

## **The Balkan Sprachbund properties:** An introduction to *Topics in Balkan Syntax and Semantics*

Olga Mišeska Tomić  
*University of Leiden Center for Linguistics*

Having discussed the theories about the origin of the Balkan Sprachbund and the membership in it, the paper examines some of the shared Balkan Sprachbund properties, paying specific attention to those properties which are analyzed in the volume: nominal cases and articles, pronominal clitics, subjunctives and evidentials. The phenomena are illustrated with examples from Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, Aromanian, Albanian, Modern Greek and Balkan Romani.

### 1. Overview

Whether in close genetic relationship or not, the languages of the Balkans share sets of typological properties. Their nominal case systems are disintegrated and their verbal systems are analytical to a considerable degree. They have a general tendency towards explicit marking of grammatical functions with specific uninflected function words.

The phenomenon was first signalled by Jernej Kopitar (1829), who pointed out that the languages spoken South of the Danube have analogous forms expressed through “different language material”. Miklosich (1861) examined the facts more closely and singled out a number of distinct common properties of the languages in the area. Nikolay Trubetzkoy (1928:18) referred to relationships such as the ones exhibited among the languages on the Balkans as “Sprachbund”, arguing that the languages of a Sprachbund (a) are remarkably similar in sentence-structure and word-formation but show no systematic sound correspondences and (b) have a great number of common “cultural” words, though their basic vocabularies may be diametrically different.

#### 1.1 *Origin*

The awareness of the existence of the Balkan Sprachbund properties inevitably led to the construction of theories about their origin. Kopitar, Miklosich and Weigand (1928) maintained that, the Balkan Sprachbund properties developed under the influence of an ancient substrate – that of the indigenous Balkan languages Thracian, Dacian or Illyrian. The linguistic material “left” by those languages is, however, extremely limited to allow the verification of the presence or absence of any of the Balkan Sprachbund properties in any of them. Moreover, the Balkan Sprachbund properties developed in the post-Byzantine period and it is unrealistic to as-

sume that any property of any substratal language had been dormant for centuries, to become active long after the language itself had disappeared.

On another theory, whose most distinguished proponent is Sandfeld (1930), the source of the Balkan Sprachbund properties was Greek – the language which, “in spite of all decadences, has never ceased to transmit a civilisation superior to that of its neighbours” (cf. Sandfeld 1930:17). In Greek, however, the Balkanisms are postclassical innovations.

On a third theory, defended most recently by Solta (1980), the source of the Balkan Sprachbund properties was a more recent substrate language – Latin, the language of the Roman empire, which ruled over the Balkans for several centuries at the beginning of the new era. But, unfortunately, the Balkan Sprachbund properties are hardly present in Latin.

Gołąb (1984:9) argues that the Balkan Sprachbund results from relationship between language substrata and language superstrata, claiming that the Balkan properties in Macedonian are actually structural borrowings or “linguistic calques” from Aromanian. But why should a language spoken by a limited number of inhabitants of the peninsula be the source of these calques? Moreover, since the Balkan Sprachbund properties are not typical for all Romance languages, their provenance in Aromanian would still be in need of explanation.

It is definitely difficult to find a single donor of the Balkan Sprachbund properties, and that not because of lack of knowledge of the history of the Balkan languages – at least Greek and Balkan Slavic are well documented for the relevant period. There simply isn't a single donor. The Balkan Sprachbund properties result from convergence of languages in a multilingual environment, in which, among the random changes in each language, those are more easily spread that contribute most to direct inter-translatability between them.<sup>1</sup> As pointed out by Lindstedt (2000), we are here dealing with a shared drift – parallel changes that are not simple transfers from a single substrate, nor from one of the languages themselves.

The convergence model is corroborated by the fact that the Balkan Sprachbund properties are most numerous in those parts of the Balkans where

---

<sup>1</sup> Discussing language convergence on the Balkans, Civjan (1965:9) allows for “the ideal model” to be “located not in the past but in the future.” Jeffers and Lehiste (1979: 146) see it possible “to set up a sentence model toward which the languages are converging” and, as pointed out by Joseph (1983:199), Kazazis (1965) has in effect produced such a sentence model in his fragment of a transformational grammar for the Balkan languages, with “Pan-Balkan” rules that allow for language-specific lexical insertion.

greatest number of languages are co-territorial.<sup>2</sup> The epicenter of Balkanisms seems to be in the area around the southern parts of the lakes Ohrid and Prespa, where Greek, Albanian, Macedonian, Aromanian and Balkan Romani intersect. The local dialects of the languages spoken in this area are actually very perspicuously similar to each other.

### 1.2 *Membership*

Not all Balkan languages have equal share in the Balkan Sprachbund. Weigand (1928) sees Albanian, Romanian and Bulgarian as typically Balkan languages, taking Greek, Serbian and Turkish to be only “geographically Balkan”. Sandfeld (1930) finds that the Balkan properties are typically exhibited in Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian and possibly Serbian, while Turkish has many lexical concordances with each and everyone of them. For Schaller (1975), Albanian, Romanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian are Balkan languages of first degree, Greek and Serbian – Balkan languages of second degree, while Turkish is a Balkan language of third degree. For Birnbaum (1968) Romanian and Aromanian are “most Balkan”; then come Bulgarian, Macedonian, Modern Greek and Albanian, in this order. Solta (1980:7) maintains that, when individual dialects are taken into consideration, the northern Greek and southern Serbian dialects could also be treated as true Balkan language codes.<sup>3</sup>

According to Soboljev (this volume), not the (standard) Balkan languages but rather individual dialects of those languages are responsible for the rise of the Balkan Sprachbund, because it is at the level of dialects that century-long language contacts have been achieved. Consequently, one should aim at maximally deep descriptions of a minimal (but large enough to be sufficient) number of Balkan dialects, which will constitute a representative corpus of relevant data, making it possible not only to perceive the diasystem of a single language theoretically as totality and product of the systems of all its territorial units, but also to describe it

---

<sup>2</sup> Throughout the period when the Balkan Sprachbund properties were developing, Greek was most prestigious and most frequently used by speakers of the other languages in the area. Yet, it is not in Greek that the number of Balkan Sprachbund properties is greatest, probably because, for the native speakers of Greek, the need of changes for the sake of communication has not been very urgent. Balkan Romani is spoken by a relatively small number of non-native speakers; accordingly, Balkan Romany has a relatively small number of Balkan Sprachbund properties.

<sup>3</sup> Balkan Romani has not been discussed by any of these authors. Recent research, however, shows that this language code exhibits many of the properties that characterize the Balkan Sprachbund.

practically as totality and product of a minimal number of its representative dialects.<sup>4</sup>

Soboljev (This volume) analyses the areal distribution of 65 grammatical properties, partly mapped on 17 maps drawn by the team of the project “Small Atlas of the Balkan Dialects”, who in the period 1996-2000 collected data in eleven villages in Montenegro, Eastern Serbia, Western Macedonia, Eastern and Southern Bulgaria, Central and Southern Albania and North-Western Greece (cf. Sobolev Forthcoming). The analysis suggests that the traditional idea of the existence of common Balkan linguistic type should be rejected, while the set of “typical Balkan properties” should be relativized.

### 1.3 *Shared properties*

A typological language property has been assumed to be areal if (a) shared by at least three languages of the area, at least two of which belong to different genetic families, but (b) not present in all the languages of the genetic family to which the language of the area belongs (if it belongs to a language family, at all).<sup>5</sup> Since the amount, the extent and the limit of areal typological properties, necessary for granting membership into the Balkan union has not and cannot be assessed independently, linguistic discussion on Sprachbund membership have centered around specific properties.<sup>6</sup> Different analyses single out different arrays of Balkan Sprachbund properties, though most of them agree on one phonological property – the presence of schwa, and six grammatical properties: (1) substitution of synthetic declension markers by analytic ones; (2) grammaticalization of the category of definiteness through postpositive definite articles; (3) pronominal doubling of objects; (4) analytic expression of futurity; (5) analytic Perfect with a “have”-auxiliary; (6) loss of the infinitive and its substitution by subjunctive clauses.

In a book which is considered a classic, Sandfeld (1926/30) registered over one hundred Balkan Sprachbund concordances (i.e. properties), making a distinction between “general concordances” and “concordances between different (i.e. individual) Balkan languages”. The morphosyntactic general concordances include:

---

<sup>4</sup> Sobolev points out that this is compatible with the modern cognitive theory of categorization, which views category members as members to different degrees.

<sup>5</sup> As pointed out by Birnbaum (1965), two or more languages can belong to the same language family as well as to the same language union.

<sup>6</sup> The nation states and the ease of communication in contemporary Europe might end linguistic convergence.

(a) postpositive articles; (b) extinction of the infinitive; (c) formation of the future with a “will”-auxiliary; (d) common genitive-dative forms; (e) simultaneous use of a “self-standing” and a not “self-standing pronoun” as well as “the use of a pronoun in association with a noun” (i.e. pronominal clitic-doubling); (f) constructions with a pronominal and a propositional complement, in which the former has same reference as the subject of the latter; (g) verbs which take two direct objects (h) loss of distinction between question words which in Latin are represented by *ubi* and *quo*, on the one hand, and *ibi* and *eo*, on the other; (i) the use of conjunctions with the meaning ‘and’ at the beginning of affirmative clauses which follow negative ones; (j) use of a paratactic conjunction with the meaning ‘and’ instead of a hypotactic one. Sandfeld offers numerous examples from Albanian; Balkan Romance – mostly from (Daco-)Romanian, but also from Aromanian and sometimes from Megleno-Romanian; Balkan Slavic – Bulgarian and Macedonian though he refers to the latter language as “Bulgarian speech in Macedonia”; and Modern Greek.

Schaller (1975) makes a distinction between primary and secondary Balkanisms. Among the primary Balkanisms, he lists two phonological phenomena – (a) vowel system without quantity, openness and nasality distinctions; and (b) existence of the schwa vowel; and eight morphosyntactic phenomena: (c) merge of the Dative and the Genitive; (d) postpositive article; (e) analytic comparison; (f) common pattern for constructing the numerals from 11 to 19; (g) loss of the infinitive and its replacement by subordinate clauses; (h) use of the “will”-auxiliary in the construction of periphrastic future tenses; (i) doubling of objects (by “short” pronominal forms); (j) use of the “short pronominal form” for the expression of possessiveness. The secondary Balkanisms are, according to him, phenomena that are restricted in coverage or play minor role in the structure of the language.

Solta (1980) concentrates on six grammatical Balkanisms, which he classifies in three groups. The first group, labelled “morphological Balkanisms,” comprises the existence of the postpositive article and the merge of the Genitive and the Dative. The second group, called “syntactic Balkanisms,” includes the loss of the infinitive and the synthetic expression of futurity. The third group, referred to as “other,” “different” or “special” (*sonstiges*), contains the Vocative “as a living category” and the periphrastic comparison of adjectives. According to Solta (1980: 223), the phenomena of the third group are not Balkanisms in the strict sense of the word, though they are characteristic (!) for the Balkan languages.

Gołąb (1984) is impressed by the “striking” similarity (or even identity) of the grammatical forms of the Balkan languages as opposed to the dissimilarity of their lexical substance. He singles out one negative similar or identical structural pattern – lack of the infinitive and its replacement by subjunctive clauses – and ten

positive similar or identical structural patterns: (a) future tense formation with a particle which etymologically represents the third singular of the verb *want* + subjunctive mood of a given verb; (b) the so-called “future-in-the-past” – “a pattern derived from the future tense by the replacement of the present tense markers by past tense ones” (Gołąb 1984:6); (c) Present optative-subjunctive mood, formed by a modal particle + the present tense of the verb; (d) imperfect optative-subjunctive mood, formed in the same manner as the present optative-subjunctive mood, but with the imperfect tense of the verb; (e) compound perfect, formed by the present Tense of the auxiliary verb *have* + an indeclinable form of the perfect participle; (f) compound pluperfect – a derivative of the compound perfect, through the replacement of the present tense of the auxiliary by its imperfect tense; (g) “futurum exactum”, or future perfect – a derivative of the compound perfect, through the replacement of the present tense of the auxiliary by its future tense; (h) postpositive definite article; (i) dative-possessive as a single morphosyntactic category. He illustrates these patterns with examples from two languages belonging to different language families: Macedonian – a Slavic language, and Aromanian – a Romance language.

Lindstedt (2000) singles out twelve grammatical Balkanisms and examines their distribution in five language groups of the Sprachbund: Greek, Albanian, Balkan Romance – including Romanian, Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, Balkan Slavic – including Bulgarian, Macedonian and the Torlak Serbian dialects, and Balkan Romani. The twelve Balkanisms fall into three groups. The first group contains six argument-marking Balkanisms: (a) enclitic articles, (b) object reduplication, (c) prepositions instead of case endings, (d) dative/possessive merger, (e) goal/location merger, and (f) *relativum generale*. The second group includes five Balkanisms pertaining to the verbal system: (g) Aux (+ Comp) + finite verb (h) *volo* future, (i) future in the past as conditional, (j) *habeo* perfect, (k) evidentials. The third group consists of only one Balkanism – (l) analytic comparison (of adjectives and adverbs). Lindstedt calculates the Balkanization indices of the language groups discussed and receives the following scores: Balkan Slavic 11,5; Albanian 10.5; Balkan Romance and Greek 9.5 each; Romani 7.5. According to this computation, the Balkan Slavic languages are the most Balkanized ones.<sup>7</sup>

Many of the properties encountered in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, Albanian or Modern Greek can also be found in what we might call “peripheral” Balkan languages. Montoliu and Auwera (this volume) show that Judeo-Spanish uses the Indicative Imperfect in both the protasis and the apodosis of conditional

---

<sup>7</sup> Lindstedt points out that Macedonian would score full 12.0 points.

sentences with a vague potentialis/present irrealis as well as a past irrealis reading, as does Modern Greek (but also Macedonian, Aromanian, Megleno Romanian and Balkan Romani). Compare (1a) (Montoliu and Auwera's example (9)) to (1b) (Montoliu and Auwera's example (20)).<sup>8</sup>

- (1) a. *Si me yamavan, ya iva.* JSp  
 if I.Obl call.3Pl.Ind.Imperf Particle go.1Sg.Ind.Imperf  
 1. 'If they called me, I would go.'  
 2. 'If they had called me, I would have gone'.
- b. *An mu toleje, tha ton* MG  
 if I.Dat it.Acc+say.3Sg.Ind.Imperf will.Mod.Cl he.Acc  
*pijena EGO.*  
 go.1Sg.Ind.Imperf I.Nom  
 1. 'If he asked me, I personally would take him there.'  
 2. 'If he had asked me, I personally would have taken him there.'

