

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE

---

INSTITUT D'ÉTUDES SUD-EST EUROPÉENNES

**New Perspectives on Balkan Linguistics**

**Nouvelles perspectives sur la linguistique  
balkanique**

Proceedings of the session held at  
the 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of South-East European Studies  
(Bucharest, 2-6 September 2019)

Edited by

CĂTĂLINA VĂTĂȘESCU



EDITURA ISTROS A MUZEULUI BRĂILEI „CAROL I”

---

BRĂILA, 2021

## DOUBLE DETERMINATION IN BALKAN SLAVIC AND ALBANIAN: TYPOLOGY & AREALITY

*Victor A. Friedman, Catherine Rudin*

### 1. Introduction

Double Determination (DD), also known as Multiple Determination, refers to the use of more than one marker of definiteness within a nominal phrase; either a demonstrative (DEM) with a definite article or inflection (DEF), or more than one DEF. This general phenomenon occurs in many languages all over the world — e.g., Hebrew, Hungarian, Swedish, and Omaha-Ponca (a language in the Dhegiha branch of the Siouan family) — with different types of realizations, constraints, and word orders. The phenomenon of DD also occurs in all the Balkan languages, albeit with different rules and constraints in each one.<sup>1</sup> In Greek and most of Balkan Romance, the phenomenon is determined grammatically, whereas in Albanian and Balkan Slavic, DD is a pragmatic device, and Romani is positioned midway between these two sets of languages, with some grammatical and some pragmatic usages.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the freedom of realization of DD in Albanian and Balkan Slavic forms a cline, with Albanian having the least and Bulgarian the most restrictive rules and Macedonian in the middle. The one exception to the rules of Balkan Romance is found in Meglenoromanian, which has the heaviest Macedonian influence. This in turn suggests that DD spread from west to east as a pragmatic feature in a central region, bordered both to the north and the south by regions of syntactically rule-governed grammatical instantiations.

The article examines these phenomena as follows: §2 discusses the grammars of Greek and Balkan Romance, §3 examines Albanian, §4 discusses Balkan Slavic, §5 examines Romani, §6 gives a formal account of the phenomena under investigation, and finally §7 provides a general summation.

---

<sup>1</sup> This phenomenon was first noted for Macedonian, Albanian, and Greek by Kr. Sandfeld, *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*, Paris, 1930, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> Turkish also has a manifestation of DD insofar as DEM can occur with a definite accusative, e.g. *bu elmayı yedim* ‘This apple [is the one that] I ate’. The definite accusative is not obligatory (*bu elma yedim* is equally grammatical), but it serves the function of adding specificity.

## 2. Greek and Balkan Romance

For Greek and most of Balkan Romance, DD is obligatory. DD is obligatory in Greek regardless of whether DEM is pre- or postposed,<sup>3</sup> as seen in example (1), although, if an adjective is present, then DEF occurs as reduplicated only in postposed position as seen in example (2).

- (1) *aftos o anthropos / o anthropos aftos / \*aftos anthropos / \*anthropos aftos*  
 DEM DEF person / DEF person DEM  
 ‘this person’ (lit. ‘this the person’)
- (2) *afto to mikro puli / to puli afto to mikro*  
 DEM DEF small bird / DEF bird DEM DEF small  
 ‘this small bird’

For Balkan Romance, both Romanian and Aromanian do not have DEF when DEM is preposed, but must have DEF when DEM is postposed.<sup>4</sup> Thus, the Romanian equivalents of (1) are *acest om / omul acesta* and the Aromanian would be *aistu om / omlu aistu*.<sup>5</sup> In the case of Meglenoromanian, the patterning seems Balkan Slavic rather than Balkan Romance, which is consistent with the influence of Macedonian on Meglenoromanian. Thus, for example Atanasov<sup>6</sup> gives nineteen examples of preposed DEM in Meglenoromanian with translations into Romanian. In the Romanian translations, DEM is postposed in nine of the nineteen examples despite the fact that DEM is never postposed in the Meglenoromanian. Moreover, Meglenoromanian is unique within Balkan Romance in permitting DEF with a preposed DEM, e.g. *tsista lup-u* ‘DEM wolf-DEF’, although DD appears to be unusual. In combinations with an adjective, the adjective does not normally add DEF, although the possibility exists, at least for Romanian and Aromanian.

