

© Татьяна Цивьян – автор, 2010
© Jack Feuillet – автор, 2010
© Zlatka Guentchéva – автор, 2010
© Петя Асенова – автор, 2010
© Victor Friedman – автор, 2010
© Thede Kahl – автор, 2010
© Petrea Lindenbauer – автор, 2010
© Michael Metzeltin – автор, 2010
© Ingmar Söhrman – автор, 2010
© Христина Марку – автор, 2010
© Anastasiya Petrova – автор, 2010
© Ценка Иванова – автор, 2010
© Helmut Schaller – автор, 2010
© Ольга Младенова – автор, 2010
© Дарина Младенова – автор, 2010
© Уте Дукова – автор, 2010
© Todor Todorov – автор, 2010
© Birgit Iglá – автор, 2010
© Издателство „Фабер“, 2010

ISBN 978–954–400–357–9

**ГЛАГОЛНАТА СИСТЕМА НА БАЛКАНСКИТЕ
ЕЗИЦИ – НАСЛЕДСТВО И НЕОЛОГИЯ**

*Сборник доклади от Международна научна конференция
(ВТУ „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“, 30.IV–2.V.2009 г.)*

Редакционна колегия:

проф. д-р Петя Асенова
доц. д-р Анастасия Петрова
доц. д-р Ценка Иванова

Оформление Силвия Георгиева
Корица Ивелина Николчева

Формат 60x84/16
Печатни коли 17

FABER – В. Търново (062) 600 650; www.faber-bg.com

**ГЛАГОЛНАТА СИСТЕМА
НА БАЛКАНСКИТЕ ЕЗИЦИ –
НАСЛЕДСТВО И НЕОЛОГИЯ**



**THE VERBAL SYSTEM
OF THE BALKAN LANGUAGES –
HERITAGE AND NEOLOGY**

*Сборник доклади от Международна научна конференция
(ВТУ „Св. св. Кирил и Методий“, 30.IV–2.V.2009 г.)*

Димова, А. 1998: Херметично-херменевтично. Опит за интерпретация (и превод) на едно стихотворение на Паул Целан. – http://liternet.bg/publish9/ana_dimova/pcelan.htm

Michov, D. M. 1908: Die Anwendung des bestimmten Artikels im Rumänischen, verglichen mit der im Albanesischen und Bulgarischen. – *Vierzehnter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig*. SS. 1–111.

Младенов, М. 2008: Една морфологично-синтактична успоредница в български и румънски език. – *Диалектология. Балканистика. Етнолингвистика*. УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“ София, стр. 592–597.

Mladenova, O. M. 2007: Definiteness in Bulgarian. Modelling the Processes of Language Change. *Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 182*. «Mouton de Gruyter». Berlin. New York.

Пенчев, Й. 2004: Граматичната категория време в съвременния български книжовен език. – *Когнитивна граматика на българския и френския език – описание и формализация*, Академично издателство „Марин Дринов“. София, 34–109.

Sandfeld, Kr. & Hedvig Olsen 1962: *Syntaxe roumaine. III. Structure de la proposition*. Copenhagen. Librairie Munksgaard.

Săteanu, C. 1980: *Timp și temporalitate în limba română contemporană*. București.

Стоянов, Ст. 1980: *Граматическата категория определеност в българския език*. „Народна просвета“, София.

Τζάρτζανος, Αχ. 1946: *Νεοελληνική σύνταξη*. Αθήνα.

ЦИТИРОВАННЫЕ ИСТОЧНИКИ

1. Н. Хайтов, *Диви разкази* (превод на албанский Z. Dokle).
2. Ν. Καζαντζάκης, *Зорипάς* (превод на болгарский Г. Куфов).
3. *Ηπειρώτικα παραμύθια* (Hrsg. Thede Kahl & Andreas Karzis). Köln, Θεσσαλονίκη, 2006.
4. М. Твен, *Том Соуер* (превод на болгарский Нели Доспевска).
5. Didier van Cauwelaert, *L'apparition* «Albin Michel», 2001.
6. Болгарская пресса.

