

Balkan Slavic Dialectology and Balkan Linguistics: Periphery as Center

Victor A. Friedman

1. Introduction

Much of the effort in Balkan linguistics has been dedicated to discovering the unity in Balkan diversity. The former Serbo-Croatian (henceforth BCS) has generally been seen as marginal to the Balkan linguistic enterprise, while Bulgarian and Macedonian have been viewed as central to it, and indeed served as the classic example of the distinction between membership in a language family and in a linguistic league (Slavic and Balkan, respectively). Today, the southeastern dialects of BCS are sometimes included in Balkan linguistic accounts, although representations of distributions of features occasionally follow political boundaries rather than actual isoglosses (e.g., in southwestern Kosovo, where many representations have routinely followed the political border with Macedonia although the most significant isoglosses run into Gora, north of Šar Planina). I argue that Balkan Slavic is best understood at the intersection of internal developments and external contacts at the dialectal level, and that peripheries can be central to this understanding. In doing so I examine three types of Balkan linguistic phenomena:

- 1) Classic Balkanisms as dialectal features: future formation and object reduplication¹
- 2) Sites of resistance to contact-induced change in the Balkans: deixis
- 3) Phonological Balkanisms as micro-areal phenomena and linguistic emblems

I shall conclude that recent typological approaches to Balkan linguistics must be refined, and that ecological and epidemiological approaches to language contact combined with an increased attention to Balkan Slavic dialectology, contacts with non-Slavic Balkan languages, and comparisons with non-Balkan Slavic dialects demonstrate that peripheries can be central to our understanding of contact-induced change.

¹ By *Balkanism*, I understand a feature of linguistic structure shared among at least some of the languages/dialects of the Balkans that can be attributed either to structural borrowing or the mutual reinforcement of feature selection resulting from multilingual contact. Crucial evidence is a combination of the absence of the feature from earlier attested stages and the absence or lesser degree of development in related extra-Balkan languages.

2. The Future Marker

The Balkan future using an invariant particle derived from a verb meaning ‘want’ or ‘will’ was one of the first Balkanisms to be identified as such (Kopitar 1829). In both Balkan Slavic and Albanian dialects, the degree of the grammaticalization of the ‘will’ future is more complex than that presented in handbooks and surveys.² Moreover, Albanian peripheries in contact with Slavic are centers of innovation. In Albanian, ‘have’ and ‘want’ futures still appear to be in competition in the oldest full texts (16th century). Most superficial descriptions of Albanian will identify the future using a conjugated present of ‘have’ plus infinitive (=*me*+short participle) with Geg and the future using an invariant particle derived from ‘will’ plus subjunctive (=*të*+finite verb) with Tosk, the latter being typically Balkan, the former being characterized as more similar to non-Balkan Romance (or Romance in general). North-western Geg dialects such as Kelmend, the foothills above Shkodër, Plav, and Gucî (Shkurtaj 1975: 54–55, 1982: 222; Ahmetaj 1989: 298–99) have the typical Geg future but also use ‘will’+subjunctive—especially in speculations—and even conjugated *dua* ‘want’+infinitive, as occurs in the neighboring dialects of BCS:

- (1) Jam i lik e duo me dek (Shkurtaj 1975: 55)
 ‘I am ill and will die.’

Further west, along the left bank of the river Buna, only the ‘will’+subjunctive future occurs (Gjinari 1971: 352). A similar situation obtains to the southwest, in Puka (Topalli 1974: 316), which is transitional between the Northeast and the Northwest, although its center of gravity is Shkodër in the Northwest. However, in Shkrel, southeast of Kelmend, only ‘will’+subjunctive is used (but also *tash* ‘now’+progressive *po*+present indicative; Beci 1971: 298). In the southern part of Northeastern Geg, e.g., Has (Gosturani 1975: 237), as well as the Presheva/Preshevo valley (Badallaj 2001: 178), the future with ‘have’ is limited to a sense of obligation while ‘will’+subjunctive is more voluntive. In Southern Geg and the Central Geg of Upper Reka (in Macedonia), the future with ‘have’+infinitive has been completely replaced by ‘will’+subjunctive (Haruni 1994: 76). South of Has and west of Upper Reka, in Luma, the two types of future are in competition, but the ‘will’ type predominates (Hoxha 1975: 165; 1990: 136). West of Luma, in Mirdita, the ‘will’ future is regular and the ‘have’ future is rare (Beci 1982: 84–85). Similarly, in Tuhin, south-

² By degree of grammaticalization, I mean the extent to which the phenomenon is integrated into the grammatical structure of a given language as opposed to both competing phenomena and to its status as a pragmatic (and therefore context-bound) or lexical device. While I am looking at current status in synchronic terms, this status is nonetheless the result of diachronic developments. I do not mean to imply, however, that a single factor is responsible for the extent to which a given phenomenon is, for example, relatively obligatory or facultative.

east of Upper Reka, the ‘will’ future (with indicative) predominates, although ‘have’+subjunctive also occurs (as it does in the Tosk dialects of Italy [Arbëresh]) with relics also in Labëri (Totoni 1971: 73). In this region, as in transitional dialects such as Shpat, as well as Luzni (southwest of Peshkopi), the ‘have’+infinitive future uses *për*+verbal noun (=*të*+participle) rather than *me*+participle, which latter construction is extremely rare in Tuhin (Murati 1989: 41, 44; Çeliku 1971: 230; Beci 1974: 250). Thus, while some Geg dialects do indeed have conjugated ‘have’+infinitive in contexts where Tosk uses invariant ‘will’+subjunctive, the characterization of Geg being opposed to Tosk in a simple binary manner in this respect fails to capture the complexities of Geg usage.