For our purposes here, the main point is that Greek, Romanian, and Aromanian have strictly rule-governed syntactic contexts in which DD occurs. Al. Nicolae notes that in Romanian, postposed DEM can carry an affective nuance, and as mentioned above and as will be seen in §4, Meglenoromanian patterns with Balkan Slavic rather than with Balkan Romance. We now turn to Albanian, which like Balkan Slavic and Meglenoromanian but unlike Greek and

<sup>3</sup> B. D. Joseph, “Multiple determination in Greek and the Balkans,” *Balkanistica* 32, 2019, 1, p. 171-183.

<sup>4</sup> Al. Nicolae, “Demonstratives”, in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, 2013, 294-300; M. Markovikj, *Aromanskiot i makedonskiot govorod ohridsko-struškiot region : vo balkanski kontekst*, Skopje, 2007.

<sup>5</sup> The difference in preposed and postposed DEM need not concern us here. For discussion see Nicolae, “Demonstratives”.

<sup>6</sup> P. Atanasov, *Meglenoromâna astăzi*, Bucharest, 2002, p. 218.

the rest of Balkan Romance, only has preposed DD, and always with a pragmatic rather than a syntactic conditioning.

### 3. Albanian

For Albanian, DD is optional and not marked as colloquial, but it usually seems to have a nuance of emphasis or emotion and is characteristic of spoken discourse or its literary representation. At the same time, DEM is never postposed. Thus, for example, *ky njeri* ‘this person’ *ky njeri-u* ‘this person-DEF’ but *\*njeri[u] ky*. Moreover, in a DD noun phrase (NP), an adjective also has the option of being definite or indefinite as seen in example (3):<sup>7</sup>

- (3) *ky djal-i im i zgjuar / ky djal-i im i zgjuar-i*  
 this boy-DEF my PC clever / this boy-DEF my PC clever-DEF  
 ‘this clever boy of mine’

Examples (4a)-(6a) and (4b)-(6b) illustrate non-DD and DD constructions, respectively, in the nominative, accusative, and genitive-dative-ablative cases. The examples are all from literature cited from Buchholz and Fiedler.<sup>8</sup> Although the examples are given without context, it is interesting to note that (4a) is at least as affective as (4b), (5b) is clearly more affective than (5a), and (6a) is clearly neutral whereas (6b) might or might not be affective. From this it emerges that while DD in Albanian may have some affective coloring, it is strictly a pragmatic issue.

- (4) a. *Ai njeri nuk meriton të përmendet.*  
 that person NEG deserves DMS mention. MP.3sg.PRS  
 ‘**That person** does not deserve to be mentioned’.
- b. *Ky dervishi duhet të ketë ndonjë hall.*  
 this dervish.DEF must DMS have. 3sg.SBJV some trouble  
 ‘**This dervish** must have some kind of problem’.
- (5) a. *Prej kujt e ke këtë libër?*  
 From whom.GEN it.ACC have.2sg.PRS this.ACC book  
 ‘From whom do you have **this book**?’
- b. *Po s’e kritikova këtë mësuesen në mes të fshatit, mos më thënçin Rremë Osmani.*  
 If NEG.him criticize.1sg.AOR that.ACC teacher.ACC.DEF in middle  
 PC.village.GEN.DEF NEG.IMV me call.3pl.OPT R. O.  
 ‘If I don’t criticize **that teacher** in front of the whole village, then my name isn’t R. O.’

<sup>7</sup> The adjective with its particle of concord (PC) could precede the noun, but this is a marked word order.

<sup>8</sup> O. Buchholz, W. Fiedler, *Albanische Grammatik*, Leipzig, 1987.

- (6) a. *Baza e këtij sistemi janë elementet e përbashkëta të shqipes.*  
 base.DEF PC this-GEN system.GEN are elements.DEF PC common  
 PC albanian.GEN.DEF

‘The common elements of Albanian are the basis **of this system**’.

- b. *Serveti ia tha “mirëmëngjes” asaj gruas.*  
 Servet.DEF her.DAT.it.ACC said.3sg.AOR good.morning that.GEN  
 woman.GEN.DEF

‘Servet said “Good morning” **to that woman**’.

We now turn to Balkan Slavic, which resembles Albanian, but with more restricted systems.

#### 4. Balkan Slavic

In Balkan Slavic, we see a cline of contexts which is broader in Macedonian and more narrow in Bulgarian. The Torlak dialects of the former Serbo-Croatian also show DD and will therefore also be discussed here. Of particular interest, but beyond the scope of the present article, are the situations in Goran and Pomak/Rhodopian Bulgarian, i.e. those systems other than Torlak and Standard Macedonian (and the dialects on which it is based) that have deictic articles.<sup>9</sup>

##### 4.1. Macedonian

We start by considering the facts of DD in Macedonian. In formal standard Macedonian, demonstratives do not cooccur with articles: (7a) shows a standard nominal with demonstrative alone. However, in colloquial usage demonstratives can be accompanied by a definite article suffix, labeled “DEF.PX” in (7b). Notice that the demonstrative is always initial; (7c) shows the demonstrative cannot follow the noun, with or without an article if they are in the same NP.