Victor A. Friedman (Chicago)

vfriedm@uchicago.edu

LABILITY AS A SCALAR BALKANISM

ЛАБИЛНОСТТА КАТО СКАЛАРЕН БАЛКАНИЗЪМ

Лабилността може да се определи като употреба на една и съща форма за интранзитивен и транзитивен глагол, напр. бълг. *Дървата горят* и *Дървата ги горят*. В македонския лабилните глаголи са по-чести, отколкото в българските езици, напр. *Ке умрам* и *Ке го умрам човеком*. Когато разглеждаме балкано-романските езици, виждаме, че арумънският е сходен с македонския, а румънският – с българския. Интересно е, че гръцкият повече прилича на македонския и арумънския по отношение на лабилността. В албанския и ромския лабилните глаголи са много по-редки, тъй като в албанския има медио-пасивно маркиране, а в ромския – каузативно маркиране. Въпреки това понякога има лабилни глаголи и в тези езици, особено в ромски диалекти, които са в контакт с македонския. В турския език, където има много силно развита каузативна морфология, лабилни глаголи не се срещат. Следователно, лабилността, която съществува в много езици по света, може да се смята все пак за балканизъм и като някои други балканизми има различни степени на реализация.

Verbal lability, i.e. the use of a form unmarked for voice as both transitive and intransitive is a characteristic that is typologically distinctive among the languages of the world. Thus, for example, it is characteristic of much Daghestanian but not of neighboring Kartvelian and Turkic, while Indo-European languages are divided between those that are more open to lability and those that eschew it. In the case of the Balkan languages, lability is a feature that Balkan Romance shares to some extent with non-Balkan Romance, but also with Greek, Albanian, and Balkan Slavic, all of which also have other fairly well developed voice-marking (intransitivizing) strategies. In the case of Balkan Slavic—especially Macedonian—lability is clearly connected to contact induced changes and is a feature distinguishing it historically from the rest of Slavic (although see below on current Russian developments). On the other hand, Balkan dialects of those languages with well developed causative strategies (Romani, Turkish) seem

to avoid lability even in heavy contact situations. It is thus the case that lability seems to be both contact-induced and contact-resistant in the Balkans. As a Balkan feature, lability has received very little attention. As in the realization of other verbal categories, Macedonian and Aromanian are distinguished as more similar to one another than to their Balkan genealogical relatives Bulgarian and Romanian, respectively (Gołąb 1970).

Let us begin with a few general observations on lability. Kulikov and Lavidas (2009) provide a convenient brief summary of current approaches. Using Modern Greek (and English) they illustrate the difference between what they call Patient-preserving lability (P-lability) in (1a&b) and Agent-preserving lability (A-lability) in (2a&b):

(1a) *O Janis espase to vazó.*

'John **broke** the vase.'

(1b) *To vazó espase.*

'The vase **broke**.'

(2a) *O Janis eface mesimeriano*

John ate lunch.'

O Janis eface.

'John ate.'

It is interesting to note that while P-lability of the type illustrated in (1) does not occur in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, or Albanian with the verb 'break', which would have to have mediopassive morphology or a mediopassive marker in a translation of sentence (1b), such usage occurs in Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance with 'burn', as in example (3a&b) from Bulgarian and example (4a&b) from Aromanian:

(3a) *Dǎrvata gorjat* (Asenova 2002:109)

'The trees **burn**'

(3b) *Dǎrvata gi gorjat.* (Asenova 2002:109)

'They **burn** the trees.'

(4a) *Hoara ardi baba s-cheaptinã.* (Cuvata 2009:65)

The village **burns**, grandma combs her hair' [cf. Nero fiddles while Rome burns.]

(4b) *Andartsilji arsirã Avdhela tu 1905.* (Papahagi 1974:194)

'The Greek bandits **burned** Avdhela in 1905.'