Some of the properties with respect to which Judeo-Spanish is similar to Modern Greek – vagueness reading between present and past irrealis, and mood harmony when the apodosis is in the Imperfect – also appear in Old Spanish and the difference between Judeo-Spanish and (Old or Modern) Spanish may be due to a development internal to Judeo-Spanish. Yet, as argued by Montoliu and Auwera, the possibility that Modern Greek has had an influence upon Judeo-Spanish conditionals should be seriously considered. The more so, since constructions that allows both present and past irrealis readings are encountered in another peripheral Balkan language, Turkish.

Many of the Balkan Sprachbund properties are also present in languages outside of the Balkans. Aaman and Auwera (this volume) demonstrate that the modal construction consisting of a complementizer and an independent main clause, i.e. the subjunctive construction which appears independently and not as a complement of a verb, is used to express volition not only in the languages of the Balkans, but also elsewhere in Southern Europe. Thus, alongside Modern Greek (MG) (Aaman and Auwera's example (1)), Romanian (R) (Aaman and Auwera's example

<sup>8</sup> In the glosses of the examples, the following abbreviations are used: Acc = accusative; Admir = admirative; Agr = agreement; Aor = aorist; Aux = auxiliary; Cl = clitic; Dat = dative; Eth = ethical; F = feminine; Fut = future; Gen = genitive; Imp = imperative; Imperf = imperfect(ive); Impers = impersonal; Ind = indicative; Inf = infinitive; Instr = instrumental; Inv = inverted; M = masculine; Mod = modal; M-P = medio-passive; N = neuter; Nom = nominative; Obl = oblique; Opt = optative; Part = participle; Past = past; Pej = pejorative; Perf = perfect(ive); Pl = plural; Poss = possessive; Pres = present; Sg = singular; Subj = subjunctive; Subj.Mark = subjunctive marker; Voc = vocative.

(2)), Albanian (Al) (Aaman and Auwera's example (6)),<sup>9</sup> Macedonian (M) (Aaman and Auwera's example (7)) we have Puglian Southern Italian (SIIt) (Aaman and Auwera's example (19)):

- |     |    |   |      |
|-----|----|---|------|
| (2) | a. | <i>Na zisetē!</i>   | MG   |
|     |    | that.Mod live.2Pl.Perf.Pres<br>'May you live (a long life)!'                |      |
|     | b. | <i>Să ne vedem sănătoși!</i>  | R    |
|     |    | that.Mod us see.1Pl.Pres healthy.M.Pl<br>'May we see each other healthy!'   |      |
|     | c. | <i>Të bëftë mirë!</i>   | Al   |
|     |    | that.Mod do.3Sg.Subj.Pres well<br>'May it be agreeable!'                    |      |
|     | d. | <i>Da pukneš!</i>   | M    |
|     |    | that.Mod burst.2Sg.Perf.Pres<br>'May you burst!'                            |      |
|     | e. | <i>Ku fáttsa éce bbóle!</i>   | SIIt |
|     |    | that.Mod do.3Sg.Subj.Pres what want.3Sg.Pres<br>'Let him do what he wants!' |      |

Amman and Auwera suggest that at least some of the Balkan properties are properties common to a wider Mediterranean area. The non-uniqueness of individual properties does not, however, contradict the possible uniqueness of their combination. What is actually remarkable on the Balkans, is the combination of linguistic properties whose dynamic equilibrium contributes to the uniqueness of the union (cf. Civjan 1979).

In the following sections, some of the most prominent Balkan properties will be examined – in particular, those properties which relate to the properties analyzed in this volume.

---

<sup>9</sup> According to Amman and Auwera (this volume) Albanian is the only modern Southeastern European language with a morphological optative. The forms which Amman and Auwera list as optative are actually subjunctive forms, Albanian being the only Balkan language with a full subjunctive paradigm. Partial subjunctive paradigms, or subjunctive paradigms for some classes of verbs are, however, encountered elsewhere on the Balkans.



## 2. Nominal cases and articles

The nominal inflections in the Balkan languages are to a great extent replaced by prepositions. Paradigms with distinct forms for all nominal types have been preserved only in Serbo-Croatian,<sup>10</sup> though the Loc case is represented by prepositional phrases with nouns in the Dat case when referring to location and prepositional phrases with nouns in the Acc case when expressing direction. Arli Balkan Romani has nominal and pronominal paradigms with distinct nominative (Nom), genitive (Gen), ablative (Abl), dative (Dat), accusative (Acc), vocative (Voc), Instrumental (Instr) and locative (Loc) case forms, but the ablative and locative case forms alternate freely with prepositional phrases with nouns in the Nom case. In Albanian there are three distinct nominal oblique case forms – Dat, Acc, Abl and Voc, but the Acc and Abl forms show up only with some nouns or in some specific cases. In Romanian and Aromanian there are distinct Dat forms for all nouns and Voc forms for some nouns. In Modern Greek masculine nouns with *o*-stems have distinct Gen, Acc and Voc case forms; all other nouns have only one oblique case form – a Gen one, though Acc case is overtly marked on the article. In the Southeastern Serbian dialects Acc and Voc forms are regularly expressed by distinct case forms. In Macedonian and Bulgarian only the Voc case is systematically marked by distinct case forms, while Acc forms exist for some nouns and in some dialects. In Megleno-Romanian Voc case forms are the only oblique nominal case forms.

The tendency towards analyticity of the nominal case system, by itself, is not specific to the Balkan languages – it is encountered in many other Indo-European languages. Characteristic for the Balkan Sprachbund, however, are a number of phenomena that accompany this tendency, such as unification of declension types, distinct vocative (Voc) case forms, syncretism of the genitive (Gen) and dative (Dat) cases, analogous selection of prepositions for the expression of case relations, postpositive articles, “bare” subjunctive constructions (i.e. use of subjunctive constructions without upper clauses), use of subjunctive constructions in future tense expressions, use of “future in the past” in irrealis sentences.

### 2.1 *Vocative case forms*

Typically the Balkan Sprachbund language have distinct case markers for the vocative case. In Arli Balkan Romani (ABR) there are specific Voc forms for all

---

<sup>10</sup> Upon the disintegration of Yugoslavia, Serbo-Croatian dissolved into Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian. The grammatical structures of the three “successors” do not, however, substantially differ from one another. I am using the term “Serbo-Croatian” (SC) when speaking of the grammatical structure of the language/languages, and “Serbian” or “Croatian”, when referring to the socio-linguistic categories “standard language” or “dialect”.

singular nouns referring to human beings, as well as for singular nouns denoting personified animals or inanimate objects:

- (3) a. *Romnie, so kerea?* (Nom *romni*) ABR  
 woman.F.Sg.Voc what do/make.2Sg  
 ‘You woman, what are you doing?!’
- b. *Manuŝea!* (Nom *manuŝ*) ABR  
 man.M.Sg.Voc  
 ‘You man!’
- c. *Na mangljum te avel* (Nom *mačo*) ABR  
 not wanted.1Sg Subj.Mark go.1Sg.Subj  
*odori, mačhea’, vakhergja ov.*  
 thither fish.M.Sg.Voc say.3Sg.Past he  
 ‘I didn’t want to go there, fish’, said he.’

In Balkan Slavic – Macedonian (M), Bulgarian (B) and Serbo-Croatian (SC), personal and geographic names, human common nouns in the singular, and some (personified) non-human common nouns also have distinct Voc case forms:<sup>11</sup>

- (4) a. *Stojane!* (Nom *Stojan*) M/B/SC  
 Stojan.M.Voc  
 ‘Stojan!’
- b. *Sestro!* (Nom *sestra*) M/B/SC  
 sister.M.Voc  
 ‘Sister!’
- c. *Profesorke!* (Nom. *profesorka*) M/B  
*Profesorice!* (Nom. *profesorica*) SC  
 professor.F.Voc

---

<sup>11</sup> In Bulgarian, nominalized adjectives, when used for direct reference, carry definite articles:

- (i) *Xajde, malkata!*  
 come on little+the.F.Sg  
 ‘Come on, my little girl!’ (lit. ‘Come one, you little one!’)
- (ii) *Ej kāsokrakija!*  
 Interj short-legged+the.M.Sg  
 ‘You, the short-legged one!’

In both Bulgarian and Macedonian, an adjectival modifier occurs to the left of a noun in the Voc case.

- ‘(Madam) Professor!’
- d. *Dunave!* (Nom *Dunav*) M/B/SC  
Danube.M.Sg.Voc  
‘You, the Danube (river)!’
- e. *Bože* *moj!* (Nom *bog*) M/B/SC  
god.M.Sg.Voc my.M.Sg  
‘My god!’
- f. *Grade*<sup>12</sup> *naš!* (Nom *grad*) M/SC  
town.M.Sg.Voc our.M.Sg  
‘My town!’

In Romanian, distinct Voc case forms appear with singular human common nouns and personal names; with masculine nouns, the Voc case marker often showing up on the definite article:

- (5) a. *Soro!* (Nom *soră*) R  
sister.F.Sg.Voc  
‘Sister!’
- b. *Popescule!* (Nom *Popescu*) R  
Popescu+the.M.Sg.Voc  
‘Popescu!’

Distinct Voc case forms for singular human nouns also exist in Megleno-Romanian (MR) and Aromanian (Ar), but the Voc forms of the feminine nouns are pejorative:

- (6) a. *Profesore!* (Nom *profesor*) MR/Ar  
professor.M.Sg.Voc  
‘Professor!’
- b. *Soro!* (Nom *soră/ă*) MR/Ar  
sister.F.Sg.Voc.Pej  
‘Sister.’

In Modern Greek the Voc case is distinctly marked by a suffix only with masculine singular human nouns with *o*-stems.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> In Macedonian, also *gradu*.

- (7) *ánthrope* (Nom *ánthropos*) MG  
 man/human being.M.Sg.Voc  
 ‘Man!’

## 2.2 Accusative case forms and case markers

Accusative case forms are encountered on a regular basis only in Serbo-Croatian<sup>14</sup> and Arli Balkan Romani, but even in these languages Nom forms are used to express Acc case relations – for masculine inanimate nouns (in Serbo-Croatian) or for all inanimate nouns (in Arli Balkan Romani). Compare the case of the nouns in (8a) and (9a) to (8b) and (9b), respectively:

- (8) a. *Video sam tvoga brata.* (Nom *brat*) SC  
 seen.M.Sg.Part am your.Acc brother.Acc  
 ‘I saw your.’
- b. *Izgubio sam tvoj nož.* SC  
 lost.M.Sg.Part am your.M.Sg.Nom knife.M.Sg.Nom  
 ‘I lost your knife.’
- (9) a. *Dikhljum e bašne.* (Nom *bašno*) ABR  
 see.1Sg.Past the.Obl cock.Acc  
 ‘I saw the cock.’
- b. *Ov čhingja o mas.* ABR  
 he cut.3Sg.Past the.M.Sg.Nom meat.Nom  
 ‘He cut the meat.’

In Albanian, specific Acc forms are used only when the nouns are definite. Thus, the definite noun in direct object position in (10a), *librin*, is in the Acc case, while the indefinite noun in the same position in (10b), *lule*, is in the Nom case:

---

<sup>13</sup> With masculine personal names with other stems, as well as with all feminine personal names, it is marked negatively, through lack of article, which otherwise accompanies personal names. Lack of article also marks the Voc case with personal names in Albanian.

<sup>14</sup> In the Southeastern Serbian dialects, Acc case forms are actually general oblique case forms, which in the case of feminine singular or masculine animate singular nouns. They combine with prepositions to express any thematic relationships other than those of subject, nominal predicate or direct object.

- (10) a. *E ka lexuar këtë librin.* AI  
 3Sg.Acc.Cl has read.Part this book+the.M.Sg.Acc  
 ‘(S)he has read THIS book.’
- b. *Agimi i dërgoi Dritës lule.* AI  
 Agim+the.M.Sg 3Sg.Dat.Cl send.3Sg.Past  
 Drita+the.F.Sg.Dat flower  
 ‘Agim sent Drita flowers.’

In Modern Greek, distinct Acc forms exist only for masculine nouns with *o*-stems; with all other nouns, Acc case is marked only on the article.<sup>15</sup>

- (11) a. *Ton vlepo to(n) (Nom Jorgos) MG*  
 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl see.1Sg the.M.Sg.Acc  
*Jorgo.*  
 Jorgos.M.Sg.Acc  
 ‘I see Jorgos.’
- b. *Ti(n) vlepo ti(n) gata. (Nom gata) MG*  
 3Sg.F.Acc.Cl see.1Sg the.F.Sg.Acc cat.F.Sg  
 ‘I see the cat.’

In the Slavic Balkan languages, Acc forms appear very selectively – with masculine proper names and masculine human common nouns denoting family relationships:<sup>16</sup>

- (12) a. *Go vidov Stojana/ M*  
 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl see.1Sg.Past Stojan.M.Sg.Acc  
*Petreta/brata ti.*  
 /Petre+the.M.Sg.Acc/brother.M.Sg.Acc 2Sg.Dat.Cl  
 ‘I saw Stojan/Petre/your brother.’
- b. *%...za da ostavi edno pismo na B*  
 ...for Subj.Mark leave.3Sg a letter to

<sup>15</sup> With neuter nouns the Acc forms of the article are equivalent to the Nom forms.

<sup>16</sup> In Bulgarian the Acc forms of the nouns are dialectal (cf. Tilkov (1982-83: 113). In Macedonian, the nouns denoting family relationships in the Acc case have to be modified by possessive clitics (cf. 3.4 below).

*djadja*            *Moska.*  
 uncle.Acc        Mosko.Acc  
 ‘... in order to leave a letter to uncle Mosko.’