- (7) Macedonian: “formal” vs “colloquial”

- a. (formal) *ovoj čovek*  
 this person
- b. (colloquial) *ovoj čovek-ov*  
 this person-DEF.PX
- c. *\*čovek(ov)* *ovoj*  
 person(DEF.PX) this

<sup>9</sup> Some Goran dialects have a two-way and others a three-way distinction.

Macedonian DD involves a demonstrative and an article, both of which have features of proximal, neutral, or distal deixis, as well as number and gender. The chart in (8) shows the deictic forms of the neuter singular DEM and DET as an example. Proximal forms have -v-, neutral forms -t-, and distal forms -n-.

(8) Double Determination in Standard Macedonian (Neuter forms)

	PX (proximal)	NL (neutral)	DL (distal)
Demonstrative	ova	toa	ona
Postposed Def. Art.	dete-vo	dete-to	dete-no

DD in Macedonian has been discussed, inter alia, by Lunt,<sup>10</sup> Koneski,<sup>11</sup> Ugrinova-Skalovska,<sup>12</sup> and Minova-Gjurkova.<sup>13</sup> Ugrinova-Skalovska observes the DD is used by some 20th century Macedonian authors to evoke a folksy tone, while Minova-Gjurkova notes that DD is used “especially when the attitude of the speaker contains a note of deprecation”. Both Friedman<sup>14</sup> and Rudin<sup>15</sup> have also observed that DD constructions are affective (emphasize speaker’s evaluation or involvement). Friedman uses the term *subjective involvement* to capture the sense of personal affect, whether positive or negative, which depends on context.

In order to study the distribution and frequency of different types of DD in Macedonian, we give examples drawn from a corpus of spoken colloquial Macedonian, *Vistinata za Makedonija* ‘The Truth About Macedonia’,<sup>16</sup> a set of transcripts of illegal wiretaps that ex-Prime Minister and now convicted criminal Nikola Gruevski and his first cousin, Sašo Mijakov, former head of the Administration for Security and Counterintelligence (Macedonian *Upravo za Bezbednosti Kontrarazuznavanje*) made of members of their own political party (VMRO-DPMNE), including themselves, between 2008 and 2015. These were obtained and published by the opposition SDSM in 2015. We examined

<sup>10</sup> H. Lunt, *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*, Skopje, 1952.

<sup>11</sup> B. Koneski, *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturni jazik*, II, *Za formite i nivnata upotreba*, Skopje, 1954, § 31.

<sup>12</sup> R. Ugrinova-Skalovska, “Dve stilski osobenosti na našiot govoren jazik”, *Makedonski jazik* 11-12, 1960-61, p. 105-110.

<sup>13</sup> L. Minova-Gjurkova, *Sintaksa na makedonskiot standarden jazik*, Skopje, 1994, p. 125.

<sup>14</sup> V. A. Friedman, “Double Determination in Colloquial Macedonian. Evidence from the 2015 *Bombi*”, in J. J. Pennington, V.A. Friedman, L.A. Grenoble (eds.), *And Thus You Are Everywhere Honored. Studies Dedicated to Brian D. Joseph*, Bloomington, Indiana, 2019, p. 109-124.

<sup>15</sup> C. Rudin, “Multiple Determination in Bulgarian and Macedonian. An Exploration of Structure, Usage, and Meaning”, in S.M. Dickey and M.R. Lauersdorf (eds.), *V zeleni drželi zeleni breg. Studies in Honor of Marc L. Greenberg*, Bloomington, Indiana, 2018, p. 263-286.

<sup>16</sup> *Prizma. Kompletan materijal od site bombi što gi objavi opozicijata*, 2015, <http://prizma.mk/kompletan-materijal-od-site-bombi-na-opozitsijata/> (last accessed 6/6/2018).

transcripts 2-24, comprising 14 hours of conversation, approximately 91,000 words, 230 pages of text, and 65 speakers. Given the contexts of political and oral corruption documented in *Vistinata za Makedonija*, pejoration is the main affect.

