF every evening  
'S/he used to tell a story every evening.'
- (v) *Răkavăt e tuk, ama răkata \*Ø/ja njama.*  
sleeve-DEF is here but arm-DEF it-FEM not-have/isn't  
'The sleeve is here but the arm isn't.'

In (iv), it could be argued that true non-pronominal indefiniteness is incompatible with topicality, while in (v) the object of the existential could be taken as its topic also by definition (but cf. example 16).

<sup>10</sup>The rules for Vlah resemble those for Macedonian (see Goľab 1984). Those for Daco-Romanian and Greek are more like Bulgarian (see Lopařov 1978).

<sup>11</sup>For a history of the study of these phenomena, see Friedman (1980a, 1981).

<sup>12</sup>West of Romanian, Serbo-Croatian forms a northern border region in which some status-like phenomena are reported to occur, while east of Greek, Turkish links the Central Balkan zone to the Caucasus and Central Asia in terms of status phenomena. See Friedman (1977:123-24; 1988b) for details.

<sup>13</sup>New paradigms using participial auxiliaries are excluded from the scope of

this discussion. For a detailed account, see Friedman (1986a).

<sup>14</sup>Bulgarian does not have the same rules for sequence of tenses as English, and so a pluperfect is used in example (20) to render the resultative effect although the Bulgarian form is a perfect.

<sup>15</sup>See Friedman (1988a) for details on the difference between morphological and semantic isoglosses.

<sup>16</sup>The truncated participle of 'have' is *pasē*. For additional details on the relation of tense to status, see Friedman (1981).

<sup>17</sup>Some constructions that must have begun as discourse-bound variation have been fully grammaticalized in all the Balkan languages, e.g. the analytic future using the auxiliary meaning 'will', infinitive replacement with subordinate clauses, analytic expression of case, etc. But even in these classic Balkan phenomena, the differences from language to language in degree of grammaticalization and permissible variation forms a continuum. It is interesting to note that here, too, the languages and dialects of southwestern Macedonia and adjacent parts of Albania and Greece represent the end of the continuum where the Balkan structure is most consistently realized. (cf. Joseph 1983:242-43, Friedman 1986b).

<sup>18</sup>The motivation for object reduplication has been attributed to the simplification or elimination of case systems in favor of analytic constructions. While it is true that reduplication can disambiguate, the fact is that in the vast majority of occurrences it does not serve this function, and its facultivity in Bulgarian militates against such a functional explanation. What reduplication does do is focus the attention of the addressee on a particular part of the message, and as such serves the purposes of communicative dynamism. Similarly, the manipulation of status/resultativity categories has been attributed to borrowing from Turkish. While similar phenomena in Turkish could certainly have given additional impetus to the Balkan Slavic and Albanian developments (cf. Friedman 1978), nonetheless the difference between the discourse-bound and grammaticalized manifestations of status/resultativity in Balkan Slavic and Albanian suggests that communicative strategies similar to those operating in object reduplication were primary motivating factors.

<sup>19</sup>It is worthy of note that Albanian object reduplication is also more consistent and frequent precisely in dialects on the periphery, in contact with Slavic (cf. Gjinari 1970:77)

<sup>20</sup>See Alexander (1993) for a detailed discussion of the place of Balkan Slavic prosodic phenomena in a theory of Balkan linguistics and the interrelationship between prosody and clitic placement.

#### REFERENCES

- Alexander, Ronelle. 1993. Remarks on the Evolution of South Slavic Prosodic Systems. In *American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists*, ed. R. Maguire & A. Timberlake, 181-201. Columbus: Slavica.
- Aronson, Howard I. 1977. Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian. *Folia Slavica* 1,1.9-32.
- Asenova, Petja. 1989. *Balkansko ezikoznanie*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

- Buchholz, Oda. 1977. *Zur Verdoppelung der Objekte im Albanischen*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR.
- Buchholz, Oda and Wilfried Fiedler. 1987. *Albanische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Dozon, Auguste. 1879. *Manuel de la langue chkipe ou albanaise*. Paris: Société asiatique de Paris.
- Dyer, D. 1992. *Word Order in the Bulgarian Simple Sentence: A Study in Grammar, Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Fielder, G. 1990. "The Bulgarian Evidential: A Pragmatically Determined Category?" Paper presented at Third International Pragmatics Conference, Barcelona July 9-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. "What's Aspect Got to Do with It?" Paper presented at Ninth Biennial Balkan Conference, Indiana University, Bloomington, April 7-9.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Forthcoming. The Discourse Properties of Verbal Categories in Bulgarian and the Implication for Balkan Verbal Categories. In *Gedenkschrift for Zbigniew Gołab.*, ed. by V. Friedman and M. Belyavski-Frank.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1977. *The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative*. Columbus: Slavica.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. On the Semantic and Morphological Influence of Turkish on Balkan Slavic. In *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting: Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by D. Farkas, W. Jacobsen and K. Todrys, 108-18. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980a. The Study of Balkan Admirativity: Its History and Development. *Balkanistica* 6.7-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980b. Reportedness in Bulgarian: Category or Stylistic Variant? *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 25/26.149-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. Admirativity and Confirmativity. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*. 17,1.12-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1982. Admirativity in Bulgarian Compared with Albanian and Turkish. In *Bulgaria Past and Present*, Vol. 2, ed. by D. Kosev, 63-67. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986a. Evidentiality in the Balkans: Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Albanian. In *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, ed. by J. Nichols and W. Chafe, 168-87. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986b. Romani *Te* in a Balkan Context. In *Językowe studia bałkanistyczne 1 (= Prace Slawistyczne 46)*, ed. by V. Koseska-Toszewa and I. Sawicka, 39-48. Wrocław: Polish Academy of Sciences.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988a. Morphological Innovation and Semantic Shift in Macedonian. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 24/1.34-41.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988b. The Category of Evidentiality in the Balkans and the Caucasus. In *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists: Linguistics*, ed. by A. M. Schenker, 121-139. Columbus: Slavica.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. Macedonian. In *The Slavonic Languages*, ed. by B. Comrie and G., 249-305. London: Routledge.