As we have seen, Southern Geg goes with Tosk (including Arvanitika), while part of Northern Geg is linked with Arbëresh by the use of ‘have’ as the future marker. Macedonian and Bulgarian, as well as some of the Romani, Turkish, and Aromanian dialects with which they are in contact, however, also use a type of ‘have’ future construction, viz. a negative existential/possessive for the ordinary negated future as illustrated in Table 1. In Balkan Slavic and Romance, this is arguably a grammaticalized remnant of competing ‘have’ constructions, which functions alongside obligative uses of ‘have.’ The place of the ‘have’ future has not been adequately appreciated in Balkan linguistic work, although Asenova (2002: 217–18) rightly turns attention to it. It is not simply the rise of the ‘will’ future but also the competition of the ‘have’ future that makes Balkan Slavic Balkan.

Table 1. Grammaticalized Negative Future with Possessive/Existential

Macedonian	nema da odime
Bulgarian	njama da hodime
Aromanian (Kruševo)	noare s' neadzim <i>not.has SP we.go</i>
Romani (Arli)	na-e amen te dža[s] <i>not-is we SP we.go</i>
West Rumelian Turkish	yoktur gidelim <i>not-is that.we.go</i>
English	<i>we won't go</i>

In Balkan Slavic, both the invariance of the particle descended from ‘want’ and the use of the subordinating particle show dialectal variation at the periphery. The more archaic stage of conjugated ‘will’ seen in Kelmend Albanian (example 1 above) is also found in Romanian and the non-Torlak Što- and Čakavian dialects of BCS. In Leskovac (Mihajlović 1977: 51), the 3 sg clitic form of ‘will’ (*će*) is on the way to becoming the generalized particle. It can occur with all persons except the first (which uses *ću*), with finite forms, with or without *da*, and in word initial position. In general,

it seems that the first person is the last to be lost in the development of the future particle, at least in terms of the BCS evidence. In the northeast corner of the Timok-Lužnica dialect of Vratnica (Sobolev 1994: 379) the situation is similar, although *če* is also attested with the first person. On the other hand, most of colloquial Tosk drops the subjunctive marker *të*, bringing its future in line with Greek and most of Balkan Slavic (as well as some Balkan Romance). Variations in the retention of the subordinating particle, e.g., Macedonian *ke da*, to ameliorate degree of certainty, also complicates the picture.

The Balkan conditional, formed by the intersection of future and past markers (Gołab 1964, Belyavski-Frank 2003) is another important aspect of Balkan futurity that is not always taken into account.³ The most Balkan (or grammatically integrated) construction consists of the same particle that marks futurity plus a past tense form (imperfect, perfect or pluperfect). This construction is characteristic of most of Macedonian, of Bulgarian dialects in the southeastern Rhodopes (including Greece, Kokkas 2004: 174) and west of Kjustendil, of colloquial Tosk Albanian, Greek, and some of Aromanian. Slightly less grammaticalized (and older) is the future marker plus subjunctive marker plus past tense, which is the usual Tosk Albanian and Aromanian construction. Megleno-Romanian, which has mostly merged future and subjunctive, nonetheless uses invariant third person ‘will’ (*vręa*) plus subjunctive marker plus past tense to form a Balkan conditional (Atanasov 1990: 226, *pace* the older sources cited in Belyavski-Frank 2003: 245–46). Next down on the scale of grammatical integration (or back, in terms of relative archaism) is invariant imperfect marking on the particle plus *da* plus non-past, found in Torlak, e.g., *teše da idu* ‘I would have gone,’ adjacent Macedonian (Kumanovo-Kriva Palanka) and Bulgarian (western transitional) dialects.⁴ Still less grammaticalized is the conjugating imperfect of the verb which is also the source of the future particle with or without the subjunctive marker and a non-past, which is characteristic of most Bulgarian dialects. At the farthest periphery, the imperfect of ‘want’ plus infinitive in conditional-type meanings occurs in the South Slavic of Bosnia-Hercegovina, Montenegro, and Kosovo as well as in Banija, Kordun, Lika, and coastal Croatia south of there, western Serbia and Srem (Belyavski-Frank 2003: 18). Those Geg Albanian dialects that use the ‘have’+infinitive future employ an analogous conditional, namely a conjugating

³ Belyavski-Frank (2003; especially pp. 272–74) gives an excellent account of the complex semantics of Balkan conditional constructions, which include future-in-the-past, iterative-habitual, presumption, attenuation, ‘almost,’ etc. The complexities of the semantics are beyond the scope of this paper, but it is worth noting that the dialects of southern Montenegro, which use the same formal structure as the rest of the non-Torlak BCS dialects, have semantics that are closer to Balkan Slavic (and Greek), e.g., in the use of the Balkan conditional for iterative-habitual meanings.

⁴ Dialects around Skopje in the north and Galičnik in the west have imperfect marking on both the future particle and the main verb, connected by *da* (Belyavski-Frank 2003: 161).

imperfect of ‘have’ with the infinitive. Most of Daco-Romanian uses a special conjugating conditional marker whose origin is debated (the alternative hypotheses being reduced forms of ‘have’ and ‘want’; see Belyavski-Frank 2003: 253–54 for discussion), but the western peripheral dialects from Satu Mare in Maramureş, almost all of Crişana (with adjacent bits of Transylvania), and the central Banat employ an imperfect (Banat, also invariant in Arad) or perfect (elsewhere) of ‘want’ plus the infinitive (Belyavski-Frank 2003: 255).