It emerges from this data that distal forms, which are often associated with pejoration in many languages, including Macedonian, are strikingly rare. Of 101 DD constructions in the portion of the *Vistinata za Makedonija* studied, only 3 distal examples, all pejorative, occurred; all three are given in (9):<sup>17</sup>

- (9) a. *More kje ja preselam onaa zgradana što e*  
 voc fut it.ACC.F move.1sg.PRS that building.DEF.DL that is  
*kaj Bristol, mamata kje im ja eb.m*  
 at Bristol mother.DEF.NL fut them.DAT her.ACC f#ck.1sg.PRS  
 ‘Hey, I’ll move **that there building** by the Bristol, I’ll f#ck them over’. (MJ, 9b.1)
- b. [...] *a onie jadicine tamu po Kumanovo i po*  
 and those poor.wretch.PL.DEF.DL there along Kumanovo and around  
*strumičko kaj šo ne pominal...*  
 Strumica.region where that NEG pass.M.PST  
 ‘and **those poor wretches** there in Kumanovo and the Strumica region, where he hasn’t been...’ (ZS, 22b.15)
- c. [...] *i go barav i ona kopileno Artan Grubi,*  
 and him.ACC seek.1sg.IMPF and that bastard.DEF.DL A. G.  
*drugar ti.*  
 friend you.DAT  
 ‘And I also tried to get a hold of **that bastard**, your friend Artan Grubi’. (ZS, 22b.14)

Proximal forms, which also tend to signal speaker involvement, are by far the most frequent. Of the remaining 98, only 27 (less than 30%) involve neutral demonstratives and articles. These also are usually pejorative. Selected examples in (10) show that the demonstrative can be followed by several configurations involving a definite article: a definite noun (10a), a definite adjective (10b), or a definite adjective and an unmarked noun (10c).

<sup>17</sup> References in capital letters refer to the speaker, as indicated in the transcript. Numbers after the speaker abbreviation refer to the number of the transcript; when followed by a letter, the letter refers to the folder (*papka*) into which some of the transcripts were subdivided, and the number after the period refers to the number of the conversation within the given transcript or folder. All translations are mine (Friedman). References to the originals are given after the translations.

- (10)a. *Zamisli ušte mi nema čestitano toj*  
 think.IMV.SG still me.DAT NEG.have congratulate.Vadj that  
*idiotot, čoveče.*  
 idiot.DEF.NL person.VOC  
 ‘Just think, **that idiot** still hasn’t congratulated me, man!’ (MR, 17.7)
- b. *Koordinirajte se tamu. Tie tvoite od lista te*  
 coordinate.IMV ITR there those your.DEF.NL from list you.ACC  
*cinkarat.*  
 squeal.3pl.PRS  
 ‘Get coordinated here. **Those guys of yours** from the electoral list are squealing on you’. (SR, 7b.4)
- c. [...] *upis kje napraime kaj šo se tie našite*  
 registration FUT do.1pl.PRS where that are those our.DEF.NL  
*profesori [...]*  
 professors  
 ‘we’ll do the [university] registration where **our professors** are [in control]’ (NTT, 22a.2)

The remainder of the DD examples are proximal. These sometimes seem to denote emphatic “personal involvement” rather than pejoration, as in (11a-c):

- (11)a. [...] *zborele ovie našive i oni se zbuneti.*  
 speak..PST.PL these our.DEF.PX and they are upset  
 ‘apparently **our [people]** were talking and they are upset’. (ES, 24.22)
- b. [...] *ovoj našiov čovek e tuka.*  
 this our.DEF.PX person is here  
 ‘**our guy** is [the one who is] here’. (NTT, 22a.2)
- c. [...] *ovaa sredbava šo ja zakažavte za 3 ipol,*  
 this meeting.DEF.PX what it.ACC appoint.2pl.AOR for 3 and.a.half  
*4 ja pomestuvame, vo nekoja gužva e...*  
 4 it.ACC.F shift.1pl.PRS in some crowd is  
 ‘**That meeting** that you had for 3:30, we’re changing it to 4, he’s really busy with something’. (LS, 24.29[3])

Many proximal examples are pejorative, however. A selection of clearly pejorative proximal DD phrases, each from a different speaker and all involving different nouns, is given in (12):

- (12) *ovie drugive goveda* ‘these other dumbbells’ (SM, 4.5)  
*ovie moronive od A1* ‘these morons from A1 [television]’ (IK, 3.7)  
*so ova kopilevo od Bitola* ‘with that bastard from Bitola’ (ZS, 6.7)  
*ovoj majmunov* ‘that monkey [jerk]’ (MP, 7h.12)  
*ovie glupacive* ‘those numbskulls’ (SR, 8a.2)  
*ovie idiotive* ‘those idiots’ (MJ, 8a.8)  
*ovoj budalava* ‘that fool’ (GJ, 8b.9)