Macedonian and Romanian would also use the same verb in each of the two sentence, e.g. Macedonian *gorat* in [3], Romanian *arde* and *arsirã* in [4a&b], respectively; however, Albanian would require mediopassive morphology for the intransitive in both examples, e.g., in (3a&b): *drutë digjen* vs transitive *drutë djegin* in. Both Romani and Turkish would use etymologically related but synchronically different verbs for the intransitive and transitive 'burn' (*yan-* and *phabol* for the intransitive, *yak-* and *phabarel* for the transitive, respectively). Similarly, the other Slavic languages would not permit such P-lability with their equivalent (i.e., underived imperfective) forms of 'burn'. In the case of the A-lability of 'eat', however, all the Balkan languages have the same types of usage as that illustrated in (2a&b), with the caveat that if the verb is perfectivized in Balkan Slavic, it may require either a direct object or an intransitive marker.¹

As a general linguistic phenomenon, lability has a long history in Indo-European and a complex distribution in the modern languages. Thus, for example, despite their morphological complexities and distinct voice systems, Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek had considerable lability as seen in (5a&b) from Sanskrit cited in Kulikov (2009:24):

(5b) *rudrã rtasya sãdameshu vãvrdhuh*

'Rudras **have grown** in the residences of the truth'

(5c) *indram ukthãni vãvrdhuh*

'The hymns **have increased** Indra'

Modern English is said to have about 800 labile verbs (McMillion 2009), although in colloquial usage, especially expressive colloquial usage, almost any word can be a verb if the context is suitable, and almost any verb can be treated as labile.² Russian, on the other hand, has no P-labile verbs, although the number of A-labile verbs appears to have been growing since the nineteenth century (Letuchiy 2009). The lack of P-lability in Russian is characteristic of Slavic in general and of the ancestral language, and it is this type of lability that is of greatest interest

¹ We can note here that non-mediopassive 'burn' is 'active' or 'agenitive', e.g. Albanian *Dielli djeg* Turkish *güneş yakar*, 'the sun burns' but Romani *o kham phabola*.

² The problem of expressive and contextual usage need not concern us here.

to us here.³ We should note that in the case of P-lability, if the patient is animate then the transitive is causative, e.g., English *The dog walks/I walk the dog*.

While both Bulgarian and Macedonian share the kind of P-lability that does not occur in the rest of Slavic, Macedonian permits the kind of causative P-lability that does not occur in Bulgarian. Examples (6a&b), (7a&b) and (8a&b) are illustrative:

(6a) *Umram.*

'I die.'

(6b) *Go umram čovekot.*

'I kill the person'

(7a) *Zaspivam.*

I fall asleep.

(7b) *Go zaspivam deteto.*

I put the child to sleep.

(8a) *Šetam.*

I walk.

(8b) *Go šetam kučeto.*

I walk the dog.

In the case of (6), both Macedonian and Bulgarian have the option of using *ubie* 'kill', but only Macedonian also has the option of using 'die' transitively to mean 'cause to die'. Similarly, in (7), the meaning of *zaspiva* in both languages is 'fall asleep', but only Macedonian can use the verb to mean 'lull to sleep' (i.e., cause to sleep); in Bulgarian, the verb *prispiva* 'lull to sleep', which occurs in both languages, is the only possible causative. Finally, in (8), Bulgarian and Macedonian have both lexical and valency differences. In Bulgarian, *šeta* means 'to do housework' or 'roam'. The Bulgarian equivalent of Macedonian *šeta* is intransitive *razxožda se* and transitive *razxožda*, for which the Macedonian equivalent, *se razoduva* means 'begin to walk' and, like the Bulgarian, is not

³ We can note here the use of an active as impersonal in Old Church Slavonic, e.g. *pišetъ* translating the Greek γέγραπται 'it is written' (the Greek is a passive perfect; see also Vaillant 1977:179).

labile. Macedonian also has transitive *rašeta* in the meaning of Bulgarian *razxožda*, but our point here is that Macedonian has the option of using *šeta* as a labile verb.

Turning now to Romanian and Aromanian, we see that Aromanian follows the same patterns as Macedonian, while Romanian patterns with Bulgarian. Thus *mor(i)*, *do(a)rme*, and *(pri)imnā* have the same lability as *umre*, *zapiva*, and *šeta*, respectively in Macedonian, whereas Romanian *muri*, *dormi*, and *plimba* do not (the first two are intransitive, the last is transitive and must be marked with *se* in order to be intransitive, as in Bulgarian). In the case of Greek, *pe:gaíno* 'go' is labile as in (9a&b):

(9a) *Pé:ge sto sxoleío* (Asenova 2002:109)

'He goes to school.'