To sum up, while the historical record makes it clear that the seeds of the Balkan future were already present in Latin, Greek, and Slavic at the time of contact, it is equally clear that the ‘will’ future in the Balkans is an example of mutual reinforcement and feature selection that began to take shape in the late middle ages but did not reach its current state until the early modern period, and in some areas, e.g., parts of Albania and Romani dialects, the process is still on-going. Competition with the ‘have’ future also shows local variation. While similar types of futures have developed elsewhere, the evidence of Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Balkan Indic (Romani) make clear the fact that in the context of European geography the Balkan future is indeed a Balkanism. Moreover, regardless of where the centers of diffusion might originally have been located, in the more recent past the intersecting peripheries of Western Macedonia and adjacent parts of Albania emerge as a center of innovation. The Balkan conditional presents a much less uniform picture than the Balkan future (see also Kramer 1995 on semantic complexities in the Balkan future), but the southwest Balkans again emerge as the center of innovation. In looking at the grammaticalization of future constructions, we see, on the one hand, that ‘will’ is still spreading at the expense of ‘have,’ ‘have’ is not altogether vanquished, and reduction to an invariant clitic is not altogether complete, especially in Romania, BCS, and Bulgaria (for the Balkan conditional, where the auxiliary conjugates).

3. Object Reduplication

While future marking is one of the first observed Balkanisms (Kopitar 1829), it was Seliščev (1918: 246–56, cf. also 1925: 45) who first extended Miklošič’s (1862: 7–8) original observation concerning reduplicated object pronouns to include substantival objects, noting that the phenomenon was as one of a number of typically Macedonian features (1918: 250) and became less frequent east of the Vardar. We should note, however, that prior to Seliščev, Wagner (1914: 130–31) observed that Judezmo reduplicates substantival objects even where Spanish does not. This last is particularly important in arguing for object reduplication as a true Balkanism. We can add that the dialectal pattern of degree of grammaticalization in Balkan Slavic also points to language contact as the chief factor in its spread and establishment. As with future formation, the most radical restructuring arguably occurred during the early modern period, contributing to viewing the *Pax Ottomanica* as the crucial period in the formation of the Balkan *sprachbund* as we have come to know it.

Reduplication is strictly dialectal in BCS; it is prescribed in standard Macedonian (and usually occurs in the Western dialects on which the standard is based) for all definite direct and all indirect substantival objects, and it is prescribed in standard Bulgarian only when essential for disambiguation or in negative existentials, (as illustrated in examples 2, 3, and 4), but is in fact completely avoided in formal contexts (Leafgren [1992: 287]).

- (2) Dārvata gorjat... (Asenova 2002: 109)
‘The trees are burning...’
- (3) Dārvata gi gorjat... (Asenova 2002: 109)
‘They burn the trees...’
- (4) Rākavāt e tuk, ama rākata *Ø/ja njama. (Guentchéva 1994: 164)
‘The sleeve is here but there’s no arm.’

Even for Macedonian, Petroska and Rista-Dema (2006) note that the pronoun can be omitted if the indirect object is the focus of the sentence, although this is not described in normative grammars. Thus, for example, in (5) the pronoun would be omitted if the sentence were an answer to the question ‘Whom did the professor help?’ but such omission would be impermissible in answer to ‘What did the professor do?’:

- (5) Profesorot [im] dade poddrška na studentite.
‘The professor helped the students.’ (Petroska and Rista-Dema 2006)

Another characteristic of standard Macedonian that is not prescribed but is practiced is the reduplication of indefinite (both specified and non-specified) direct objects. Example (6) is from Marko Cepenkov as cited by Koneski (1967: 262); example (7) is used by Koneski himself (1967: 231–32):

- (6) Star čoek da go pregrnuvaš vo son [...] boles kе te fati. (Koneski 1967: 262)
‘If you dream of embracing an old person [...] you’ll get sick.’
- (7) Razvieno prvo bitno vrz takvo vospriemanje, toa vo jazikot može da se oddeli sosem od nego, pa da imame prostranstveno opredeluvanje ne po toa kako vistinski ja doživuvame edna situacija, ami po toa kako **ja** zamisluvame, kako si ja pretstavuvame subjektivno. (Koneski 1967: 231–32)
‘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 Ø experience a [given] situation, but with how we think of it, how we represent it to ourselves subjectively.'

Leafgren (2002: 197) argues that Bulgarian object reduplication marks *aboutness*, (cf. *thématisation* in Guentchéva 1994), usually contrastive. The concept of *aboutness* enables Leafgren to account for the fact that topicality and focus are not always in complementary distribution. This fact, which is also recognized by Guentchéva (cited in Leafgren 2002: 177) and others, is illustrated in (8):

- (8) —Na piano svirja veče s dve râce. —Na pianoto! —Da. —I kakvo sviriš?
 —Razni pieski Ama edna ošte ne sám ja naučil, zaštoto e mnogo trudna.
 “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.’” (Leafgren 2002: 149)

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

- (9) Banan ne običam da go jam.
 ‘I don’t like to eat bananas.’ (Leafgren 2002: 176)

Turning now to dialects, we can begin with the northwesternmost limit of the phenomenon—southern and eastern Montenegrin dialects of BCS—where object reduplication is limited to pronouns. Moving eastward to Kosovo, substantival reduplication in Đakovica (Stevanović 1950: 113, 152) always involves datives, and, moreover, denotes people who are in some way specific, definite, or identifiable (such dative forms are typical topics). Moving southeast, examples from Prizren show some inconsistency (Remetić 1996: 544), but on the whole the frequency of reduplication in Prizren is similar to that found in Gora, with most examples being specific, determinate, definite, or in some way identifiable. In Gora, which many important isoglosses link with western Macedonian (including the postposed definite article, otherwise absent in Kosovo), reduplication normally occurs with definite objects, including proper names, but in (10) we see that it can also occur when definiteness is contextual but not marked (*ga prodavam bašča*) as well as when a new topic is introduced (*som ge turila pesto iljade*). The absence of reduplication in *mljekoto izməti* is problematic and must be left for future exposition:

- (10) —Bašča Ćazimofska, nji^h na bila bašča, taja mi bila bratova. Pa ka došof Samjl'o, som došla grančice da zemem.—Ja će ga prodavam bašča. [...]—Ja drva ze, mljekoto izmotti, omi sədo'. Vo nedra som ge turila pesto iljade. (Mladenović 2001: 577)
 “Ćazimovska garden, the garden was theirs, it was my brother’s. And when Samjl'o came, I came to gather larkspur.” “I will sell the garden.” [...] “I gathered wood, I churned milk, I washed dishes. I put five thousand in my bosom.””