In Bulgarian, there is specific masculine singular Acc form of the definite article. Compare (13a) to (13b):

- (13) a.    *Pokazax*        *mu*                    *pătja.*                    B  
 show.1Sg.Aor 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl road+the.M.Sg.Acc  
 ‘I showed him the way.’
- b.        *Pătăt*                            *ne*        *beše*    *lesen.*                    B  
 road+the.M.Sg.Nom nor        was        easy.M.Sg  
 ‘The road was not easy.’

The Balkan Romance languages have no Acc nominal forms. In Romanian, however, the prepositions *pe* is used as an Acc case marker with all proper names, as well as with [+human, +specific] bare common nouns and nouns preceded by the indefinite article. Thus, it is used in (170a) but not in (170b):<sup>17</sup>

- (14) a.    *L-am*                            *văzut*    *pe*                    *Ion/*                    R  
 3Sg.Acc.Cl.-have.1Sg seen    Acc.Mark        Ion  
*profesor/un profesor.*  
 professor/a professor  
 ‘I saw/have seen Ion/the professor/a (specific) professor.’
- b.        *Caut*                    *profesor/un profesor.*                    R  
 look for.1Sg    professor/a professor  
 ‘I am looking for a/any professor.’

## 2.2 Dative/genitive case forms and case markers

Dative case forms for nouns of any type exist not only in Serbo-Croatian and Arli Balkan Romani – languages which have nominal paradigms with many distinct forms – but also in Romanian, Aromanian and Albanian. Whereas in Romanian and Aromanian only definite nouns can have Dat case forms, in Albanian Dat case forms also appear with indefinite nouns. In Aromanian, the noun with the Dat case form is obligatorily preceded by a case marker – the preposition *a* ‘to’. Examples:

---

<sup>17</sup> In view of the fact that all Romanian prepositions void the use of the definite article, bare nouns to the right of *pe* may be looked upon as definite DPs with voided articles.

- (15) a. *Petru i-a dat fetei* R  
 Petru 3Sg.Dat.Cl-have.3Sg given girl+the.F.Sg.Dat  
*o floare.*  
 a.F.Sg flower  
 ‘Petru gave the girl a flower.’
- b. *Petre lji are dată lilice* Ar  
 Peter 3Sg.Dat.Cl have.3Sg given.Part flower  
*a featiljei.*  
 to girl+the.F.Sg.Dat  
 ‘Peter has given a flower to the girl.’
- c. *Agimi i dërgoi* Al  
 Agim+the.M.Sg 3Sg.Dat.Cl send.3Sg.Past  
*Dritës/një vajze(je)* *lule.*  
 Drita+the.F.Sg.Dat/a girl.Sg.Dat flower  
 ‘Agim sent Drita/a girl flowers.’

In all the three languages – Romanian, Aromanian and Albanian – Dat case forms are also used to express Gen case relationships. In Romanian the Dat modifier appears to the immediate left of its referent, in Aromanian the Dat modifier is preceded by the Dat case marker *a* ’to’, while in Albanian the modifier is related to its referent by an agreement clitic:

- (16) a. *floara fetei* R  
 flower+the.F.Sg girl+the.F.Sg.Dat  
 ‘the girl’s flower’
- b. *sor-sa a profesorlui* Ar  
 sister+his.M.Sg.Cl to professor+the.M.Sg.Dat  
 ‘the professor’s sister’
- c. *koka e profesorit* Al  
 head+the.F.Sg Dat/Acc.Agr.Cl Agim+the.M.Dat  
 ‘the professor’s head’

In Modern Greek there are no Dat case forms – Gen case forms are used to express both Gen and Dat case relationships.

- (17) a. *Edhosa to vivlio tis Marias.* MG  
 gave.1Sg.Aor the.N.Sg.Acc book the.F.Sg.Gen Maria.Gen  
 ‘I gave the book to Maria.’

- b. *Tis epese tis Marias* MG  
 3Sg.F.Gen.Cl fall.1Sg.Aor the.F.Sg.Gen Maria.F.Gen  
*to potiri tu patera.*  
 the.M.Sg.Gen father.Gen the.N.Sg.Acc glass  
 ‘Maria dropped her father’s glass.’ (lit. ‘To Maria fell her father’s glass.’)

In the Slavic Balkan languages and Megleno-Romanian, both Dat and Gen case relations are expressed through case marking prepositions. In Bulgarian, the preposition *na* ‘on/to’ marks Dat as well as Gen case relations:

- (18) a. *Dadox knjigata na Jana/Stojan/* B  
 give.1Sg.Aor book+the.F.Sg to Jana/Stojan/  
*dedoto.*  
 grandpa+the.N.Sg  
 ‘I gave the book to Jana/Stojan/the grandpa.’
- b. *Zagubixme knjigata na Ana/* B  
 loose.1Pl.Aor book+the.F.Sg to Ana/  
*Stojan/dedoto.*  
 Stojan/grandpa+the.N.Sg  
 ‘We lost Jana’s/Stojan’s/grandpa’s book.’



In Macedonian, to express Dat relationships one uses the preposition *na* ‘on/to’, while for Gen relationships *na* is a dispreferred alternative to the preposition *od* ‘of/from’.<sup>18</sup>

- (19) a. *Mu ja dadov knjigata* M  
 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.F.Acc.Cl give.1Sg.Past book+the.F.Sg  
*na Stojana/studentot/edno dete.*  
 to Stojan.Acc/student+the.M.Sg/a boy  
 ‘I gave the book to Stojan/the student/a boy.’
- b. *Ja zaginavme knjigata od/?na* M  
 3Sg.F.Acc.Cl loose.1Pl.Past book+the.F.Sg of/to  
*Ana/Stojana.*  
 Ana/Stojan.Acc  
 ‘We lost Jana’s/Stojan’s book.’
- c. *Ja popraviv nogata od/??na* M  
 3Sg.F.Acc.Cl repair.1Sg.Past leg+the.F.Sg of/to  
*masata.*  
 table+the.F.Sg  
 ‘I repaired the leg of the table.’

Megleno-Romanian indirect objects are introduced by the preposition *la* ‘to/at’ if animate and by the preposition *di* ‘from’ otherwise:

---

<sup>18</sup> In the Southern Macedonian dialects, and the northern Modern Greek dialects there is a tendency toward Dat/Acc syncretism. In the Southern Macedonian dialects, the preposition *na* is used not only in expressions featuring dative (indirect object) relationships, but also in expressions featuring accusative (direct object) relationships:

- (i) *Ja vidov na Jana.* M  
 3Sg.F.Acc.Cl see.1Sg to Jana  
 ‘I saw Jana.’

In the Northern Modern Greek dialects, on the other hand, Dat relationships are regularly marked by PPs with NPs in the Acc form.

- (ii) *Edhosa sto Jorgho ta vivlia.* MG  
 give.1Sg.Aor to+the.M.Sg.Acc Jorghos.Acc the.N.Pl books.N  
 ‘I gave Jorghos the books.’

- (20) a. *Petre ăi*                      *deadi*                      *la*                      *feata*                      *flor.* MR  
 Peter 3Sg.Dat.Cl                      give.3Sg.Aor                      to                      girl+the.F.Sg                      flour  
 ‘Peter gave a flower to the girl.’
- b. *capu*                                      *al*                      *profesoru/mața*                                      MR  
 head+the.M.Sg                      of                      professor+the.M.Sg/cat+the.F.Sg  
 ‘the head of the professor/the cat’
- c. *picioru*                      *di*                      *masa/una masă*                                      MR  
 leg+the.M.Sg                      from                      table+the.F.Sg/a.F.Sg                      table  
 ‘the leg of the/a table’

### 2.3 Position and use of the definite articles

All the Balkan languages other than (standard) Serbo-Croatian have articles.<sup>19</sup> In Modern Greek and Arli Balkan Romani the articles are pronominal words that inflect for person, number and case,<sup>20</sup> in the other Balkan languages they are clitics that encliticize to the noun, if the noun is the only DP constituent, and to its pronominal modifier(s) otherwise.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> There are definite postpositive articles in some Eastern Serbian dialects. For example:

- (i) *Najbolje*                      *se*                                      *slažem*                                      *s’*                      *pomladutu*                                      SES  
 best                                      Impers.Acc.Cl                      agree.1Sg                      with                      younger+the.F.Sg.Acc  
*mi*                                      *čerku.*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl                      daughter.Acc  
 ‘I agree best with my younger daughter.’

<sup>20</sup> In Modern Greek the definite articles inflect for gender, number and case, while in Arli Balkan Romani there are distinct nominative forms for masculine singular, feminine singular and (masculine or feminine) plural and a common oblique case form (for both genders and numbers).

<sup>21</sup> The articles do not attach to the modifiers of the modifiers. Thus we have (i), but not (ii)

- (i) *mult*                      *mushata*                                      *aroshe shimie*                                      Ar  
 much                      beautiful+the.F.Sg                      red.F.Sg scarf  
 ‘the very beautiful red scarf’
- (ii) *\*multa*                                      *mushatã*                                      *aroshe shimie*                                      Ar  
 much+the.F.Sg                      beautiful.F.Sg                      red.F.Sg scarf

(21)	a <sub>1</sub>	<i>nedelata</i> week+the.F.Sg 'the week'			M
	a <sub>2</sub>	<i>mojata</i> my.F.Sg+the.F.Sg <i>nedela</i> week.F.Sg 'my first working week'	<i>prva</i> first.F.Sg	<i>rabotna</i> working.F.Sg	
	b <sub>1</sub>	<i>rokljata</i> dress+the.F.Sg 'the dress'			B
	b <sub>2</sub>	<i>tvojata</i> your.F.Sg+the.F.Sg <i>roklja</i> dress.F.Sg 'your beautiful summer the dress'	<i>xubava</i> beautiful.F.Sg	<i>ljatna</i> summer.Adj.F.Sg	
	c <sub>1</sub>	<i>castelul</i> castle+the.M.Sg 'the castle'			R
	c <sub>2</sub>	<i>frumosul</i> beautiful+the.M.Sg 'the beautiful big castle'	<i>și</i> and	<i>marele</i> big+the.M.Sg	<i>castel</i> <sup>22</sup> castle
	d <sub>1</sub>	<i>porcu</i> pig+the.M.Sg 'the pig'			MR
	d <sub>2</sub>	<i>micu</i> small+the.M.Sg 'the small white pig'	<i>alb</i> white	<i>porc</i> pig	

---

<sup>22</sup> In Romanian, in DPs with two or more prenominal adjectives, which have to be conjoined, the article appears on every adjective.

d <sub>1</sub>	<i>feata</i> girl+the.F.Sg 'the girl'				Ar
d <sub>2</sub>	<i>mushata</i> beautiful+the.F.Sg	<i>mintimenã</i> clever.F.Sg	<i>featã</i> girl		
	'the beautiful clever girl'				
e <sub>1</sub>	<i>vajzat</i> book+the.F.Pl 'the girls'				Al
e <sub>2</sub>	<i>të</i> Agr.Cl	<i>mjerat</i> miserable+the.F.Pl	<i>vajza</i> <sup>23</sup> girls		
	'the miserable girls'				

Except in Albanian, postnominal adjectives occur in emphatic environments. In Modern Greek, in this case, both the noun and the adjectives are always preceded by definite articles, though DPs with pronominal adjectives can also have more than one article. As a matter of fact, we have the following alternatives:

- (22) a. *to* *megalo* *omorfo* *spiti* MG  
the.N.Sg big.N.Sg beautiful.N.Sg house
- b. *to* *megalo* *to* *omorfo* MG  
the.N.Sg big.N.Sg the.N.Sg beautiful.N.Sg  
*to* *spiti*  
the.N.Sg house
- c. *to* *spiti* *to* *megalo* *to* MG  
the.N.Sg house the.N.Sg big.N.Sg the.N.Sg  
*omorfo*  
beautiful.N.Sg  
'the big beautiful house'

Traditional Greek grammars as well as certain current analyses (cf. Androutsopoulou 1995, Manolessou 2000) take the DPs with more than one definite article to be stylistic variants of the DPs with only one definite article. Campos and Stav-

---

<sup>23</sup> In Albanian, modifiers are, as a rule, postnominal and are related to their referents through agreement clitics. Prenominal modifiers occur in Tosk (but not in Gheg) Albanian, only in emphatic environments, such as the one in (19e<sub>2</sub>), and that only in Tosk (but not in Gheg) Albanian.



ically syntactically pre-verbal and phonologically proclitic, while the Bulgarian clausal clitic clusters are phonologically enclitic, but syntactically pre-verbal.

### 3.1 *Pronominal clitics functioning in the clause*

In Serbo-Croatian, the pronominal clitics behave uniformly in all environments; the pronominal clitics of the other Balkan languages, however, show distinct behaviour in some environments.

Being phonologically enclitic, the Bulgarian pronominal clitics have to have a lexical host to their left, except when they follow modal clitics or the negation marker. Thus, (24a) is not a well-formed sentence, while (24b) and (24c) are:

- (24) a.    \**Mu*            *go*                *e*        *dal.*                            B  
           3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl is.Cl    given.M.Sg./-Part  
           purported meaning: ‘He has given it to him.’
- b.    *Ne*    *mu*                *go*                *e*        *dal.*                            B  
           not    3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl is.Cl    given.M.Sg./-Part  
           ‘He hasn’t given it to him.’
- c.    *Šte*    *mu*                *go*                *dade*                *ut্রে.*                            B  
           will    3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl give.3Sg    tomorrow  
           ‘(S)he will give it to him tomorrow.’

The well-formedness of sentences such as (24b) and (24c) can be explained through the distinct phonological directionality of *ne* and *šte*: while the auxiliary and pronominal clitics are phonologically enclitic, the negation marker *ne* and the modal clitics *šte* are phonologically proclitic. Echoing the position of Inkelas (1989) that clitics may lean on one another and satisfy each other’s prosodic requirements, Halpern (1992: 283-287) suggests that, when a proclitic clitic is followed by an enclitic one, we must allow the prosodic subcategorizations to “cancel”, so that the combination is not, as a whole, prosodically dependent. It is this “cancellation” and the stress that the complex acquires as a result of it, which make it possible for the negation marker *ne* to appear clause-initially and form a phonological unit with the clitic following it, to the exclusion of the verb. As for the modal clitics *šte* and *bi(x)*, they influence the behaviour of the other clitics: when the modal clitics are cluster-initial, the cluster forms a local domain with the following verb, and, consequently, can appear clause-initially (cf. Tomić 1996a, 1997).