*ovie žutive* ‘these yellow ones [Chinese]’ (NG, 14.7)

There is a unique example of a demonstrative followed by an adjective and noun, both of which bear the definite article:

- (13) *A slušaj, ovie naše polupismenive što*  
 and listen.IMV these our.DEF.PX semiliterates.DEF.PX that  
*gledaat denes mu se javile na Martin.*  
 watch.3pl.PRS today him.DAT ITR call.PST.PL to M.  
 ‘Well, listen, **those semiliterates of ours** who are watching [the news] today  
 apparently called Martin’. (DPL, 24.11)

Two examples of number/gender mismatch between DEM and DET occur in the corpus. In both cases the demonstrative is neuter and proximal; the articles agree in deixis (proximal) but differ in gender or number – plural in (14a); feminine in (14b).

- (14) a. *Ne znam dali se pečati sega nešto vo*  
 NEG know.1sg.PRS whether ITR print.3sg.PRS now something in  
*mejuvreme. Ova kartive site se ispečatani.*  
 meantime this.N ballots.DEF.PL.PX all.DEF.PL are printed.VADJ.PL  
 ‘I don’t know whether anything is being printed in the mean time. **These here ballots** are all printed’. (KB, 7a.1)
- b. *Vaka sea, ova drugava rabota.*  
 thus now this.n other.DEF.F.PX work  
 ‘Here’s what’s goin’ on, [it’s about] **this other business**’. (SM, 20.14)

According to Ugrinova such cases “are not uncommon in the colloquial language” («не се необични за разговорниот јазик»<sup>18</sup>), although she has no examples from nineteenth century folklore texts. Aneta Dučevska and Boban Karapejovski of Sts. Cyril and Methodius University of Skopje have suggested (p.c.) that in such constructions *ova* ‘this.N’ is semantically bleached and functions as a kind of focus particle.

There are also a couple of examples of deictic mismatch in our data. The direction of mismatch in both cases is a proximal demonstrative with a neutral article, as described by Koneski:<sup>19</sup>

- (15) a. *Ovaa celata rabota kje se istera kako što*  
 this.PX entire.DEF.NL work FUT ITR accomplish as what  
*treba.*  
 need.3sg.PRS  
 ‘**This whole business** will turn out as it should’. (VC, 16.6)

<sup>18</sup> R. Ugrinova-Skalovska, “Dve stilski osobenosti na našiot govoren jazik,” p. 107.

<sup>19</sup> B. Koneski, *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturni jazik*, § 31.

- b. *Na primer* *eve* *tri* *što* *se* *loši*. *Edniot* *e* *Manikj*,  
 to example behold 3 that are bad. One.DEF.NL is M.  
*edniot* *e* *Borjan Jovanovski*, *edniot* *e* *ovoj pretsedatelot*  
 one.DEF.NL is B. J. one.DEF.NL is this president.DEF.PX  
*na Sovet za radiodifuzija...*  
 of council for radio.transmission  
 ‘For example, here are three that are bad. One is Manikj, one is Borjan Jovanovski, [and] **one is that president** of the Council for Radio Transmission ...’ (DPL, 2.5)

A similar example from K. Čašule cited in Ugrinova<sup>20</sup> has a distal demonstrative but again a neutral article (in fact, two neutral articles, similar to the repeating articles in (13)).

- (16) *onoj* *mojot* *najmaliot*  
 that.DL my.DEF.NL smallest.DEF.NL  
 ‘that smallest one of mine’

Franks<sup>21</sup> provides an account of why the second element, the article, must always be neutral in such mismatches, claiming that neutral is less marked and thus does not actually conflict with a governing proximal or distal element. See also Karapejovski,<sup>22</sup> who identifies *-t-* forms as unmarked and semantically more article-like, while *-v-* and *-n-* are more strongly deictic, as already noted by Lunt.<sup>23</sup>

There is some variation among Macedonian speakers in acceptability of examples like (14)-(15) with deictic mismatches as well as the ones like (13) and (16) with more than one definite article in the NP. Ugrinova considers such constructions unlikely or marginal, but geographical factors may also be involved. Both the writer of example (18) and the speaker of example (13) are from Ohrid, i.e. in southwest North Macedonia, across from the Albanian border and not far from Greece. Thus the multiple article constructions may well be a regionalism, and one that is close to Albanian and Greek, which can also have multiple DEFs in one NP.

<sup>20</sup> R. Ugrinova-Skalovska, “Dve stilski osobenosti na našiot govoren jazik”.