East of Gora, in Sretečka Župa, where the definite article is lacking, reduplication is much less frequent. Adjusting for different sizes in the corpora, reduplication in Sretečka Župa occurs less than a fifth as often as in Gora. The examples all involve unique individuals, determined objects, or previously introduced topics as in (11):

- (11) pa de vidi dukat—zgazi,—dok gi zbrale sve dukati. (Pavlović 1939: 288)
 ‘and where he saw a ducat, there he stepped, until he had gathered up all the ducats.’

In contrast to the dialects of Kosovo, the Torlak dialects of Serbia do not seem to make much use of reduplication other than with pronominal objects, and even that usage is apparently in decline. Reduplication of substantival objects is absent from Belić’s (1905) material from southern Serbia and rare in Sobolev’s (1984) material from Vratanica. Toma [Thomas] (1998: 315–16) reports that in Niš and the surrounding villages (in the northern part of the South Morava region of Torlakia) reduplicated pronouns have become rare, and he speculates that this may be because the feature is perceived as a particularly salient dialectism. Vukadinović (1996: 151) observes the same in Crna Trava and Vlasina east of Vranje in the southern part of the Lužnica and Zaplanje regions, although it is more frequent in the Lužnica part of the region than the Zaplanje part. The definite article, however, is still fully functional in Timok-Lužnica and sporadic in parts of Zaplanje.

The east Macedonian and west Bulgarian regions show interesting variations in the details of object reduplication, and the rate and contexts vary from region to region in a non-linear fashion. Thus, for example, it is more regular in the southeastern part of the lower Vardar region than further northwest in the region. Gołab (1960/61: 118–20) reports for Suho and Visoka (Greek Sohos and Ossa) that reduplication is regular (i.e., normal but not absolute) with definite direct objects and possible but less frequent with indirect objects. For Ajvatovo (Greek Liti), west of Langadina (Greek Langadas), Adamou (2006: 34) reports that it is so frequent in her corpus as to be “quasi-obligatory” for determined objects, except with cardinal numerals. For Gevgelija, northwest of Langadas, Ivanov’s (1932: 109–22) material gives contra-

dictory evidence. The material he collected from his father from Geveglja itself shows regular reduplication, but that from Baba Tona from Mačukovo (Greek Evzoni) only has reduplication with pronominal objects. Approximately half-way between Langadina and Gevgelija, in Kukuš (Greek Kilkis), Peev (1987: 294–96) reports that direct object reduplication is regular only with personal pronouns and proper names while indirect objects tend to be reduplicated, albeit not always. In Greek Thrace, in the Bulgarian dialect of Săchanli (Greek Pontiki) in the Gjumjurdžina (Greek Komotini) region, Bojadžiev (1972: 212–13) reports the absence of object reduplication as “typical” for both pronominal and substantival objects, although it can occur. In the northwest of eastern Macedonian territory, in Kumanovo, Vidoeski (1962: 246) describes object reduplication as “normal” but also observes that it is not unusual for reduplication to be absent, especially if the object is not articulated (although definite reference may still be present). The following two examples from the same story illustrate the point:

- (12) Kólko páre si prodája kráve—ga prašúje Nastratín. (Vidoeski 1962: 290)
 ‘How much money did you sell the cows for asked Nasreddin’ but later in the same story.’
- (13) Zémev-ga oni prljaká^at. (Vidoeski 1962: 290)
 ‘They took the donkey foal.’

At the western edge of Bulgarian territory, on the other hand, in Kjustendil, east of Kumanovo (Umlenski 1965: 190–210), the use of reduplication is like that described for Sofia in Leafgren 2002, i.e., it is used for topicalization but is not obligatory, as in the following example about an ox that was killed in a traffic accident:

- (14) Pa stáreco si zéme lojta—dvanájse oki stari—a mesóto taká go izédoa orlíté.
 (Umlenski 1965: 190)
 ‘Well the old man took the fat—12 okas old style—and as for the meat, the eagles ate it.’

To the east (and slightly north), in Ihtiman, at the edge of the main isoglosses on which the traditional division in east and west Bulgarian is based, Mladenov (1966: 177–79) reports a similar situation, but even in contexts where reduplication would normally be expected, it can be absent. We can add that this is the case even when the standard requires it (cf. example 5 above):

- (15) Koláta i volóvéte níkade néma. (Mladenov 1966: 177)
 ‘There are no carts or oxen anywhere.’

Moving back to the northwest, in Bulgarian dialects bordering on Torlak we see a particularly interesting pattern of distribution at three points: Godeč (Videnov 1978: 74–78; 142–59), northwest of Sofia, Dimitrovgrad (Božkov 1984: 64), just across the border in Serbia, and Novo Selo, Vidinsko (Mladenov 1969: 156–57) in the northwest corner of Bulgaria, on the Danube, near the Timok. All three areas have reduplicated personal pronouns, but Dimitrovgrad does not have substantival object reduplication in the texts, whereas the two villages in Bulgaria do, although Novo Selo, Vidinsko sometimes lacks it with indirect objects. Of particular significance is the occurrence of reduplication with a non-articulated substantive in (16):

- (16) Dárvo ga isékemo. (Mladenov 1969: 156–57)
 ‘We cut [the(?)] wood.’