The Macedonian pronominal clitics (all clausal clitics, as a matter of fact) are, as a rule syntactically pre-verbal and phonologically proclitic. In clauses with [+V, +N] heads, however, they can also and preferably be syntactically second-position and phonologically enclitic:

- (25) a<sub>1</sub> *Im* → *gi* → *DAdov* *KNIgite.* M  
 3Pl.Dat.Cl 3Pl.Acc.Cl give.1Sg.Past books+the.Pl
- a<sub>2</sub> \**DAdov* ← *im* ← *gi* *KNIgite.*  
 give.1Sg.Past 3Pl.Dat.Cl 3Pl.Acc.Cl books+the.Pl  
 ‘I have given them the books.’
- b<sub>1</sub> ?*Mu* → *e* → *SKInato* *PALtoto* M  
 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl is.Cl torn.N.Sg coat+the.N.Sg
- b<sub>2</sub> *SKInato* ← *mu* ← *e* *PALtoto.*  
 torn.N.Sg 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl is.Cl coat+the.N.Sg  
 ‘His coat is torn.’

The pronominal clitics in Megleno-Romanian and Aromanian have analogous behaviour: Though, as a rule, syntactically pre-verbal and proclitic, in clauses in which V is instantiated by inflecting passive participles or adjectives they can occur either to the left of V and procliticize to it, or to the right of V and encliticize to a focused element:

- (26) a<sub>1</sub> *Ăi* → *ța* → *greali* *ăntriborli.* MR  
 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl are.3Pl.Cl difficult.F.Pl questions+the.F.Pl
- a<sub>2</sub> *Greali* ← *ăi* ← *ța* *ăntriborli.*  
 difficult.M.Pl 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl are.3Pl.Cl questions+the.F.Pl  
 ‘His questions are difficult.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *L* *iaste* *mintimen* *cănle.* Ar  
 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl is clever dog+the.M.Sg
- b<sub>2</sub> *Mintimen* *l* *iaste* *cănle.*  
 clever 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl is dog+the.M.Sg  
 ‘His dog is clever.’

In positive imperative clauses, in all the languages considered, the pronominal clitics occur to the immediate right of the verb and encliticize to it, as they do in the non Balkan Romance languages. Miyoshi (2002), in line with Bošković’s (2001) account for the occurrence of the clitics to the right of the imperative verb through the existence of a underlying PF (phonetic form) affix to the left of the verb, with which the verb has to merge. Both indicatives and imperatives have clitic-V order, with a lower copy of the pronominal clitic following the verb. In indicatives, the

higher copy of the clitic can be, hence must be pronounced. On the other hand, in imperatives pronunciation of the higher copy of the clitic leads to a Stranded Affix Filter violation; so the lower copy of the clitic, to the right of the verb is pronounced.

As a rule, in positive imperatives, the Acc clitics follow the Dat/Gen clitics, as they do in indicative clauses. In Modern Greek positive imperative clauses, however, both Gen Acc and Acc Gen ordering of clitics is possible:

- (27) a. *Dhos mu to!* MG  
 give.2Sg.Imp 1Sg.Gen.Cl 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl
- b. *Dhos to mu!* MG  
 give.2Sg.Imp 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl 1Sg.Gen.Cl
- ‘Give it to me!’

Bošković (this volume) argues that the Acc Gen word is related to an affix in the underlying phonetic form (PF), which forces a lower copy of the clitic to be pronounced. With respect to clitic placement, imperatives are derived just like indicatives, where the order of clitics in a double object clitic construction is dative-accusative. Since in indicatives the highest copy of the pronominal clitics must be pronounced, we always get only the dative-accusative order. In imperatives, the pronunciation of lower copies of the pronominal clitics allows for accusative-dative order. The optionality of ordering of clitics in imperatives is related to an element X, possibly AgrDO (direct object agreement) to which the Gen clitic has to move. Without the presence of X, the dative-accusative-V complex will be immediately formed. Depending on whether or not X is present in the structure we then get either the dative-accusative or the accusative-dative order in the postverbal position.

In negative imperative clauses, in Serbo-Croatian and (standard) Macedonian the pronominal clitics occur to the left of the verb:<sup>25</sup>

- (28) a. *NE – daj ← mu ← ga!* SC  
 not.Cl give.2Sg.Imperf.Imp 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl
- ‘Don’t give it to him!’

---

<sup>25</sup> In Serbo-Croatian the clitics encliticize to the verb, whereas in Macedonian they form a single phonological word with the verb and the negation operator to its left. In the North-Western Macedonian dialects, however, the clitics occur between the negation marker and the verb and encliticize to the negation marker (cf. Tomić 2001).



- b. *Ne – daVAJ – mu – go!* M  
 not.Cl give.2Sg.Imperf.Imp 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl  
 ‘Don’t give it to him!’

In Bulgarian, Megleno-Romanian, Aromanian and Arli Balkan Romani negated imperatives, the clitics occur between the negation operator and the verb.<sup>26</sup>

- (27) a. *Ne – MU – go DAvaj!* B  
 not.Cl 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl give.2Sg.Imperf.Imp  
 ‘Don’t give it to him!’
- b. *NU ←la MANcă!* MR  
 not 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl eat.2Sg.Imp  
 ‘Don’t eat it!’
- c. *NU ← u MĂcă!* Ar  
 not 3Sg.F.Acc.Cl eat.2Sg.Imp  
 ‘Don’t eat it!’
- d. *Ma ← de ← le MANgje!* ABR  
 not.Mod give.2Sg.Imp 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl 1Sg.Dat.Pron  
 ‘Don’t give it to me!’

In Modern Greek and Romanian, verbs with imperative morphology cannot be negated and prohibition is expressed by negated subjunctive clauses and other negated structures.<sup>27</sup> As pointed out by Bošković (this volume) Miyoshi (2002) accounts for the ban on negative imperatives in Modern Greek by assuming the existence of a PF affix, which in negative contexts is separated from the verb by the negation marker. Just as the English verb, when separated from its past tense affix by a negation operator, resorts to “do-support”, the Modern Greek imperative verb (and ipso facto the Romanian imperative verb), when separated from its PF affix by a negation operator, resorts to another verb form – that of the subjunctive.

<sup>26</sup> Whereas in Bulgarian the clitics form a single phonological word with the negation operator, in Megleno-Romanian, Aromanian and Arli Balkan Romani they encliticize to the negation marker. In all of these languages the verb is stressed independently.

<sup>27</sup> In Modern Greek and Albanian we have distinct modal negation markers.

### 3.2 Clitic doubling

The Balkan Dat and Acc clitics can double lexical indirect and direct objects, respectively.<sup>28</sup> In Macedonian, Megleno-Romanian and Aromanian, direct-object clitic-doubling is contingent on definiteness, and indirect object clitic-doubling on specificity. Thus, we have the following acceptability judgements:

- (28) a. *Jana mu go dade* M  
 Jana 3Sg.M/N.Dat.Cl 3Sg.M/N.Acc.Cl give.3Sg.Past  
*pismoto/(~~\*edno pismo~~)/(~~\*pismo~~) na deteto/(edno dete)/(~~\*dete~~).*  
 letter+the/(a letter)/letter to child+the/(a child)/child  
 ‘Jana gave the letter/a letter/letter to the child/a child/child.’
- b. *Petre i-u ari dat* MR  
 Petre 3Sg.Dat.Cl-3Sg.F.Acc.Cl have.3Sg given.Part  
*floarea/(~~\*ună floari~~)/(~~\*floari~~) la feata/(una feată)/(~~\*feată~~).*  
 flower+the/(a flower)/flower to girl+the/(a girl)/(~~\*girl~~)  
 ‘Petre has given the flower/a flower/flower to the girl/a girl/girl.’
- c. *Petre lj-u deade cartea/* Ar  
 Petre 3Sg.Dat.Cl-3Sg.F.Acc.Cl give.3Sg.Past book+the/  
*(~~\*ună carte~~)/(~~\*carte~~) a featiljei/(unei feată)/(~~\*feată~~).*  
 (a book)/book to girl+the.Dat/(a.Dat girl)/girl  
 ‘Petre has given the book/a book/book to the girl/a girl/girl.’

In Bulgarian, both direct and indirect objects are clitic-doubled if specific, and not clitic-doubled if focused.<sup>29</sup> Thus, we have the following contrasts:

<sup>28</sup> In standard Serbian and standard Croatian there is no clitic-doubling, but in the Svrljig-Zaplen Southeastern Serbian dialect, direct objects can optionally be clitic-doubled when definite and indirect objects when specific. Examples:

- (i) *Nesām (ga) videl ovčara(toga).*  
 not+ am.Aux.Cl 3Sg.M.Cl.Acc.Cl seen.M.Sg./-Part shepherd+the.M.Sg.Acc  
 ‘I haven’t seen the shepherd.’
- (ii) *Dala sām (mu) cveće na šefa/*  
 given.F.Sg./-Part am.Aux.Cl 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl flowers to chief.Acc/  
*edno dete.*  
 a child  
 ‘I gave the flowers to the chief/a child.’

<sup>29</sup> The doubling of indefinite direct objects is not, however, accepted by all speakers.

- (29) a. *Jana* (*\*go*) *čete* *PISMOTO/* B  
 letter+the.M.Sg 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl read.3Sg letter/  
*EDNO PISMO.*  
 (a letter)  
 ‘Jana is reading the letter/a letter.’
- b. *JANA* *go* *čete* *pismoto/* B  
 letter+the.M.Sg 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl read.3Sg letter/  
 (%*edno pismo*).  
 [a letter]  
 ‘It is Jana that is reading the letter/a letter.’

In Albanian, all specific indirect objects are clitic-doubled, whereas direct objects are clitic-doubled if specific and not focused. Thus, though both the direct object in (30a) and the one in (30b) have indefinite (specific) articles, only the direct object in (30b), which is not focused, can be clitic-doubled:

- (30) a. *Do* *ta* *pi* *me* Al  
 will.Mod.Cl Subj.Mark+3Sg.Acc.Cl drink.1Sg with  
*kënaqësi* *një* *birë.*  
 pleasure a beer.Acc  
 ‘I will gladly have a beer.’
- b. *Agimi* (*\*e*) *piu* *MADJE* Al  
 Agim+the.M.Sg 3Sg.Acc.Cl drink.3Sg.Aor even  
*NJË BIRRË para se të shkonte.*  
 a beer before that Subj.Mark go.3Sg  
 ‘Agim drank even a beer before he left.’

In Modern Greek, specific direct objects – whether definite or indefinite – are clitic-doubled if topicalized.

- (31) a. *Ton* *Jani* *ton* *kseri* MG  
 the.M.Sg.Acc Janis.Acc 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl know.3Sg  
*i* *Maria.*  
 the.F.Sg Maria  
 ‘Janis, Maria knows.’
- b. *Ena* *vivlio* *tha* *su* *to* MG  
 a.N.Sg.Acc friend will.Mod.Cl 2Sg.Gen.Cl 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl

*paro.*

take.1Sg.Perf.Pres

‘As for a book, I will take it for you (but don’t ask for more).’

In *situ* direct objects are also clitic-doubled if discourse linked or familiar, especially if they are definite.

- (32) a. *Tus pira tus markadhorus.* MG  
 3Pl.M.Acc.Cl took.1Sg.Aor the.M.Pl pencils  
 ‘I took the pencils.’
- b. *(%Tis) elisa merikes askisis me* MG  
 3Pl.F.Acc.Cl solve.1Sg.Aor some.Pl exercises with  
*diskolia.*  
 difficulty  
 ‘Some exercises I solved with difficulty.’

Modern Greek indirect objects are, however, clitic-doubled only when definite:

- (33) a. *Tu edhosa tu Jorghu* MG  
 3Sg.M.Gen.Cl give.1Sg.Aor the.M.Sg.Gen Jorgos.M.Gen  
*to vivlio.*  
 the.N.Sg.Acc book  
 ‘I gave the book to Jorgos.’
- b. *(\*Tu) edhosa enos filu* MG  
 3Sg.M.Gen.Cl give.1Sg.Aor a.M.Sg.Gen friend.Gen  
*mu to vivlio.*  
 1Sg.Gen.Cl the.N.Sg.Acc book  
 ‘I gave the book to a friend of mine.’

In Romanian, direct object clitic doubling is contingent on specificity, topicality and humanness. Human direct objects are clitic-doubled whether topicalized or not.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>Human DPs with definite articles are, as a rule, not clitic-doubled, even though they are most often specific:

- (i) *(\*L)-am văzut profesorul.*  
 3Sg.Acc.Cl-have.1Sg seen professor+the.M.Sg  
 ‘I saw/have seen the professor.’

- (34) a. *L-am văzut pe profesor/un* R  
 3Sg.Acc.Cl.-have.1Sg seen Acc.Mark professor/a  
*profesor.*  
 professor  
 ‘I saw/have seen the professor/a (specific) professor.’

Non-human direct objects are, however, clitic-doubled only when topicalized:

- (35) a. *Filmul ăsta \*(l-)am văzut.* R  
 film+the.M.Sg this.M.Sg 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl.-have.1Sg seen  
 ‘This film, I haven’t seen.’  
 b. *Am mâncat pește.* R  
 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl.-have.1Sg eaten fish+the.M.Sg  
 ‘I ate/have eaten the fish.’

Clitic-doubling of Romanian indirect objects is typically subject to specificity. Examples:

- (36) a. *Petru i-a dat fetei* R  
 Petru 3Sg.Dat.Cl.-has given girl+the.F.Sg.Dat  
*o floare.*  
 a.F.Sg flower  
 ‘Petru gave the girl a flower.’  
 b. *I-am pus borcanului* R  
 3Sg.Dat.Cl.-have.1Sg put.Part pot+the.M.Sg.Dat  
*ăsta capac.*  
 this.M.Sg lid  
 ‘I covered the pot with this lid.’