- Givón, Talmy. 1976. Topic, Pronoun and Grammatical Agreement. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. by C. Li and S. Thompson, 149-188. New York: Academic Press.
- Gjinari, Jorgji. 1970. *Dialektologjia shqiptare*. Prishtina: Universiteti i Prishtinës. (originally published 1966, Tirana: Universiteti i Tiranës.)
- Gołąb, Zbigniew. 1953. Funkcija syntaktyczna proklityki zaimkowej w gwarach macedońskich. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 4.275-91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *The Arumanian Dialect of Kruševo in SR Macedonia, SFR Yugoslavia*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka. 1993. *Thématisation de l'objet en bulgare*. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Ikonomov, Nikolaj. 1968. *Balkanska narodna mǎdrost*. Sofia: Bǎlgarska akademija na naukite.
- Ilievski, Petar. 1962/63. Prilog kon hronologijata na eden balkanizam vo makedonskiot jazik. *Makedonski jazik* 13/14.67-85. (reprinted in Ilievski 1988:167-181).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1973. Kon interpretacijata na modelot na udvoeniot objekt vo makedonskiot jazik. *Godišen zbornik, Filozofski fakultet na Univerzitetot Skopje* 205-220. (reprinted in Ilievski 1988:167-182).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *Balkanološki lingvistički studii*. Skopje: Institut za Makedonski Jazik.
- Ivić, Pavle. 1958. *Die serbokroatischen Dialekte*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Kazazis, Kostas. 1968. On a Generative Grammar of Balkan Languages. *Actes du premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud est européennes*, vol. 6, ed. by I. Gǎlǎbov et al., 823-828. Sofia: Bǎlgarskia akademija na naukite.
- Kazazis, Kostas and Joseph Pentheroudakis. 1976. Reduplication of Indefinite Direct Objects in Albanian and Modern Greek. *Language* 53.398-403.
- Kopitar, J. 1829. Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache. *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46.59-106.
- Kostov, V. 1972. Semantische Beobachtung über die Verbindung von imam mit dem Partizipium Perfecti Passivi im Bulgarischen. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 17,3.371-379.
- Leafgren, John. 1992. Object Reduplication and Topicality in Bulgarian, U. of Virginia. Ph.D. dissertation.
- Lopašov, Ju. A. 1978. *Mestoimennye povtory dopolnenija v balkanskix jazykax*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- McClain, K. 1991. "Pragmatic Considerations in Complementation", Paper presented at 24th Annual Meeting, American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, San Francisco, December 27-30.
- Masica, Colin P. 1976. *Defining a Linguistic Area*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Miklosich, Franz. 1860. Die slavischen Elemente im Rumunischen. *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*,

- Philosophisch-historische Klasse.* 12.1-70.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1992. The Substratum in Grammar and Discourse. In *Language Contact: Theoretical and Empirical Studies*, ed. by Ernst Håkon Jahr, 103-115. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Peev, Kosta. 1987. *Kukuškiot govor*, vol. 1. Skopje: Studentski zbor.
- Prince, E. 1988. On Pragmatic Change: The Borrowing of Discourse Functions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12.505-518.
- Roth, Juliana. 1979. *Die indirekten Erlebnisformen im Bulgarischen: Eine Untersuchung zu ihrem Gebrauch in der Umgangssprache. (Slavistische Beiträge 130)*. Munich: Otto Sagner.
- Sandfeld, K. 1930. *La linguistique balkanique*. Paris: Klincksieck. (originally published in Danish: 1926. *Balkanfilologien*. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.)
- Saramandu, N. 1981. Variation dialectale et variabilité sociolinguistique. *Logos Semantikos: Studia Linguistica in honorem Eugenio Coseriu*, 89-98. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Topolińska, Z. 1992. Za pragmatičnata i semantičnata motivacija na morfosintaksički balkanizmi. *Prilozi: Oddelenie za lingvistika i literaturna nauka - Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite* 16,1.119-27.
- Trifonov, J. 1905. "Sintaktični beležki za šædinenieto na minalo dejstvitelno pričastie s glagola *sãm* v novobãlgarskija ezik." *Periodičesko spisanie na Bãlgarskoto knižovno družestvo v Sofija* 66,3-4: 155-192.
- Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. 1960-61. Dve stiliski osobenosti vo nawiot govoren jazik. *Makedonski Jazik* 11-12.105-111.
- Vidoeski, Božo. 1962. *Kumanovskiøt govor*. Skopje: Institut za Makedonski Jazik.

*MAP OF PLACES MENTIONED IN THE TEXT*