Standard Albanian differs significantly from standard colloquial Macedonian in two respects. First, while topicalized direct objects are reduplicated, non-topicalized (focused) direct objects are not (Kallulli 1999: 32; Buchholz 1977: 180), as seen in example (17). The version without reduplication would be the answer to ‘What is Agim doing?’ The version with reduplication would be the answer to ‘What is Agim watching?’. Example (18), the Albanian equivalent of (6), demonstrates that in Albanian indirect objects must be reduplicated regardless of whether they are topicalized or not.

- (17) Agimi po Ø/e vështron hënë.
 ‘Agim is watching the moon.’
 (18) Profesori i/*Ø dha ndihmë studentëve.
 ‘The professor helped the students.’ (Petroska and Rista-Dema 2006)

Standard Macedonian would require reduplication in the first instance, while the second would depend on context. Standard Bulgarian would prohibit it in both cases (although it would be likely to occur colloquially in the second), and Standard Greek would permit but not require reduplication in contexts of topicalization.

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. 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 insights. The situation for Romanian as described by Tasmowski De Ryck (1985), in which topicality is a factor but not a sole determiner, is in fact reminiscent of explicitness and aboutness as described by Leafgren (2002) for Bulgarian. It is

South Danubian Romance that shows most clearly the contact nature of reduplication. In Macedonia, Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian pattern with Macedonian, and thus, for example, in contrast to Daco-Romanian, all definite direct objects are reduplicated (Gołęb 1974: 37; Marković 2000: 58; Papatsafa 1997: 27/1999: 15). The Aromanian of Amiciu (Greek Metsovo) in Greece, however, patterns with Greek:

- (19) Kinele muske fčorulu.
‘The dog bit the boy’ (Beis 2000: 382).
- (20) Fčorulu lu muske kinele.
‘As for the boy, the dog bit him’ (Beis 2000: 232).

Interestingly, even Romani dialects in intense contact with Macedonian behave like Greek, which was its earliest and most significant Balkan contact language historically. The phenomenon thus appears in Romani as a site of grammatical resistance.

4. Deictic Oppositions

Unlike referential areal features such as object reduplication, definite/indefinite articles, and double determination, deictic oppositions as such do not generally figure in Balkan linguistic accounts, and with reason: deictic systems in the Balkans generally show resistance to contact induced changes at the macro-level, although micro-level deictic Balkanisms do occur. Balkan deictic systems can be characterized as two-term (which are all simplifications from earlier three-term systems) and three-term (which continue inherited distinctions albeit with differing material). The non-Slavic Balkan languages are all consistent in their use of two-term or three-term systems. Albanian and Balkan Romance (like all of Romance) have two-term proximal/neutral systems, e.g., Albanian *ky/ai*, Aromanian *atsest/atsel* ‘this/that.’⁵ Greek and Turkish have preserved earlier three-way distinctions, e.g., Greek *toútos*, *autós*, *ekeínos* ‘this, that, yon’ and *bu*, *şu*, *o* ‘this, this/that, that,’ respectively. Romani combines proximal/distal (or speech situation/discourse) (-a/o-) with general/specific (-d/k-) so that every demonstrative must express both oppositions, e.g., Arli *adava*, *akava*, *odova*, *okova* (see Matras 2002: 103–06). Almost all Romani dialects both within and beyond the Balkans preserve this unique quadripartite system.

Balkan Slavic differs from the rest of South Slavic and from other Balkan languages in that there are five parameters of dialectal differentiation in deictics: 1) older three-term vs. newer two-term systems, 2) proximal/neutral vs. distal/neutral in two-

⁵ Newer three-term systems such as Albanian spatial *këtu/aty/atje* ‘here/there/yonder’ do not concern us here.

term systems, 3) *s* vs. *v* as the proximal marker,⁶ 4) absence versus presence of postposed definite deixis, 5) presence vs. absence of case marking on postposed articles. Table 2 summarizes the distribution and root consonant marker. A hyphen to the left indicates that the marker occurs in postposed definite articles, a hyphen to the right indicates that the marker can occur in free-standing deictics.

Table 2. Balkan Slavic Deictic Categories

	Proximal	Neutral	Distal	Case on Def. Art.
Prizren	v-	t-	n-	—
Timok; Upper Gora	-v-	-t-	-n-	+
W. Macedonian	-v-	-t-	-n-	—
Lower Gora	-v-	-t-	—	+
Korča	s-	-t-	—	+
E. Macedonian	v-	-t-	—	—
E. Bulgarian/Kostur	—	-t-	n-	—
Rhodopes/Thrace	-s-	-t-	-n-	+

According to Mladenović (2001: 356), the loss of distal deictics in Lower Gora (from Mlike northward in Kosovo and all of Albania) is under the influence of Albanian, which, as just indicated, has the same type of binary deictic opposition. Prizren, like the rest of Kosovo and most of BCS territory, has a three-way deictic distinction but no definite articles. Like Lower Gora, the Macedonian dialects of the Korča (Albanian Korça) region also simplify to a proximal/neutral distinction, but with a different pronominal stem. Eastern Bulgarian, however, except in the Rhodopes and Thrace, has gone in the direction of East Slavic by losing the marker of proximity, but his change also occurs in the Kostur (Greek Kastoria) region. Eastern Macedonian also has a two-way deictic system, like eastern Bulgarian, but, as in Lower Gora and Korča, it is the distal that is lost. The situation in the eastern Balkans might be related to earlier contact with Balkan Romance, but the matter is in need of further investigation. Finally, the Timok-Lužnica (and transitional northwest Bulgarian) development, like those of Albania, Kosovo, and the southern Rhodopes, show a preservation of case endings on the article. Although oblique substantives also occur elsewhere in western Macedonian, such marking never occurs on an article.