In Arli Balkan Romani clitic-doubling, as a rule, occurs only with highly emphasized pronouns and with quirky Acc subjects in sentences with V’s instantiated by the impersonal verb *isi* ‘be’ and its negative counterpart *na(n)e* ‘not be’:<sup>31</sup>

<sup>31</sup> In some cases, highly emphasized lexical objects can also be clitic-doubled. Example:

- (i) *I Merita DENGJA le o lil*  
 the.F.Sg.Nom Merita gave.3Sg 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl the.M.Sg book  
*jekhe čhaveske!*  
 a.Obl man.Dat  
 ‘Merita did give the book to a man!’

- (37) a. *Diklja men amen.* ABR  
 saw.3Sg 1Pl.Acc.Cl 3Pl.Acc.Pron  
 ‘He saw US.’
- b. *Man isi ma(n) jekh kher.* ABR  
 1Sg.Acc.Pron be.Impers 1Sg.Acc.Cl a house  
 ‘I have a house.’ (lit. ‘To me is a house.’)

### 3.3 Impersonal pronominal clitics

The Dat and Acc clitics have corresponding impersonal forms, which are used for anaphoric reference, in impersonal clauses and as passive and middle markers. In Balkan Slavic, the impersonal pronominal clitics are used for anaphoric reference whenever co-referential with the subject. Thus, we have the following contrasts:

- (38) a<sub>1</sub> *Petko se mie.* M/B  
 a<sub>2</sub> *Petko se umiva.* SC  
 Petko Impers.Acc.Cl wash.3Sg  
 ‘Petko is washing himself.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Petko go mie.* M/B  
 b<sub>2</sub> *Petko ga umiva.* SC  
 Petko 1Sg.Acc.Cl shave.3Sg  
 ‘Petko is shaving me.’

In Balkan Romance, the impersonal pronominal clitics are used for anaphoric reference to third persons:

- (39) a<sub>1</sub> *Ion s-a ras.* R  
 Ion Impers.Acc.Cl-has.Cl shaved.M.Sg
- a<sub>2</sub> *Iani si briciaști.* MR  
 Iani Acc.Imp.Cl shave.3Sg
- a<sub>3</sub> *Iane s-sursi.* Ar  
 Iane Impers.Acc.Cl-shave.3Sg  
 ‘Iane shaved himself.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Ion își cântă.* R  
 Ion Impers.Dat.Cl sing.3Sg
- b<sub>2</sub> *Iani ăș contă.* MR  
 Iani Impers.Dat.Cl sing.3Sg  
 ‘Iani is singing to himself.’



- b. *I*                    *u*                    *punua*                    *kētu.*                    AI  
 3Sg.Dat            Impers.Cl            work.3Sg.Imperf            here  
 Preferred reading: ‘(S)he felt like working here.’
- c. *I*                    *se*                    *lucra*                    *în fabrică.*            R  
 3Sg.Dat.Cl            Impers.Acc.Cl work.3Sg.Imperf            in factory  
 1. ‘One/people worked in the factory) on his/her behalf.’  
 2. ‘One/people worked in his/her factory.’  
 Not: ‘(S)he felt like working in the factory.’

The second construction, which consists of an anticausative core coupled with a dative open to a variety of interpretations, is found in all Balkan languages along parallel lines:

- (43) a. *Mu*                    *se*                    *skrši*                    *prozorecot.*            M  
 b. *I-*                    *u*                    *thye*                    *dritarja.*            AI  
 c. *I*                    *se*                    *sparse*                    *ferestrea.*            R  
           3Sg.Dat.Cl            Impers.Cl            break.3Sg.Aor window+the  
 1. ‘His window got broken.’  
 2. ‘He was the cause of/responsible for the breaking of the window’.  
 3. ‘He involuntarily caused the big vase to break.’

Rivero argues that involuntary state constructions contain a passive or impersonal core. This core contains an argument, which is implicit or existentially closed due to Argument Saturation. The dative discloses and binds this implicit argument via a formal semantic procedure called Dative Disclosure. Anticausative datives, on the other hand, are interpreted by an inferential procedure called Ethical strategy, which differs from Dative Disclosure because it cannot operate on formally present arguments. Dative Disclosure cannot apply in anticausatives because they lack the appropriate suppressed argument.

### 3.3 Possessive pronominal clitics

In all the Balkan languages, possessive relationships can be expressed by nominal, as well as by clausal clitics. In Balkan Slavic, in both cases, the (personal or impersonal) Dat pronominal clitic is used; there is, however, a between language difference with respect to the reference and markedness of the nominal possessive clitic. In Bulgarian, both nominal and clausal possessive nominal clitics are widely used and can refer to either animate an inanimate nouns. Examples:

- (44) a<sub>1</sub>            *Razbole*                    *se*                    *deteto*                    *mi.*                    B  
           get sick.N.Sg./Part            Acc.Impers.Cl child+the.N.Sg 1Sg.Dat.Cl



- a<sub>2</sub>    *Rasbole*                      *mi*                      *se*                      *deteto.*  
 get sick.N.Sg./Part    1Sg.Dat.Cl    Acc.Imp.Cl    child+the.N.Sg  
 ‘My child got sick.’
- b<sub>1</sub>    *Interesni*    *sa*                      *văprosite*                      *im.*                      B  
 Interesting.Pl    are.3Pl                      questions+the.Pl                      3Pl.Dat.Cl
- b<sub>2</sub>    *Interesni*    *sa*                      *im*                      *văprosite.*  
 Interesting.Pl    are.3Pl                      3Pl.Dat.Cl                      questions+the.Pl  
 ‘Their questions are interesting.’

In Macedonian, the nominal clitics can refer only to nouns denoting family relationships. Thus, we have the following acceptability judgements:

- (45) a<sub>1</sub>    \**Se*                      *razbole*                      *deteto*                      *mi.*                      M  
 Impers.Acc.Cl get sick.N.Sg./Part    child+the.N.Sg 1Sg.Dat.Cl
- a<sub>2</sub>    *Mi*                      *se*                      *razbole*                      *deteto.*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl    Impers.Acc.Cl get sick.N.Sg./Part    child+the.N.Sg  
 ‘My child got sick.’
- b<sub>1</sub>    *Se*                      *razbole*                      *sin*                      *mi.*                      M  
 Impers.Acc.Cl get sick.N.Sg./Part    son+the.M.Sg 1Sg.Dat.Cl
- b<sub>2</sub>    *Mi*                      *se*                      *razbole*                      *sin*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl    Impers.Acc.Cl get sick.N.Sg./Part    son  
*mi.*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl  
 ‘My son got sick.’

In Serbo-Croatian, the use of nominal clitics is not only referentially restricted to nouns denoting family relationships; it is also marked as archaic and dialectal.

In Romanian, the Dat pronominal clitics are regularly used to denote possessive relationship in the clause, while their use in the nominal phrase, though not restricted to the type of noun, is marked as archaic or belonging to the literary style.

- (46) a.    %*Chipu-i*                      *luminos*                      *domina*                      R  
 face-3Sg.Dat.Cl                      bright.M.Sg    dominate.3Sg.Aor  
*mulțimea.*  
 crowd+ the.F.Sg  
 ‘His/her bright face dominated the crowd.’

- b. *I-am* *zărit* *chipul* R  
 3Sg.Dat.Cl-have.1Sg.Cl spotted.M.SgPart. face+the.M.Sg  
*în mulțime.*  
 in crowd  
 ‘I spotted his/her face in the crowd.’

In the other two Romance Balkan languages, Megleno-Romanian and Aromanian, the Dat pronominal clitics are not used in the nominal phrase. In all three Romance Balkan languages, there are, however, clitics relating to lexical possessive pronouns/determiners which express possessive relationship by referring to singular nouns denoting close family relationships.

- (47) a. *Este frumoasă nevasta-sa.* R  
 is beautiful.F.Sg wife-his/her.Sg.F.Cl  
 ‘His wife is beautiful.’
- b. *Ți este frumoasa nevastă-ta.*<sup>34</sup> MR  
 2Sg.Dat.Cl is beautiful.F.Sg wife-your.2Sg.F.Cl  
 ‘Your wife is beautiful.’
- b. *Ul vidzu frati-nju.* Ar  
 3Sg.F.Acc.Cl see.3Sg.Aor brother-my.M.Sg.Cl  
 ‘(S)he saw my brother.’

In Albanian, clausal Dat pronominal clitics can be used to express possessive relationship without any restrictions, whereas within the nominal phrase, they can refer only to singular nouns denoting close family relationship:

- (48) *Erdhi nga e ëma.* Al  
 come.3Sg.Aor from F.Sg.Agr.Cl mother+the.F.Sg  
 ‘(S)he came from his/her mother’s.’

In Arli Balkan Romani, Dat pronominal clitics are very selectively used and never express possessive relationships. There are, however, possessive pronominal clitics related to full (lexical) possessive pronouns/determiners, which refer to singular nouns denoting close family relationships:

---

<sup>34</sup> In this sentence the possessive pronominal clitic cooccurs with a clausal Dat pronominal clitic.

- (49) a. *So šuži stadik pletingja ti* ABR  
 what beautiful.F.Sg hat knit.3Sg.Past your.2Sg.Cl  
*daj!*  
 mother  
 ‘What a beautiful hat has your mother knitted for you!’
- b. *Kergja lafi te dadea.* ABR  
 make.3Sg.Past talk your.2Sg.Obl.Cl dadea.Instr  
 ‘(S)he talked to your father.’

In Modern Greek, possessive relationships within the nominal phrase as well as possessive relationships within the clause are expressed by Gen pronominal clitics, as are also dative pronominal arguments:<sup>35</sup>

- (50) a. *O Jorghos idhe tin* MG  
 the.M.Sg Jorghos see.1Sg.Aor the.F.Sg.Acc  
*kori su.*  
 daughter 2Sg.Gen.Cl  
 ‘Jorgo saw your daughter.’
- b. *Tu pandrevete i kori.* MG  
 3Sg.M.Gen.Cl marry.3Sg.M-P the.F.Sg daughter  
 ‘His daughter is getting married.’

Pancheva (this volume) argues that Modern Greek possessive clitics receive abstract genitive case and are thus formally distinct from clausal indirect object clitics, which are valued as dative. The identity between the two types of clitics in this language results from dative/genitive syncretism in the morpho-phonological expression of distinct abstract syntactic features. In contrast, in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Romanian, and Serbo-Croatian, possessive clitics have dative case features in syntax, and are the same entities as clausal indirect object clitics; the identity of morpho-phonological form of the two types of clitics is due to identity of formal features and not to case syncretism. There are further distinctions within this latter group of languages: Bulgarian and Macedonian DPs have the syntactic means to value dative case on possessive arguments, Serbo-Croatian DPs do not, and Romanian DPs have almost completely lost the dative-case valuation mechanism. This parametric difference is responsible for the availability of DP-internal pos-

---

<sup>35</sup> The occurrence of clausal Gen clitics with possessive interpretation is not, however, possible in all environments. The common denominator of the environments that allow possessively interpreted clausal Gen clitics and those that do not allow them have yet to be determined.

sessive clitics in Bulgarian and Macedonian, their lack in Serbo-Croatian, and their non-productivity in Romanian.

Pancheva bases her conclusions on comparative data from the contemporary languages, as well as on historical data. She gives evidence that in Greek, a pre-nominal genitive position was available to all DPs up until the 15<sup>th</sup> century, while in the history of South Slavic genitive clitics were never available.

There have been arguments in the generative literature that the clausal clitics with possessive interpretation originate in and are raised from DPs (cf. Avram and Coene 2000; Stateva 2002; Moskovsky This volume). While Avram and Coene (2000) maintains that the movement is triggered by a topic feature, and Stateva (2002) believes that it is case-driven, Moskovsky (this volume) argues the the DP to CP clitic movement in Bulgarian that strictly respects normal constraints on movement – it is an optional movement allowed only out of complements of the verb, that is, out of maximal projections which are L-marked. He presents evidence that locality constraints on binding in Bulgarian apply within narrower boundaries than generally assumed (e.g., under a “governing category” formulation).

Note, however, that, whatever the reasoning behind the raising, the raising itself is questioned by the fact that possessive clitics in the DP can cooccur with clausal clitics with possessive interpretation:

- (51) a. *Došla*                      *mu*                      *na*                      *gosti* *dăšterja*                      B  
 come.F.Sg./Part                      3Sg.M.Dat.Cl on                      guests daughter  
*ti.*  
 2Sg.Dat.Cl  
 ‘Your daughter has come to visit him.’
- b. *Mu*                      *došla*                      *vo*                      *poseta* *kerka*                      M  
 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl come.F.Sg./Part                      in                      visit daughter  
*ti.*  
 2Sg.Dat.Cl  
 ‘Your daughter has come to visit him, I hear.’
- c. *Mu*                      *ksodepse*                      *ola*                      *ta*                      MG  
 1Sg.Gen.Cl                      spent.3Sg.Aor all.F.Acc                      the.N.Pl.Acc  
*lefta*                      *mu.*  
 money.N.Pl                      1Sg.Gen.Cl  
 ‘He spent all my money.’

It is not plausible to assume that the DP clitic would raise only if there is no possessively interpreted clitic in the CP. The possessively interpreted clitics in the CP seems to be derived independently.

#### 4. Subjunctives

The most perspicuous and most widely discussed property of the Balkan Sprachbund languages is the loss of the infinitive and its replacement by structurally comparable subjunctive constructions. In Macedonian and Tosk Albanian the loss of the infinitive is complete and in Aromanian, Modern Greek, Bulgarian and the Southeastern Serbian dialects it is almost complete; in Gheg Albanian and Megleno-Romanian the infinitive shows up in a limited number of expression; whereas in Romanian, Standard Serbian and Standard Croatian it shares many of its functions with subjunctive constructions with finite verbs.

##### 4.1 *Subjunctives as complements of modal and intentional verbs*

Typically, subjunctive constructions are used in complement positions of modal and intentional verbs. The verb of the subjunctive construction can, but need not agree in person and number with the verb of the main clause. Whenever such an agreement occurs, there is “equi” deletion and only one subject surfaces – in unmarked sentences, to the left of the main verb. Pronominal subjects are dropped, unless emphatic.