<sup>21</sup> S. Franks, “The internal structure of Slavic NPs, with special reference to Bulgarian,” in A. Przepiórkowski and P. Bański (eds.), *Generative linguistics in Poland: Syntax and morphosyntax*, Warszawa, 2001, p. 53-69.

<sup>22</sup> B. Karapejovski, “Pokaznite zamenki nasprema morfološki vrzaniot člen kako eksponenti na kategorijata opredelenost”, in *Prilozi / Contributions. Section of Linguistics and Literary Science* (Macedonian Academy of Sciences) 42, 2017, 1-2, p. 5-18.

<sup>23</sup> H. Lunt, *A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language*, p. 41.

To sum up for Macedonian, we can make the following observations:

1. DD signals ‘expressive subjectivity’: emphasis or emotivity, such as pejoration, but also affection.
2. Proximal DD accounts for 2/3 of the *Vistinata za Makedonija* corpus, in keeping with the meaning of speaker’s expressive subjectivity.
3. Distal DD occurs in only 3% of the examples despite the fact that distal is often used pejoratively and DD in *Vistinata za Makedonija* is commonly pejorative. This may be an indication of the DEF.DL becoming obsolete. Indeed, some of the extremely peripheral western Macedonian dialects (Lower Gora, Korça) have lost DEF.DL and have only DEF.PX and DEF.NL.
4. Gender disagreement is always neuter DEM and non-neuter DEF, always proximal, and very rare.
5. Deictic disagreement always involves DEF.NL and a DEM marked as PX (more common) or DL (rarer).
6. In general, with DEM, either an adjective or a noun can be definite, but usually not both. Example (13), although it occurred naturally, was rejected by many speakers. The fact that both (13) and (16) were produced by speakers from Ohrid may be significant.

#### 4.2. Bulgarian

DD in Bulgarian is very similar to that of Macedonian insofar as Bulgarian DD also has the “expressive subjectivity” function. A phrase with a demonstrative and no article has a “canonical demonstrative” (pointing, contrastive) meaning, as in (17a). With the addition of an article the meaning shifts to emotive (positive, in the case of (17b) or expressively emphatic).

- (17) a. *Tazi nejna banica e po-vkusna ot onezi.*  
 this.F her.F banica is more-tasty from those  
 ‘This (certain) banica of hers is tastier than those (otherones)’.
- b. *Tazi nejnata banica e straxotna!*  
 this.F her.F.DEF banica is awesome  
 ‘That banica of hers is awesome!’ (≈ *Nejnata banica e straxotna* ‘Her banica is awesome’)

A major difference between Bulgarian and Macedonian DD is that in Bulgarian, DD is possible only with adjectives. An article suffix cannot occur on a noun after a demonstrative. Compare the ungrammatical (18) with similar grammatical examples in Macedonian given above, for example in (12).<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Some speakers of Bulgarian will accept some DD NPs that involve a DEF noun, but in general such constructions are rejected, and in any case do not have the same status as in Macedonian, where they are quite common.

- (18) \**onija idiotite*  
 those idiots.DEF  
 intended: ‘those idiots’

In this respect, Bulgarian looks more conservative vis-à-vis Macedonian. As Flier<sup>25</sup> documents for Old Church Slavonic, when a deictic was accompanied by an adjective, it was normal for the adjective to be in the definite form, as in Greek. While the definiteness marking of Balkan Slavic has different origins and functions from that of Old Church Slavonic, the fact that Macedonian shows DD with both nouns and adjectives in a manner similar to, but not identical with, Albanian, while Bulgarian basically limits DD to adjectives, like Old Church Slavonic, is at the least a recapitulation of the spread of a rule.

#### 4.3. Torlak

The Torlak dialects of the former Serbo-Croatian have a tri-partite definite article as in western Macedonian, and, moreover, they attest DD with both nouns and adjectives, e.g. *taj postarata* ‘that the.older.one’,<sup>26</sup> *za onúo košárkutu* ‘for that the.basket (ACC)’, *tie pesmete* ‘these the.songs’, *toa vašija dom* ‘this your house’.<sup>27</sup> Teodora Vuković<sup>28</sup> of the University of Zurich has numerous examples of DD, e.g. *taj mužat* ‘that man’, *ovoj kućava* ‘this here house’, *ono telefonat* ‘that telephone’. As can be seen from Vuković’s examples, gender and deixis mismatches also seem to occur in Torlak.

#### 5. Romani

Many Romani dialects in the Balkans permit but do not require DEF with a preposed DEM, in which case DEF must precede the noun, but if DEM follows the noun, the latter must be definite in some dialects, e.g. in Agia Varvara for ‘this person’, one finds *kadava (o) manuš* ‘DEM (DEF) person’, and

<sup>25</sup> M. S. Flier, *Aspects of Nominal Determination in Old Church Slavonic*, The Hague, 1974, p. 158.