In terms of center/periphery relationships, the interactions between deixis and definiteness in dialectal Balkan Slavic display differing patterns of conservatism and innovation. The Korča and Rhodopian developments are classic peripheral archaisms in their use of *s* and their preservation of some case distinctions. The Rhodopian is

⁶ The original proximal deictic is *s*- later often replaced by the oppositional deictic *v*- (cf. Flier 1974: 59).

more innovating in that *s-* is generally eliminated as a free-standing deictic. Gora and Timok-Lužnica share in the replacement of *s* by *v* but preserve case markers that West Macedonia does not. This leaves East Macedonia and Bulgaria, but also Kostur, as regions that have gone furthest in the direction of simplification. In terms of historical development, the grammaticalization of postposed deictics as articles must have involved all the deictics, and as the grammaticalization of definiteness proceeded, the marked deictic articles were gradually lost. The simplification in the western periphery is clearly contact-induced, but the eastern core is not as easy to explain. Nonetheless, given the relative stability of deictic systems in non-Slavic Balkan languages, the complexity of the Balkan Slavic situation indicates the importance of local conditions in systemic preservation and change.

The differential spread of the postposed definite articles and the reduplication of non-pronominal objects indicates that they mark different allegiances as well as different types of narrative strategy. The spread of the definite article to Gora and no further suggests its orientation to the south and the emblematic status of the definite article (cf. Enfield 2001: 267–68). Reduplication, on the other hand, is a different type of referentiality. The Prizren dialects, with their clear preservation of the accusative/dative opposition in substantives, argue against the case function of reduplication and in favor of its discourse function. At the same time it appears to have become negatively valued in the southeast Serbian periphery during the course of the 20th century.

5. Balkan Phonologies

The emblematicity of phonological phenomena and the effects of substrate influence on phonology render phonological Balkanisms distinctive and unifying at the micro-level rather than the macro-level. We can thus speak more accurately of Balkan phonologies rather than Balkan phonology. For example, Aromanian and Macedonian dialects in contact with Greek or Albanian have interdental fricatives in loan words and sometimes even in native words; Romani dialects in contact with Greek have /s/ for earlier /š/; various Slavic and Romani dialects in intensive contact with Turkish and/or Albanian have /ü/ (usually in loanwords, but sometimes also elsewhere), while West Rumelian Turkish dialects in contact with Albanian and Balkan Slavic lose /ö/. A significant diachronic development in the Debar town dialects of Macedonian and Albanian is shared reflex of the low back nasal of Common Slavic and Common Albanian as the same denasalized open /ɔ/. Moreover, the complete loss of nasalization in Debar Geg and its extreme attenuation in the mostly Orthodox Geg villages to the north toward Gora point to intense contact with Slavic (and, in Debar, Turkish). The loss of /h/ in the western Balkans can also be viewed from an areal perspective as the result of shared linguistic habits. It is striking that while local dialects of Albanian, Turkish, Romani, and Macedonian can share this phenomenon, in western Bosnia *h-*

loss versus preservation serves as an emblematic distinction between Serbs (Orthodox) and Croats (Catholics), on the one hand, and Bosniacs (Muslims), on the other. While the distinction may owe its origins to dialectal provenance, the role of emblematicity, especially in view of the position of dorsal fricatives in Arabic—the prestige language of Islam—cannot be discounted. This in turn highlights the syncretism of western Macedonia that we know of from other sources. There are many other examples, but we shall focus here on two: laterals in the western Balkans and stressed schwa in general.

The behavior of laterals is complex. Stevanović (1935: 43–45) notes that in most of eastern and southern Montenegro, *l* is automatically clear before front vowels and normally dark before back vowels, as in most Macedonian dialects (the clear/dark distinction being phonemic in Albanian). This alternating *l* is opposed to the palatal *l* of most of BCS. On the Zeta plain, however, just across the border from Hoti in northwesternmost Albania, there is only one *l*, and it is phonetically identical to the Albanian palato-alveolar clear *l*. This is also the case in the Slavic dialects of Gora. The Albanian pronunciation of clear /l/ is considered emblematically distinct by other Slavic speakers, yet Hamp (2002: 249–50) attributes the current BCS situation to an Albanoid substratum. Then again, pronunciation of etymological palatal *l* as a palatal rather than clear *l* is characteristic of the northern Macedonian dialects transitional to BCS. Velar *l* is also characteristic and emblematic of northern Greek dialects, which are those in the most intensive contact with non-Greek languages where the sound is present. The Macedonian automatic alternation is also found in local Romani dialects as well as Turkish. In Megleno-Romanian, velar *l* occurs only in the dialect of Tsărnareka, which is the most Slavicized (Atanasov 1990: 120).