Modal verbs are very often impersonal. When personal, however, they have to agree in person and number with the verb in the subjunctive construction.<sup>36</sup>

- (52) a. *Ne možam da go* M  
 not can.1Sg Subj.Mark 3Sg.M/N.Acc.Cl  
*vidam/\*vidiš.*  
 see.1/2Sg.Perf.Pres  
 ‘I cannot see him/it.’
- b. *Poq s-ti/\*il duq/\*duca.* MR  
 can/may.2Sg Subj.Mark-2/3Sg.Acc.Cl go.2/3Sg  
 ‘You can/may go.’

---

<sup>36</sup> As a personal verb, the Albanian verb *mund* ‘can/may’ appears only in the aorist or a perfect tense. The Arli Balkan Romani verb *šaj* ‘can/may’, on the other, can never be personal.

- c. *Dy prej tyre mundën (që) të shpëtonin.* AI  
 two from they.Dat can.3Pl.Aor that Subj.Mark  
 save.3Pl.M-P  
 ‘Two of them could be saved.’
- d. *Boro na figo/\*figis.* MG  
 can/may.1Sg Subj.Mark leave.1/2Sg  
 ‘I/\*you can/may leave.’

Intentional verbs fall into three classes with respect to agreement with the person/number features of their subjunctive complements. Verbs of the “intend” type have same reference as the subjects of their subjunctive complements; verbs of the “order” type have different reference from the reference of the subjects of their subjunctive complements (disjoint reference verbs); while verbs of the “want” type may agree or disagree with the person/number features of their subjunctive complements.

- (53) a. *Namerava da patuva/\*patuvaš.* M  
 intend.3Sg Subj.Mark travel.3/2Sg  
 ‘(S)he intends to travel.’
- b. *Intenționează să meargă/\*meargi la Paris.* R  
 intend.3Sg Subj.Mark go.3/2Sg.Subj to Paris  
 ‘(S)he intends to go to Paris.’
- c. *Tentoi (që) të vijë/\*vij.* AI  
 intend.3Sg.Aor that Subj.Mark come.3/1Sg.Subj  
 ‘He intended to come.’
- d. *Skopevo na ertho/\*erthis.* MG  
 intend.1Sg Subj.Mark come.1/3Sg.Perf.Pres  
 ‘I intend to come.’
- e. *Nietinela te dromarel/\*dromarela.* ABR  
 intend.3Sg Subj.Mark travel.3/1Sg  
 ‘(S)he intends to travel.’
- (54) a. *Zapoveda Marija da dojde vednaš.* M  
 ordered.3Sg.Perf.Past Marija Subj.Mark  
 come.3Sg.Perf.Pres immediately  
 ‘He gave an order for Marija to come immediately.’

- b. *A ordonat ca Maria să* R  
 has ordered.Part Subj.Mark Maria Subj.Mark  
*vină numaidecât.*  
 come.3Sg.Subj immediately.  
 ‘(S)he gave an order for Maria to come immediately.’
- c. *Urdhëroi Drita (që) të vish* AI  
 order.3Sg.Aor Drita that Subj.Mark come.2Sg.Subj  
*menjëherë.*  
 immediately  
 ‘He ordered Drita to come immediately.’
- d. *Dietakse ti Maria na* MG  
 order.3Sg.Aor the.F.Sg.Acc Maria Subj.Mark  
*erthi amesos.*  
 come.3Sg.Perf.Pres immediately  
 ‘He gave an order for Maria to come immediately.’
- e. *Naredingja i Nafija te* ABR  
 ordered.3Sg.Past the.F.Sg Nafija Subj.Mark  
*avel akana.*  
 come.3Sg now  
 ‘He gave an order for Marija to come immediately.’
- (55) a. *Sakam da mu go* M  
 want.1Sg Subj.Mark 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl  
*dadeš/dadat.*  
 give.2Sg/3Pl.Perf.Pres  
 ‘I want that you/they give it to him.’
- b. *Vrea să pleci/plece la București.* R  
 want.3Sg Subj.Mark leave.2/3Sg to Bucharest  
 ‘(S)he wants you/him/her to leave for Bucharest.’
- c. *Duan (që) t’ia* AI  
 want.3Pl that Subj.Mark-Sg.Dat.Cl+3Sg.Acc.Cl  
*japin/japë.*  
 give.3Pl/Sg.Subj  
 ‘They want/want you to give it to him/her.’

- d. *Thelo na pao/pai eki.* MG  
 want.1Sg Subj.Mark go.1/3Sg there  
 ‘I want/want him/her to go there.’
- e. *Na mangela te ovav/ovel tlo/klo* ABR  
 not want.3Sg Subj.Mark be.1/3Sg.Subj your  
*izmekjari.*  
 servant  
 ‘(S)he doesn’t want me/her/him to be your servant.’

In Serbo-Croatian, intentional verbs take not only subjunctive but also infinitive complements. The usage of infinitive and subjunctive complements with individual types of intentional verbs in (standard) Serbian is different from their usage in (standard) Croatian. When the intentional verb and its complement have disjoint reference, intentional verbs in both (standard) Serbian and (standard) Croatian we have subjunctive complements. In the case of joint reference, intentional verbs in (standard) Croatian take only infinitives, while with intentional verbs in (standard) Serbian both infinitive and subjunctive complements occur, though the latter are preferred. Stojanović and Marelj (this volume) examined child and adult strategies in interpreting the empty subjects in Serbian and Croatian subjunctive and infinitival complements of intentional verbs. Fifteen four-and-five year old speakers of Serbian, and 25 three-to-five year old speakers of Croatian, as well as 16 Serbian and Croatian speaking adults were tested in an act-out experiment. The results demonstrate that the rules for interpreting null subjects in infinitive complements in both Serbian and Croatian are in place by the age of five. Although neither child nor adult subjects showed any problems with interpreting null subjects in subjunctive-like complements, only the Croatian-speaking children adopted the external reference for empty subjects in “want” type subjunctive complements.

#### 4.2 *Subjunctive constructions as modifiers*

In all the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund, subjunctive constructions can function as adjectival or adverbial modifiers. The border between subjunctive constructions functioning as adjectival or adverbial modifiers is actually very weak. Thus, clauses in which the subjunctive construction is introduced by a “wh” relativizer clearly functions as adjectival modifiers:<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> The main verbs are, as a rule, equivalents of verbs such as look for or find, which can go under the general name of verbs of quest.



- (56) a. *Tărsja žena kojato da* B  
 look for.1Sg woman who.F.Sg+to Subj.Mark  
*mi gleda decata.*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl looks after children+the.Pl  
 ‘I am looking for a woman to look after my children.’
- b. *Caut o fată (care) să* R  
 look for.1Sg a.F girl which Subj.Mark  
*știe englezește.*  
 know.3Sg.Subj English  
 ‘I am looking for a girl that knows English.’
- c. *Ubides capelă cari s-mi* MR  
 look for.1Sg hat which Subj.Mark-1Sg.Acc.Cl  
*veagljă di soare.*  
 protect.3Sg.Subj from sun.  
 ‘I am looking for a hat that would protect me from the sun.’
- d. *Aflai tu sone una fustane cai/tsi* Ar  
 find.1Sg.Aor at end a dress which/what  
*s-mi arisească.*  
 Subj.Mark-1Sg.Acc.Cl please.3Sg.Subj  
 ‘I finally found a dress which should please me.’
- e. *Gjeta njeri që të punojë* Al  
 find.1Sg.Aor man that Subj.Mark hoe.3Sg.Subj  
*vreshtën.*  
 vineyard+the.SgAcc  
 ‘I found a man that hoes vineyards.’
- f. *Psahno kapelo pu na me* MG  
 look for.1Sg hat that Subj.Mark 2Sg.Acc.Cl  
*prostatevi apo ton ilio.*  
 protect.3Sg from the.M.Sg sun  
 ‘I am looking for a hat that would protect me from the sun’.

On the other hand, subjunctive constructions preceded by equivalents of the preposition *for*, clearly function as adverbial modifiers of purpose:

- (57) a. *Npravivme pauza za da gi* M  
 make.1Pl.Perf.Past pause for Subj.Mark 3Pl.Acc.Cl

- čueme*                      *vestite.*  
hear.1Pl.Perf.Pres      news+the.Pl  
'We paused in order to hear the news.'
- b. *Dojdoh*      *za*      *da*      *vi*                      *săobšta*                      B  
come.1Sg.Aor for      to      2Pl.Acc.Cl      inform.1Sg.Perf.Pres  
*če*      *si*                      *otivam.*  
That      Impers.Dat.Cl leave.1Sg  
'I came to inform you that I am leaving.'
- c. *Ion*      *e*      *prea*      *periculos*      *pentru*      *ca*                      R  
Ion      is      too      dangerous      for      that.Mod  
*să-l*                                      *angajăm.*  
Subj.Mark+3Sg.M.Acc.Cl      hire.1Pl  
'Ion is too dangerous for us to hire him.'
- d. *Irtha*                      *ja*      *na*                      *se*                      MG  
come.1Sg.Aor              for      Subj.Mark      2Sg.Acc.Cl  
*voithiso.*  
help.1Sg.Perf.Pres  
'I came to help you.'

Nevertheless, the relativizer and the preposition can be left out, and in some languages do not occur at all, and then the clause is open to ambiguities. Bužarovska (This volume) examines the syntactic environments that favor the realization of an isofunctional syntactic pattern, which occurs in the mixed domain of purpose and modification in Macedonian, Aromanian, Albanian and Modern Greek. She shows that these languages share a limited set of ditransitive verbs that allow "purpose-like" modification of their direct object due to dual case assignment and argues that the weakening of control at the expense of benefactive meaning is responsible for gradual shift from purpose to modification.

Related to subjunctive constructions functioning as adjectival modifiers are subjunctive constructions with "wh"-words as subjects, objects or adjuncts, which can be reinterpreted as structures in which subjunctive constructions modify "wh"-words. The latter subjunctive constructions appear in complement positions of verbs expressing (a) assertion or denial of existence or (b) coming into being, view or availability or causation of one of these. In (48) we have examples of subjunctive constructions with "wh" arguments or adjuncts in complement positions of equivalents of the existential verb "have" – a verb that typically expresses assertion or denial:

- (58) a. *Ima koj da mi pomogne.* M  
 have.Impers who Subj.Mark 1Sg.Dat.Cl help.3Sg.Perf.Pr  
 ‘There is someone who can help me.’
- b. *Njama kakvo da kupiš.* B  
 not+have.Impers what Subj.Mark buy.2Sg.Perf  
 ‘There are nothing to buy.’
- c. *Nemaš kako da pošalješ paket.* SC  
 not+have.2Sg how Subj.Mark send.2Pl.Perf.Pr parcel  
 ‘You have no way to send a/the parcel.’
- d. *Nu am cu cine sã vin.* R  
 not have.1Sg with who Subj.Mark come.1Sg  
 ‘I have nobody with whom I can come.’
- e. *Nu ari di ři si cařã.* MR  
 not have.Impers from what Subj.Mark catch.3Sg/Pl.Subj  
 ‘There is nothing (s)he/they can hold onto.’
- f. *Am cu cai (tã) s-yin.* Ar  
 have.1Sg with whom that.Mod Subj.Mark-come.1Sg  
 ‘I have somebody with whom I can come.’
- g. *S’ka (që) ç-të bëhet.* Al  
 not-have.Impers that what-Subj.Mark do.Impers.M-P  
 ‘There is nothing one can do.’
- h. *(Dhen) exume se pjion na* MG  
 not have.1Pl to who.Acc Subj.Mark  
*stilume ta emborevmata.*  
 send.1Pl.Perf.Pres the.N.Pl merchandize  
 ‘We have someone/(noone) to whom to send the merchandise.’
- i. *Na(n)e kasaja te avav.* ABR  
 not+be.Impers who.Instr Subj.Mark come.1Sg  
 ‘There is nobody with whom I can come.’

Grosu (This volume) refers to the subjunctive complements with “wh” arguments or adjuncts as “modal existential “wh”-constructions (MECs)”, and argues that they have the superficial appearance of a “wh”-clause, but the semantics of a narrow-scope existential generalized quantifier (GQ), such that the property expressed by the IP has modal possibility/ability force. Building on Grosu (1994), Grosu and

Landman (1998) and Izvorski (1998), and modifying some of the views in these works, Grosu proposes that MECs are non-core relative constructions consisting of a bare CP which carries the feature  $[GQ_{\exists}]$ , as well as a specification of its particular modality. Cross-linguistic distribution is captured by extensions of subcategorization options from nominal to CP arguments, such extensions being potentially “licensed” by semantic-pragmatic properties of the matrix predicates in conjunction with the larger context, in the sense that they constitute necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for extension.

#### 4.3 Bare subjunctive constructions

Subjunctive constructions can be bare, i.e. they can occur not as complements, but as the only constituent of a sentence. Typically, bare subjunctive constructions with verbs in the present tense express a wish, a mild command, an intention or a suggestion:

(59)	a.	<i>Da</i>		<i>odiš!</i>	M
	b.	<i>Da</i>		<i>otideš!</i>	B
	c.	<i>Da</i>		<i>ideš!</i>	SC
	d.	<i>Të</i>		<i>shkosh!</i>	AI
	e.	<i>Na</i>		<i>pas!</i>	MG
	f.	<i>Te</i>		<i>dža!</i>	ABR
	g.	<i>Să</i>	<i>te</i>	<i>duci!</i>	R
	h.	<i>S-</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>duṭ!</i>	MR
	i.	<i>S-</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>duts!</i>	Ar
		Subj.Mark	2Sg.Acc.Cl	go.2Sg	
		‘You should go!’			