<sup>26</sup> A. Belić, *Dijalekti istočne i južne Srbije (Srpski dijalektološki zbornik, I, Belgrade, 1905, p. 447.*

<sup>27</sup> A.N. Sobolev, *Govor sela Vratnica v vostočnom Serbii*, Munich, 1994, p. 185-186. In the Vratnica dialect described from Sobolev, the demonstratives *toa* and *toj* can both be used for both masculine and neuter, and *toj* is more frequent for neuter. The masculine definite article has the shape *-a*.

<sup>28</sup> T. Vuković, *Spoken Torlak dialect corpus 1.0 (transcription)*, 2020, Slovenian language resource repository CLARIN.SI, <http://hdl.handle.net/11356/1281>, and [https://www.clarin.si/noske/run.cgi/first\\_form?corpname=torlak;align=\(last accessed 6/10/2020\)](https://www.clarin.si/noske/run.cgi/first_form?corpname=torlak;align=(last%20accessed%206/10/2020)).

*o manuš kadava* ‘DEF person DEM’.<sup>29</sup> Double determination or the order noun-determiner is pragmatically more thematic in the discourse. However, a postposed demonstrative without a definite article is possible in at least some dialects. As argued by Tirard,<sup>30</sup> Boretzky,<sup>31</sup> Iglá,<sup>32</sup> and Matras,<sup>33</sup> the construction of the type DEM+N is inherited, and both DEM+DEF+N and N+DEF+DEM are borrowed. And, as Tirard makes clear, the construction is found throughout the Vlax and Balkan Romani dialects of the Balkans, but not beyond the Balkans (except in the case of recent migrations).

### 6. Syntactic Structure of Balkan DD Constructions

At this point we briefly shift focus from a Balkanological perspective to a formal and typological one; that is, to a consideration of what DD constructions tell us about the structure (and semantic interpretation) of the nominal phrase. The Balkan languages considered above split into two syntactic types, with Bulgarian, Macedonian, Torlak, Albanian, and Meglenoromanian<sup>34</sup> differing from the other Balkan languages in several characteristics of DD. In the first group of languages the demonstrative is always initial (cannot postpose), word order is restricted to that of normal DP (for instance, adjective precedes noun in Balkan Slavic but follows in Albanian), the entire construction is a single prosodic phrase with no pause or comma intonation, and the characteristic semantics of “subjective involvement” or affectivity is present. In Greek, Romani, Romanian, and Aromanian, on the contrary, demonstratives can postpose, word order is relatively free, and the prosody and semantics are more variable. Taken together, these characteristics suggest that in the first group of languages the DD construction is a single nominal phrase with distinct syntactic positions and semantic functions for DEM and DEF, while in the second group DD constructions may be appositives (DEM is a separate phrase) or may perhaps have other structures as well; the second group is less homogeneous than the first.

The most basic difference between the two types of DD is the position of the demonstrative, illustrated in (19) vs. (20).

---

<sup>29</sup> B. Iglá, *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara: deskriptive und historisch-vergleichende Darstellung eines Zigeunerndialekts*, Wiesbaden, 1996, p. 165; cf. N. Boretzky, *Bugurdži: Deskriptiver und historischer Abriss eines Romani-dialekts*, Wiesbaden, 1993, p. 55.

<sup>30</sup> A. Tirard, *Les syntagmes nominaux polydéfinis en romani d’Albanie*, Ph. D. dissertation, Université Clermont Auvergne, 2019, p. 125.

<sup>31</sup> N. Boretzky, *Bugurdži*, p. 55.

<sup>32</sup> B. Iglá, *Das Romani von Ajia Varvara*, p. 165.

<sup>33</sup> Y. Matras, *Romani. A linguistic introduction*, Cambridge, 2002, p. 97; idem, “Romacilikanes – The Romani dialect of Parakalamos”, *Romani Studies*, 5, vol. 14, 2004, 1, pp. 78-79.

<sup>34</sup> Torlak presumably also belongs in this group, though we have less evidence for this.