Finally, the oft-cited example of stressed schwa as a Balkanism (first proposed in Miklosich 1862) requires dialectal sensitivity. Numerological approaches to Balkan linguistics ticking off features of standard languages to determine degree of “Balkanicity” often count this feature, to the detriment of Macedonian and Geg Albanian. Although standard Macedonian and the west-central dialects on which it is based lack stressed schwa, most dialects do in fact have the vowel, but from different sources in different regions, and moreover, the development was universally present during the late-medieval and early modern periods. Similarly, while stressed schwa is a typically Tosk structural feature, it also occurs in central Geg as a result of later processes of diphthongization. Thus, for example, in Mirdita stressed /i/ and /ɪ/ are diphthongized (and denasalized in the case of /ɪ/) to /ej/, then centralized to / əj/ which can be monophthongized to stressed /ə/ in words such as *korrek* (Tosk *korrik*) ‘July,’ *mullë* (Standard Geg *mulli*) ‘mill’ as well as preserved in Turkisms such as *açëk* ‘open’ (Beci 1982: 42). A similar situation obtains in Debar/Dibra (Bashi 1989: 151–52). On the other hand, Bulgarian dialects such as Teteven and Erkeč lack schwa altogether while Torlak BCS has it. Thus, a key problem with a typological approach to areal

linguistics (as already indicated by Hamp [1977: 281]), and one which is brought out by attention to dialectology, is that crucial details and historical facts can be missed.

6. Conclusion

As can be seen from the foregoing, the Balkan Slavic and Balkan non-Slavic dialectal pictures are considerably more complex than numerological or Eurological approaches to Balkan linguistics would suggest (for examples see van der Auwera 1998; Haspelmath 1998; Heine and Kuteva 2006).⁷ The former misses crucial facts, while the latter distorts the historical realities that brought about linguistic convergence in the Balkans. Contact-induced change moves in different directions in and among different languages depending on location, feature, and sociolinguistic relations. As Hamp (1977: 279, 281) has observed, in the 19th century, when the discovery of the regularity of sound change was in progress, we did not have a precise understanding of the place of changes conditioned by contact phenomena vis-à-vis divergences within given groups. Now, however, we understand that divergence in a linguistic family and convergence in a linguistic league are part of the same process and should be examined with the same rigor. We must therefore be careful to distinguish areal and typological approaches in general, and in Balkan linguistics in particular. This is not to say that a typological approach to the Balkan languages cannot afford insights into how language works. For example, as I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 2005), the behavior of Balkan admirativity shows correlations between tense and discourse factors that may well be typological in nature. In examining morphosyntactic phenomena that are more or less susceptible to change, as well as phonological developments, however, we see that as a periphery of Europe, the Balkans are nonetheless an historical center of innovation, and within that locus, it is the region of overlapping peripheries in the western Balkans whence change originates and radiates.

University of Chicago
vfriedm@uchicago.edu

⁷ By *Eurological*, I mean approaches to contact-induced language change arguing that all European languages are typologically convergent, the center of convergence being roughly the Romance/Germanic heart of the Holy Roman Empire, which happens to correspond to the six original members of the European Economic Community (France, Germany, Italy, Benelux). This approach reproduces the geopolitics of late 20th-century Europe, with the Balkans relegated to the periphery.

References

- Adamou, E. 2006. *Le nashta*. Munich.
- Ahmetaj, M. 1989." E folmja shqipe e Plavës dhe e Gucisë," *Studime gjuhësore*; 2: *Dialektologji*, ed. Sh. Berani, 223–342. Prishtina.
- Asenova, P. 2002. *Balkansko ezikoznanie*. Sofia.
- Atanasov, P. 1990. *Le mégléno-roumain de nos jours*. Hamburg.
- Badallaj, I. 2001. *E folmja e Hasit*. Prishtina.
- Bashi, N. 1989. "E folmja e qytetit të Dibrës," *Studime gjuhësore*; 2: *Dialektologji*, ed. Sh. Berani, 137–221. Prishtina.
- Beci, B. 1971. "E folmja e Shkrelit," *Dialektologja shqiptare* 1, ed. M. Domi, 268–330. Tirana.
- . 1974. "E folmja e Luznisë së Dibrës," *Dialektologja shqiptare* 2, ed. M. Domi, 223–81. Tirana.
- . 1982. "E folmja e Mirditës," *Dialektologja shqiptare* 4, ed. M. Domi, 3–92. Tirana.
- Beis, S. 2000. Le parler aroumain de Metsovo: Description d'une langue en voie de disparition. PhD diss., Université Paris 5 - René Descartes.
- Belić, A. 1905. *Dijalekti istočne i južne Srbije*. Belgrade.
- Belyavski-Frank, M. 2003. *The Balkan Conditional in South Slavic*. Munich.
- Bojadžiev, T. 1972. *Govorăt na s. Săchanli, Gjumjurđinsko*. Sofia.
- Božkov, R. 1984. *Dimitrovgradskijat (Caribrodskijat) govor*. Sofia.
- Buchholz, O. 1977. *Zur Verdoppelung der Objekte im Albanischen*. Berlin.
- Çeliku, M. 1971. "E folmja kalimtare e Shpatit," *Dialektologja shqiptare* 1, ed. M. Domi, 194–267. Tirana.
- Enfield, N. J. 2003. *Linguistic epidemiology: Semantics and grammar of language contact in Mainland Southeast Asia*. London.
- Flier, M. 1974. *Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavonic*. The Hague.
- Friedman, V. A. 2005. "Admirativity: Between Modality and Evidentiality," *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* (58): 26–37.
- Gjinari, J., 1971. "Vëzhgime mbi të folmen e Bregut të Bunës," *Dialektologja shqiptare* 1, M. Domi, 331–70. Tirana.
- Gołąb, Z. 1960/61. "Dva makedonski govora (na Suho i Visoka vo Solunsko)," *Makedonski jazik* (11/12): 113–82.
- . 1964. *Conditionalis typu bałkańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich*. Cracow.
- . 1974. "Strukturalna sporedba na eden vlaški i makedonski tekst," *Prilozi: Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite; Oddel za opštstvenite nauki* (5): 35–40.