Bare subjunctive constructions are dealt with by two papers in this volume. While Aaman and Auwera demonstrate that bare subjunctive constructions are used to express volition not only in the languages of the Balkans, but also elsewhere in Southern Europe, Isac and Jakab are concerned with the derivation of the imperative force of the structure and propose that the imperative Force features are hosted in MP – a projection placed in the left periphery of the sentence, which is lower than the highest CP projection. Isac and Jacab argue that, by hosting the Force features in an MP lower than CP, it is possible to unify the syntax of subjunctive constructions and other “surrogate” imperatives, whose morphology is “borrowed” from another paradigm, with the syntax of “true” imperatives, i.e. with the syntax of imperatives with imperative morphology. They show that cross linguistic variation follows from the particular properties that clitics and negative markers have across languages, as well as from the particular mechanism by which the impera-

tive Force feature is checked (by merging a Mood particle in the head of the MP; by moving the imperative verb to M; or by moving the Negative head to M).

#### 4.3 *Future tenses*

With some exceptions, the future tenses of the Balkan Sprachbund languages are analytic constructions which have evolved from configurations in which subjunctive constructions appear in complement positions of lexical “will”-modals. They are of types: (a) inflected “will”-modal clitics plus subjunctive constructions; (b) non-inflecting “will”-modal clitics plus subjunctive constructions; (c) non-inflecting “will”-modal clitics plus tensed verbs whose forms are analogous to the forms of the verbs in the subjunctive constructions of the languages in question (cf. Tomić To appear)

In Serbo-Croatian, the future tense with a subjunctive construction operates alongside future tense with infinitives; in either case the structure is introduced by “will”-auxiliary clitics that inflect for person and number. Examples:<sup>38</sup>

- |      |    |                        |                 |               |                |                  |    |
|------|----|------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|----|
| (60) | a. | <i>On</i>              | <i>će</i>       | <i>to</i>     | <i>da</i>      | <i>uradi</i>     | SC |
|      |    | he                     | will.3Sg.Mod.Cl | it/that       | Subj.Mark      | do.3Sg.Perf.Pres |    |
|      |    | <i>sutra.</i>          |                 |               |                |                  |    |
|      |    | tomorrow               |                 |               |                |                  |    |
|      | b. | <i>On</i>              | <i>će</i>       | <i>to</i>     | <i>uraditi</i> | <i>sutra.</i>    | SC |
|      |    | he                     | will.3Sg.Mod.Cl | it/that       | do.Inf         | tomorrow         |    |
|      | c. | <i>Uradiće</i>         | <i>to</i>       | <i>sutra.</i> |                |                  | SC |
|      |    | do.Inf+will.3Sg.Mod.Cl | it/that         | tomorrow      |                |                  |    |

‘He will do that tomorrow.’

In Romanian the standard future tenses is, as a rule, constructed with non-finite modal clitics plus short (suffixless) infinitives. In colloquial Romanian, however, there is a future tense construction which employs the invariant clitic *o*, arguably representing a reduced version of the “will”-auxiliary, plus finite lexical verbs.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>38</sup> In constructions with infinitives, when the subject is dropped, the “will”-clitic encliticises to the infinitive.

<sup>39</sup> In addition to these future tenses, there are in Romanian a formal future tense (used only in the third person singular), in which the subjunctive construction is preceded by *voi* ‘will’ and an intentional future tense, in which the subjunctive construction is preceded by forms of *avea* ‘have’.

Examples of future tense with an infinitive and future tense with a subjunctive construction are given in (61a) and (61b), respectively:

- (61) a. *Ion va pleca mâine.* R  
 Ion will.3Sg.Mod.Cl leave.Inf tomorrow  
 ‘Ion will leave tomorrow.’
- b. *Ion o să-i ceară mașina.* R  
 Ion will.Mod Subj.Comp-3Sg.Dat.Cl ask.3Sg.Subj  
 car+the.F.Sg  
 ‘Ion will ask him for the car.’

In Aromanian and Albanian the subjunctive construction is preceded by an invariant form of the “will”-auxiliary clitic:

- (61) a. *Va s-yin s-ti ved mâne.* Ar  
 will Subj.Comp-come.1Sg.Pres Subj.Comp-2Sg.Acc.Cl  
 see.1Sg.Pres tomorrow.  
 ‘I will come to see you tomorrow.’
- b. *Do ta jap librin nesër.* Al  
 will Subj.Comp+3Sg.Dat.Cl+3Sg.Acc.Cl give.1Sg  
 book+the.M.Sg tomorrow  
 ‘I will give you the book tomorrow.’

In Macedonian, Bulgarian, Modern Greek and Arli Balkan Romani we have an invariant form of the “will”- auxiliary clitic followed by a tensed verb:

- (62) a. *(Toj) ќе go stori* M  
 he will.Mod.Cl 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl do.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
*toa utre.*  
 that tomorrow  
 ‘He will do that tomorrow.’
- b. *(Toj) šte napravi tova utre.* B  
 he will.Mod.Cl do.3Sg.Perf.Pres that tomorrow  
 ‘He will do that tomorrow.’

- c. *Tha su dhiavaso avrio.* MG  
 will.Mod.Cl 2Sg.Gen.Cl read.1Sg.Perf.Pres tomorrow  
 ‘I will be reading/read to you tomorrow.’
- d. *Ka čitnav tukje tajsa.* ABR  
 will.Mod.Cl read.1Sg 2Sg.Dat.Pron tomorrow  
 I will read/be reading to you tomorrow.’

Nevertheless, historical evidence and the forms of the verbs – analogous to the forms of the verbs in subjunctive constructions and often distinct from the present tense forms – testify to the fact that the Macedonian, Bulgarian and Modern Greek future tenses originated as structures such as those in the future tenses of Albanian and Aromanian, and ultimately as structures such as those in the Serbo-Croatian future tenses with subjunctive structures. The Arli Balkan Romani future tenses, on the other hand, were modeled after the Modern Greek future tenses.

The Megleno-Romanian future tense is a bare subjunctive construction:

- (63) a. *Si vină.* MR  
 Subj.Mark come.3Sg/Pl.Subj  
 ‘(S)he/they will come.’
- b. *S-la lea.* MR  
 Subj.Mark-3Sg.M.Acc.Cl take.2Sg  
 ‘You will take it.’

The structures of the future-in-the-past tenses of the Balkan languages, in the majority of cases, also includes or is diachronically related to subjunctive constructions. Bulgarian and the Southeastern Serbian dialects have future-in-the-past tenses with past tense forms of “will”-auxiliaries plus subjunctive constructions with verbs in the present tense.

- (64) a. *Da ne valeše, ošte štjahme* B  
 Subj.Mark not rain.3Sg.Imperfect still would.1Pl  
*da se razxoždame.*  
 Subj.Mark Impers.Acc.Cl walk.1Pl.Imperf.Pres  
 ‘If it didn’t rain, we would have still be walking.’
- b. *Ća da ga nosi.* SES  
 would.Mod.Aux Subj.Mark 3Sg.N.Acc.Cl carries  
 ‘(S)he wanted to carry him.’

Aromanian and Albanian have future-in-the-past constructions with non-inflected modal clitics followed by subjunctive constructions with verbs in a past tense form:

- (65) a. *Nu va (s-)lipsea* Ar  
 not will.Mod.Cl Subj.Mark-should.Imperf  
*s-yinã.*  
 Subj.Mark-come.3Sg/Pl.Subj  
 ‘(S)he/they shouldn’t have come!’
- b. *Po të më ftonin* Al  
 if Subj.Mark 1Sg.Acc.Cl invite.3Pl.Imperf  
*do të merrja pjesë.*  
 will.Mod.Cl Subj.Mark take.1Sg.Imperf part  
 ‘If they invited me I would take part.’

In Megleno-Romanian, the function which in the other Balkan languages is performed by future-in-the-past tenses is performed by bare subjunctive constructions with verbs in the Imperfect:

- (66) *Si vineau ier.*  
 Subj.Mark come.3Pl.Imperf yesterday  
 ‘(As far as I know) they were to come yesterday.’

Macedonian and Modern Greek have future-in-the-past constructions with non-inflected modal clitics followed by verbs in a past tense form:

- (67) a. *Ķe dojdeše do pet.* M  
 will.Mod.Cl come.3Sg.Subj.Past till five  
 ‘(S)he was (supposed) to come by five.’
- b. *Dhen tha eprepe na* MG  
 not will.Mod.Cl must.3Sg.Imperf Subj.Mark  
*erthun.*  
 come.3Pl.Perf.Pres  
 ‘They shouldn’t have come!’

Like their future tenses, the future-in-the-past tenses of Macedonian and Modern Greek are diachronically derived from “will”-auxiliary plus subjunctive construction sequences, analogous to those in Albanian and Aromanian.

Arli Balkan Romani has a future-in-the-past tense constructed by adding the frozen third person singular past tense form of the auxiliary *isi* ‘be’, *sine*, which actually represents a pastness marker, to the future tense constructions of this language, which, as pointed above, are modeled after the Modern Greek future tense constructions.



- (68) *Dži akana/tajsa ka sikljovel* ABR  
 till now/tomorrow will.Mod.Cl show/teach/learn.3Sg.M-P  
*sine te nangjovel.*  
 Past.Mark Subj.Mark swim.3Sg  
 ‘Till now/tomorrow he will have taught himself/learnt to swim.’

The future-in-the-past tense of Romanian is unique among the Balkan languages in not being related to a subjunctive construction – it is formed by the non-inflecting modal clitic *o* or by forms of the inflecting “will”-modal clitic auxiliaries followed by the perfect form of the “be”-auxiliary, *fi*, and a participle:

- (69) a. *S-o fi plimbat Ion. R*  
 Impers.Acc.Cl-will.Cl be.Perf walk.Part Ion  
 b. *Se va fi plimbat Ion. R*  
 Impers.Acc.Cl will.3Sg.Mod.Cl be.Perf walk.Part Ion  
 ‘Ion will have walked.’

In a revised Reichenbachian framework, D’Hulst, Coene and Avram (this volume) show that, as opposed to most Western Romance languages, Romanian has an extremely reduced deictic tense system in which a single past morpheme can express both the relation between Event Time and Reference Time and between Reference Time and Speech Time. The invariant third person form of the “want”-auxiliary that combines with the infinitive or the subjunctive to form the Romanian future tenses, is shown not to be part of the deictic tense system, but to consist of a future operator taking scope over the event expressed in the clause. The proposed operator status for the Romanian future tenses also explains its availability as future in the past on a par with the conditional in other Romance languages. Whereas in the latter languages, the future in the past readings follow from the inherent settings of Reference Time, Speech Time and Event Time in the conditional, in Romanian (and *ipso facto* in the other Balkan languages) they are the result of the future operator falling in the scope of the past tense of the matrix clause and taking scope over the event expressed in the complement clause.

## 5. Evidentials

Many, though not all, Balkan languages encode evidentiality – whether through distinct evidential sets of forms (as in Tosk Albanian, Macedonian and Megleno-Romanian) or by calquing new meanings into existing forms (as in Bulgarian and Romanian). The rise and spread of grammaticalized evidentiality is, however, uneven both between and within individual languages.

### 5.1 *Balkan Slavic*

Within Macedonian, two verb subsystems intersect. Subsystem A has a (simple) past tense (with distinct paradigms for perfective and imperfective verbs, reflecting the paradigms of the aorist and the imperfect tenses, respectively), a “be”-perfect used to express resultativeness and experience, as well as evidentiality, and a “be”-pluperfect. Subsystem B has a simple past tense (with distinct paradigms for perfective and imperfective verbs), a “be”-perfect used exclusively to express evidentiality, a “have” present perfect and a “have” past perfect (cf. Tomić 1988).

Typically, the Macedonian evidential forms impart the speaker’s non-awareness of the event to which the verb refers. Consider the following sentences:

- (70) a. *Veli deka si me videl.* M  
 say.3Sg that be.2Sg 1Sg.Acc.Cl see.M.Sg.l-Part  
 ‘(S)he says that you have seen me.’
- b. *Se gleda deka si zborovala* M  
 Impers.Acc.Cl see.Impers that be.2Sg speak.F.Sg.l-Part  
*so Ana.*  
 with Ana  
 ‘One can see that you have spoken to Ana.’
- c. *Ovaa forma se upotrebuva za dejstva što* M  
 this.F form Impers.Acc.Cl use.Impers for actions what  
*se izvršile pred neкое drugo dejstvo*  
 Impers.Acc.Cl accomplish.l-Part before some other action  
*vo minatoto.*  
 in past+the.N.Sg  
 ‘This form is used to express actions that have taken place before some other actions in the past.’

In (60a) we have a reported event; in (60b) a circumstantial deduction; in (60c) the *l*-participle *izvršile* is used in a definition.

Further, the Macedonian evidential forms can express surprise, admiration, amazement or irony. Very often, with appropriate intonation, the same sentence can have all these meanings:

- (71) *Ama ti si bil junak!* M  
 but you are.2Sg be.M.Sg./-Part hero  
 1. ‘You are such a hero!’ (admiration)  
 2. ‘(I am surprised to see that) you are a hero. (surprise)  
 3. ‘You a hero! (irony)

The Macedonian evidential forms can commonly be used in connected narratives:

- (72) a. *Sum (ti) stanala rano i* M  
 am 2Sg.Eth.Dat.Cl get up.F.Sg./-Part early and  
*sum (ti) se dala*  
 am 2Sg.Eth.Dat.Cl Impers.Acc.Cl give.F.Sg./-Part  
*na rabota.*  
 on work  
 ‘Lo behold, I got up early and got to task.’ (lit. ‘I got up early and gave myself to work.’)
- b. *Si bil eden car i si* M  
 Impers.Dat.Cl be.M.Sg./-Part a king and Impers.Dat.Cl  
*imal dva sina.*  
 have.M.Sg./-Part two sons  
 ‘There was a king and he had two sons.’

The Bulgarian “be” perfect, in addition to its typical uses as a perfect expressing witnessed events, has most of the evidential functions expressed by the Macedonian “be” perfect. It imparts the speaker’s non-awareness of the event to which the verb refers, and can express surprise, admiration, amazement or irony. The Bulgarian “be” perfect can also be used in story-telling, though not in narrating events that the speaker has experienced. Thus, the Macedonian sentence (62a) has no adequate equivalent in Bulgarian, while in the Bulgarian equivalent of (62b), given in (63), instead of the *l*-participle of the “be” auxiliary, preceded by an impersonal clitic we have the *l*-participle of the “have” auxiliary:

- (73) *Imalo edin car i toj imal* B  
 have.N.Sg./-Part a king and he have.M.Sg./-Part  
*dvama sina.*  
 two sons  
 ‘There was a king and he had two sons.’