(9b) *Ton pé:ge sto sxol'eío* (Asenova 2002:109)

'He takes him to school.'

However, the equivalent of Macedonian *šeta*, which is *perpatáo:*, is only weakly labile. Speaker's found it unacceptable with *skylí* 'dog', although it was marginally acceptable in a sentence like (10) for some speakers:

(10) *?Na se perpaté:so: te: stáse:*

Let me walk you to the bus stop.

On the other hand, *páo:* 'go' is also labile in Greek. On the other hand, 'sleep' and 'die' are not labile in Greek, the intransitive and transitives being *koimóumai* vs *koimízo:* and *apothné:sko:* vs *skotó:no:*, respectively.

Turkish has a well established causative system, and no such lability occurs even in the west Rumelian dialects. Romani, however, is in a different position. Historically, Romani has a robust system of causative formation, although it has been transformed to varying degrees in varying dialects. One of the inherited causative formants is *-av-*, although in some dialects, such as Skopje Arli, the root *ker-* 'do' can also be morphologized to indicate causation, and in examples (11a&b&b):

(11a) *Me phirava.*

I walk.

(11b) *Me phiravava e džukele.*

(11b') *Me phiravkerdjava e džukele*

'I walk the dog.

On the other hand some recent loanwords into Skopje Romani such as *plivinel* 'swim' show the lability of Macedonian (*pliva*), lacking in Bulgarian (*pluvam*), as in (12a&B):

(12a) *Plivam* (Macedonian) = *Plivinava* (Romani)

'I swim.'

(12b) *Go plivam kučeto.* (Macedonian) = *Plivinava e džukele* (Romani)

I give the dog a swim.'

There is considerably more to be said about Balkan lability, particularly its relationship to tense, aspect, telicity, and inherent versus prepositional objects. These topics, however, must remain for the future. For the moment it suffices to observe that, as with the Balkan infinitive (Joseph 1983) or the Denatal Modal Subordinator (*da, të, sã/s', na, te*; Friedman 1985), lability is a scalar Balkanism. Here Turkish is at the extreme end of non-lability, with Romani and Albanian both being far less labile than Greek, Balkan Slavic, or Balkan Romance, albeit in different ways. Albanian has a strong mediopassive system, whereas Romani maintains causativity and even renews it morphologically, as seen in example (12). On the other hand, contact induced change in Romani is also seen in (12). Within Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance, Macedonian and Aromanian pattern together as the most innovative, whereas Bulgarian and Romanian pattern together as more conservative. Interestingly, it appears that Greek is also at the more labile end of the scale. The topic is clearly worth further investigation, but I hope to have indicated the basic outlines and most fruitful directions here.

REFERENCES

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

Goľab, Z. 1970. Za "mehanizamot" na slovensko-romanskite odnosi na Balkanskiot Poluoostrov. *Makedonski jazik* 21., 5–18.

Kulikov, L. 2009. The decay of Labile Syntax in Old Indo-Aryan: A Diachronic and Typological Perspective. in Kulikov and Lavidas, 24–25.

Friedman, V. A. 1985. Balkan Romani Modality and Other Balkan Languages. *Folia Slavica* 7(3), 381–389.

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

Kulikov, L. and N. Lavidas. 2009. Typology of labile verbs: focus on diachrony. in Abstract: 19th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics April 3–5, 2009, p. 17.

<<http://www.enl.auth.gr/symposium19/abstracts.pdf>. > Accessed 24 February 2010.

Letuchiy, A. 2009. The Emergence of Lability in Modern Russian, in Kulikov and Lavidas 2009, 25–26.

McMillion, A. 2009. The Labialization of English, in Kulikov and Lavidas, 26.

Markovikj, M. 2007. *Govorot na Aromancite Faršeroti od ohridsko-struškiot region (vo balkanski kontekst)*. Skopje: MANU.

Vaillant, A. 1977. *Grammaire comparé des langues slaves*. Paris: Klincksieck.