- Gosturani, Xh. "E folmja e Hasit," *Dialektologja shqiptare* 3, ed. M. Domi, 211–69. Tirana.
- Guentchéva, Z. 1994. *Thématisation de l'objet en bulgare*. Berne.
- Haruni, S. 1994. *E folmja shqipe e Rekës së epërme të Gostivarit*. Skopje.
- Hamp, E. P. 1977. "On Some Questions of Areal Linguistics," *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, ed. K. Whistler and R. van Valin, 279–82. Berkeley.
- _____. 2002. "On Serbo-Croatian's Historic Laterals," *Of All the Slavs My Favorites: Studies in Honor of Howard I Aronson on the Occasion of his 66th Birthday*. ed. V. A. Friedman and D. Dyer, 243–50. Bloomington, IN.
- Haspelmath, M. 1998. "How Young is Standard Average European?," *Language Sciences* (20): 271–87.
- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford.
- Hoxha, Sh. 1975. "Vëzhgime mbi të folmen e Vilë-e-Kalisit të Lumës," *Dialektologja shqiptare* 3, ed. M. Domi, 130–210. Tirana.
- Ivanov, D. 1932. *Gevgeliskijat govor*. Sofia.
- Kallulli, D. 1999. The Comparative Syntax of Albanian: On the Contribution of Syntactic Types to Propositional Interpretation. PhD diss., University of Durham.
- Kokkas, N. 2004. *Úchem so pomátsko*. Ksanthi.
- Koneski, B. 1967. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturnen jazik*. Skopje.
- Kopitar, J. 1829. "Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache," *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46: 59–106.
- Kramer, C. E. 1995. "The Grammaticalization of the Future Auxiliary in the Balkan Languages," *Indiana Slavic Studies* 7: 127–36.
- Leafgren, J. 1992. Object Reduplication and Topicality in Bulgarian. PhD diss., University of Virginia.
- _____. 2002. *Degrees of Explicitness*. Amsterdam.
- Marković, M. 2000. *Govorot na Aromancite Faršeroti od ohridsko-struškiot region (vo balkanski kontekst)*. PhD diss., Univerzitet Sv. Kiril i Metodij - Skopje.
- Matras, Y. 2002. *Romani: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Mihajlović, J. S. 1977. *Leskovački govor*. Leskovac.
- Miklosich, F. 1862. "Die slavischen Elemente im Rumunischen," *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* (12): 1–70.
- Mladenov, M. 1966. *Ihtimanskijat govor*. Sofia.
- _____. 1969. *Govorát na Novo Selo, Vidinsko*. Sofia.
- Mladenović, R. 2001. *Govor Šarplaninske Župe Gora*. Belgrade.
- Murati, Q. 1989. "E folmja shqipe e rrëthinës së Tuhinit të Kërçovës," *Studiime gjuhësore*; 2: *Dialektologji*, ed. Sh. Berani, 3–113. Prishtina.
- Papatsafa, D. 1997. *Prikozmur din Meglenia*. Skopje.

- Papatsafa, D. 1999. *Vlaški prikazni od Meglen*. Skopje.
- Pavlović, M. 1939. *Govor Sretečke Župe*. Belgrade.
- Peev, K. 1987. *Kukuškiot govor* 1. Skopje.
- Petroska, E., and M. Rista-Dema. 2006. “Information Structure and Word Order in Albanian and Macedonian,” Paper delivered at the 15th Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore, March 30–April 1, 2006, University of California, Berkeley.
- Remetić, S. 1996. “Srpski prizrenski govor,” *Južnoslovenski filolog* 42: 319–614.
- Seliščev, A. 1918. *Očerki po makedonskoj dialektologiji*. Kazan.
- Shkurtaj, Gj. 1975. “E folmja e Kelmendit,” *Dialektologija shqiptare* 3, ed. M. Domi, 5–129. Tirana.
- Shkurtaj, Gj. 1982. “E folmja e Rranxave të Mbishkodrës,” *Dialektologija shqiptare* 4, ed. M. Domi, 144–278. Tirana.
- Sobolev, A. N. 1994. *Govor sela Vratarnica v vostočnoj Serbii v istoričeskom i areal'nom osveščenii*. Munich.
- Stevanović, M. S. 1935. *Istočnocrnogorski govor*. Belgrade.
- . 1950. *Đakovački govor*. Belgrade.
- Tasmowski De Ryck, L. 1987. “La réduplication clitique en roumain,” *Akten der Thedor Gartner-Tagung*, ed. G. A. Plagg and M. Iliescu, 377–99. Innsbruck.
- Toma, P.-L. [Thomas, P.-L.] 1998. *Govori Niša i okolnih sela*. Belgrade.
- Topalli, Xh. 1974. “Disa vërejtje për të folmen e krahinës së Pukës,” *Dialektologija shqiptare* 2, ed. M. Domi, 282–343. Tirana.
- Totoni M. 1971. “Vëzhgime rrëth të folmeve të Kurveleshit,” *Dialektologija shqiptare* 1, ed. M. Domi, 31–117. Tirana.
- Umlenski, I. 1965. *Kjustendilskijat govor*. Sofia.
- van der Auwera, J. 1998. “Revisiting the Balkan and Meso-American Linguistic Areas,” *Language Sciences* (20): 259–270.
- Videnov, M. 1978. *Godečkijat govor*. Sofia.
- Vidoeski, B. 1962. *Kumanovskiot govor*. Skopje.
- Vukadinović, V. 1996. “Govor Crne Trave i Vlasine,” *Južnoslovenski filolog* (42): 1–317.
- Wagner, M. L. 1914. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Judenspanischen von Konstantinopel*. Vienna.