## 5.2 Albanian

In Tosk Albanian there are two sets of synthetic evidential forms – those of the admirative present and imperfect tenses, and four sets of analytic evidential forms – those of the active or medio-passive admirative present perfect and active or medio-passive admirative Past perfect. Typically, the Tosk Albanian evidential (admirative) forms can express admiration, surprise or irony:<sup>40</sup>

- (74) a. *TI* (*me të vërtetë*) *flitke* Al  
 you in Pl.Agr.Cl truth speak.3Sg.Admir  
*kinezçe.*  
 Chinese  
 ‘You really speak Chinese!’

The Tosk Albanian evidential (admirative) forms are also used to assert the occurrence of an action or the existence of a state:<sup>41</sup>

- (75) a. *Ai* (*vërtetë*) *flitka* *kinezçe.* Al  
 he truth speak.3Sg.Admir.Pres Chinese  
 ‘He does speak Chinese!’
- b. *Ai* (*vërtetë*) *e paska*  
 he truth 3Sg.Acc.Cl have.3Sg.Pres.Admir  
*përdorur thikën.*  
 used.Part knife+the.M.Sg.Acc  
 ‘He indeed used the knife!’

<sup>40</sup> The label “admirative” actually reflects this usage.

<sup>41</sup> It is noteworthy that, while in Balkan Slavic the evidential forms always have some sort of past reference, even when the apparent meaning is present, the Albanian evidential system has a true present. Mark the difference between the reading of (65a) and (65b). Note also that, while the Slavic evidential forms are used only in declarative sentences, the Albanian admirative is used in questions:

- (i) *Ku qenka mjeshtri?*  
 where be.3Sg.Admir boss+the.M.Sg  
 ‘Where is the boss?’

The Albanian admirative is, however, never used in narratives.

By inference, the evidential (admirative) forms are also used to express disagreement, or uncertainty:

- (76) a. *Thonë se lakam tasha* Al  
 say.3Sg that wash.1Sg.Pres.Admir clothes.Sg+the.F.Sg  
*çdo ditë.*  
 every day  
 ‘They say that I wash/was washing clothes every day (but I don’t).’
- b. (*Më duket sikur po* Al  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl seem.Impers as if Affirm.Particle  
*afroreshkan retë.*  
 approach.3Pl.Pres.Admir clouds  
 ‘(It seems to me) that the clouds are approaching.’

Some Gheg Albanian dialects also use the admirative. Very often, however, Gheg Albanian uses the perfect instead.

### 5.3 *Balkan Romance*

Although in direct contact with both Macedonian and Albanian, Aromanian, as a rule, does not express evidentiality.<sup>42</sup> In Romanian, on the other hand, constructions with forms of the “will” or “would” modal auxiliaries plus the perfect participle *fi* plus present or past participles could be treated as exponents of evidentiality,<sup>43</sup> though evidential-like uses of similar modal constructions in Western Romance (cf. Squartini 2001) can be adduced as an argument against the independent status of these constructions. The existence of evidential forms in Megleno-Romanian cannot, however, be disputed.

Megleno-Romanian has two sets of forms with evidential function: the forms of the inverted perfect and the forms of the inverted past perfect. Whereas in the inverted perfect invariable past participles of lexical verbs are followed by present tense forms of the “have” auxiliary, in the inverted past perfect inverted perfect forms of the “have” auxiliary appear to the left of invariable past participles of

<sup>42</sup> In the Farsheriot Aromanian dialect spoken in the village Gorna Belica in Southwestern Macedonia, there are evidential forms constructed in analogy to the formation of the Albanian admirative forms – by adding a suffix to the aorist form of the verb. Moreover, the suffix itself is borrowed from Albanian – it actually is the third person singular present tense form of the Albanian auxiliary *kam* ‘have’, *ca*.

<sup>43</sup> Dimitriu (1979: 269-71) treats the will/would plus *fi* plus present participle constructions as present presumptive and the “will”/“would” plus *fi* plus past participle constructions as past presumptive constructions.

lexical verbs. Typically, the Megleno-Romanian inverted perfect renders reported or circumstantially deduced actions, and the inverted past perfect expresses non-witnessed events or actions that have begun at a point in the past and last until the moment of speaking:

- (77) a. *Zisi ca ț-li* MR  
 say.3Sg that 2Sg.Dat.Cl+3Pl.F.Acc.Cl  
*vutau dat.*  
 have.3Sg.Inv.Perf given.Part  
 ‘(S)he says that (s)he had given them to you.’
- b. *Vutau vizut vrină feată în drumu.* MR  
 have.3Sg.Inv.Perf seen.Part some girl in road  
 ‘They had, reportedly, seen some girl on the way.’

The Megleno-Romanian inverted perfect can also express surprise, admiration, amazement or irony and can be used in story-telling:

- (78) a. *Tu fostai ăncrilată!* MR  
 you be.3Sg.Inv.Perf clever  
 1. ‘You are clever!’ (admiration)  
 2. ‘(I am surprised to see that) you are so clever.’  
 3. ‘You clever!’ (irony)
- b. *Ășh vutau ună mumă trei feati..* MR  
 Impers.Dat.Cl have.3Sg.Inv.Perf a.F mother three girls  
 ‘(Once upon a time) a mother had three daughters ...’

While the structure of the Megleno-Romanian evidential forms is analogous to that of the Albanian evidential forms, their usage is analogous to the usage of the Macedonian evidentials.

#### 5.4 *Confirmative and nonconfirmative evidentials*

Friedman (this volume) makes a distinction between confirmative and nonconfirmative evidentials. While confirmatives are used for both witnessed events and unwitnessed events that the speaker is willing to vouch for, nonconfirmatives are used for reports, deductions, and to express surprise (admirativity) or disbelief (irony, doubt, dubitativity). Friedman argues that Albanian and Balkan Romance grammaticalize only non-confirmative evidentiality, while in Balkan Slavic the forms of the “be” perfect are exponents of non-confirmative evidentiality, and the forms of the simple past tense are exponents of confirmative evidentiality. He

illustrates the two types of evidentiality with examples such as 69 (Friedman's example (3)):

- (79) *Mu se javiv na vujko M*  
 3Sg.Dat.Cl Impers.Acc.Cl call.1Sg.Perf.Past to uncle  
*mi. Ne beše doma, na plaža bil.*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl not be.3Sg.Past at home on beach be.1-Part  
 'I called my uncle. He was not at home, [apparently] he was at the beach.'

Both statements about the uncle are based on the same telephone call. The first statement is in the (simple, syncretic) past tense, which, according to Friedman, is an exponent of confirmative evidentiality, because the speaker is personally convinced that his uncle would have come to the telephone had he been at home. The second statement is expressed by the "be" perfect, which is an exponent of non-confirmative evidentiality, since neither the speaker nor his interlocutor could actually know for sure where the uncle was. According to Friedman the opposition confirmative: non-confirmative evidentiality, existing in Balkan Slavic also exists in Turkish, but not in Albanian and Megleno-Romanian. Friedman's analysis shows that morphological, semantic, and discourse-pragmatic isoglosses have differential distribution of evidentiality, and the distinction between meanings calqued onto existing forms and the creation of new forms to convey new content does not map isomorphically onto the distribution of semantic-pragmatic isoglosses. Moreover, the geographic distribution of evidentiality – its occurrence in urban centers with heavy concentrations of Turkish-speakers – argues for a sociolinguistically based explanation for the spread of the phenomenon.

## 6. Concluding remarks

Having discussed some of the most prominent Balkan Sprachbund properties, we have seen that not all of them are present, or present to the same degree, in all Balkan languages. Moreover, the morphosyntactic devices representing them are not analogous and a given morphosyntactic device may have different functions in different languages.

At the end of my survey, I would like to point out that the "list" of (prominent) Balkan Sprachbund properties is not and cannot be finalized. Thus, Hill (This volume) discusses a property that, so far, has not been listed as "Balkan" – the position of the Focus. Empirical evidence for Hill's analysis are Romanian and Bulgarian data that show the ordering of contrastive focus between the subject and the verb, such as (80) (Hill's example (1)):

- (80) a. *Pavel MAȘINĂ a cumpărat (nu casă).* R  
 Pavel car has bought.Part not house
- b. *Pavel KOLA kupi (ne kăšta).* B  
 Pavel car bought.3Sg not house  
 ‘Pavel bought a car (not a house).’

Hill argues that the checking conditions for Focus and Nominative Case features coincide and that they both require the presence of finite T(ense). She proposes that a syncretic [focus/tense] feature is formed at a pre-syntactic level and associates with T in syntax. Consequently, fronting to Focus in Romanian, Bulgarian, and possibly other Balkan languages, targets TP internal positions, and does not necessarily end up in the CP field.

### References

- Androutsopoulou, A. 1995. “The licensing of adjectival modification”. WCCFL 13:17-31.
- Avram, Larisa and Martine Coene 2001. “Genitive/Dative Clitics as last Resort”. *University of Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics: Papers from 3<sup>rd</sup> Conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic and Balkan Languages*, 157-169.
- Birnbaum, H. 1968. “Slavjanskije jazyki na Balkanax i ponjatije tak nazyvajemyh jazykovyh sojuzov” [The Slavic languages on the Balkans and the notion of the so-called language unions]. *Glossa* 2/1. 70-92.
- Bošković, Ž. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Civjan, T. V. 1965. *Imja suščestviteljnoje v balkanskih jazykax* [The Noun in the Balkan Languages]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Civjan, V. 1979. *Sintaktičeskaja struktura balkanskogo jazykovogo sojuza* [The Syntactic Structure of the Balkan Language Union]. Moskva.
- Dimitriu, C. 1979. *Gramatica limbii române explicată*. [Explanatory Grammar of the Romanian Language]. Iași: Junimea.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M and G. Giusti 1998. “Fragments of Balkan nominal structure”. In Alexiadou, A. and C. Wilder eds. *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 333-360.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 2000. “(In)Definiteness spread: From Romanian genitives to Hebrew construct state nominals”. In Motopanyane, V. ed. *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, Amsterdam: Elsevier. 177-226.



- Golaž, Z. 1984. *The Arumanian dialect of Kruševo in SR Macedonia, SFR Yugoslavia*. Skopje: Macedonian academy of Sciences and Arts.
- Grosu A. 1994. *Three Studies in Locality and Case*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Grosu and Landman. 1998. "Strange relatives of the third kind". *Natural Language Semantics* 6/2. 125-170.
- Halpern, Aaron L. (1992), *Topics in the Placement and Morphology of Clitics*, Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California.
- Inkelas, S. 1989. *Prosodic Constituency in the Lexicon*. Ph. D. dissertation. Stanford University.
- Izvorski, R. 1998. "Non-indicative wh-complements of existential/possessive predicates". In P.N. Tamanji and K. Kusumoto eds. *NELS* 28. 159-173.
- Jeffers, R. and I. Lehiste. 1979. *Principles and Methods for Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Joseph, B. 1992. "Balkan Languages." In William Bright ed. *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 4 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Vol. 1: 153-155.
- Kazazis, K. 1966. "On a generative Grammar of the Balkan languages". *Actes du premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*. Vol. 4: *Linguistique*. Sofija: BAN. 823-828.
- Kolliakou, D. (1995) *Definites and Possessives in Modern Greek: an HPSG Syntax for Noun Phrases*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Kopitar, J. 1829. "Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache." *Jahrbücher der Literatur*, Band 46. Wien. 59-106.
- Lindstedt, J. 2000. "Linguistic Balkanization: Contact-induced Change by Mutual Reinforcement." Gilbers, Dicky, John Nerbonne and Jos Schaecken eds. *Languages in Contact*. Amsterdam: Rodopi. 231-246.
- Manolessou, I. 2000. *Greek Noun Phrase Structure: A Study in Syntactic Evolution*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Miyoshi, N. 2002. "Negative imperatives and PF merger." Ms., University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Miklošič, F. 1861. "Die slavischen Elemente im Rumunischen", *Denkschriften der Wiener Akad. Phil.-hist. Cl.* Vol. 12.
- Ortmann, A. and A. Popescu 2000. "Romanian definite articles are not clitics". In Gerlach, B. and J. Grijzenhout eds. *Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin. 295-325.

- Sandfeld, K. 1926/1930. *Balkanfilologien*. University of Copenhagen, 1926. [Translated into French under the title *Linguistique balkanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Champion, 1930].
- Schaller, H. W. 1975. *Die Balkansprachen. Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*. Heidelberg.
- Sobolev, Andrej N. ed. Forthcoming. *Malyj dialektologičeskij atlas balkanskih jazykov*. [Small Dialectological Atlas of the Balkan Languages]. Initial Volume. Marburg: Biblion Verlag.
- Solta, Georg Rhenanus. 1980. *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Squartini, M. 2001. "The Internal Structure of Evidentiality in Romance". *Studies in Language* 25. 297-334.
- Stateva, P. 2002. "Possessive clitics and the structure of nominal expressions." *Lingua* 112/8. 648-690.
- Tilkov, D. et. al. eds. 1982-83. *Gramatika na sǎvremennija bǎlgarski knižoven ezik v tri toma* [Grammar of the Contemporary Bulgarian Literary Language in Three Volumes]. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na bǎlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 1988. "Language contact, language system and language code." In Radovanović 1988. 361-381.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 1996a. "The Balkan Slavic Clausal Clitics," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14. 811-872.
- Tomić, O. Mišeska. 1996b. "The Balkan Slavic nominal clitics". In A. Halpern and A. Zwicky eds. *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. 511-536.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 1997. 'Non-first as a Default Clitic Position'. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5(2). 1-23.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2001. "The Macedonian Negation Operator and Cliticization," *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19. 647-682.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. To appear. "The Syntax of the Balkan Slavic Future Tenses." To appear in *Lingua*.
- Trubetzkoy, Nikolay. 1928. A paper presented at the Congress of Linguists, published in Leiden, in the Proceedings of that Congress.
- Weigand, G. 1928. "Texte zur vergleichenden Syntax der Balkansprachen." *Balkan Archiv* IV, 53-70.