(19) Only one possible order - DEM is initial only

- a. Macedonian: *ovoj čovekov* (\**čovekov ovoj*)  
DEM person.DEF  
'this person'
- b. Bulgarian: *tija bogatite* (\**bogatite tija*)  
DEM rich.DEF  
'these rich folks'
- c. Albanian: *ky njeriu* (\**njeriu ky*)  
DEM person.DEF  
'this person'

(20) Variable order– DEM can be postposed

- a. Greek: *aftos o anthropos* / *o anthropos aftos*  
DEM DEF person DEF person DEM  
'this person'
- b. Romani (Agia Varvara): *kadava (o) manuš* / *o manuš kadava*  
DEM DEF person DEF person DEM  
'this person'
- c. Romanian: *acel om* / *omul acela*  
DEM man man.DEF DEM  
'this man'

This strongly suggests a difference in syntactic structure between the two sets of languages and particularly a difference in the syntactic status of DEM. Balkan Slavic and Albanian have a structure like (21), with the demonstrative occupying a position inside the nominal phrase, either specifier of DP (shown here) or heading a Demonstrative phrase above DP.

(21) [<sub>DP</sub> DEM [<sub>DP</sub> ...] ]

Further analysis or justification of this structure is beyond the scope of the present work; see Rudin<sup>35</sup> for detailed discussion of not only the position of DEM, but also that of the definite inflection DEF, as well as how the combined semantics of DEM and DEF within a single phrase results in the characteristic affective flavor of the construction.

In the other type of languages, including Greek, Romani, Aromanian and Romanian, DEM is not specifier of DP in DD constructions, but instead either constitutes a separate DP, in an appositive structure (shown in (22a) or occupies a different, lower demonstrative position within DP (shown in (22b)).

<sup>35</sup> C. Rudin, "Demonstratives and Definiteness: Multiple Determination in Balkan Slavic", in *Advances in Formal Slavic Linguistics 2018*, Berlin, 2021.

- (22) a. [DP DEM] [DP ...] *or* [DP ...] [DP DEM]  
 b. [DP ... DEM]

Given differences among these languages in whether the article is obligatory, optional, or disallowed with a preceding demonstrative, it is likely the three languages do not share exactly the same structure. Greek probably has the type of structure in (22a) while Romanian and Aromanian at least in some cases are more like (22b).<sup>36</sup>

As a final note, appositive constructions (structure (22a)) do occur in Balkan Slavic and Albanian, but differ significantly from the DD construction we have discussed in those languages. To give just one example, in Bulgarian it is possible to say (23), with variable placement of the demonstrative, comma intonation and a definite noun (we have seen above that definite marking occurs only on adjectives in the normal DD construction in Bulgarian):

- (23) *tozi, profesora* / *profesora, tozi*  
 DEM professor.DEF professor.DEF DEM  
 ‘that guy, the professor’ ‘the professor, that guy’

The interpretation of this type of utterance tends to be clarifying or hesitation, rather than affective. An affective reading is possible with demonstratives in general, including in (23) and in the DD constructions throughout the Balkans, but the normal, non-appositive Balkan Slavic/Albanian DD construction obligatorily has the affective “subjective involvement” sense.

In short, the difference between the two groups of Balkan languages appears to be that Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Albanian (and perhaps Torlak and Meglenoromanian as well) have DD constructions of type (21), with the demonstrative in a high position within DP, while the other Balkan languages lack this type.

## 7. Conclusions

It is not surprising that the Balkan Slavic languages share syntactic similarity as opposed to the rest of the Balkan languages, but perhaps more surprising that Albanian shares so much with them, and possibly Meglenoromanian also. In fact, the non-appositive, affective DD construction has a clear areal basis: it occupies a continuous swathe of territory across the Balkans, with Romanian to the north and Greek to the south having a less-grammaticalized construction. Macedonian shares some features with Albanian (DEM N-DEF), others with Bulgarian (position of adjective, etc.). Moreover, the

<sup>36</sup> See e.g. Al. Nicolae, “Demonstratives”.

type of DD in Albanian that permits two DEFs in a single constituent and is not considered normal for Balkan Slavic, does seem to appear in southwest Macedonian, i.e. close to Albanian and Greek linguistic territory. The position of Romani in all of this is consistent with the dispersal of its dialects among the various other languages. Moving from Greek, on the one hand, where DD is obligatory and placement of DEM can be pre- or post-posed, through Balkan Romance, where DD is only sometimes obligatory but pre- and post-posing are both options, through Albanian and Balkan Slavic, where DD is always affective and never obligatory, but the number of types becomes more restricted as one moves eastward. We can summarize the observation with the cline given in (24):

(24) Cline of Double Determination<sup>37</sup>

Greek > Romani > Aromanian & Romanian > Albanian > Meglenoromanian > Macedonian & Torlak > Bulgarian.

Our final conclusion is that for Albanian and Balkan Slavic, as well as Romani and Meglenoromanian, DD is probably a Balkanism, i.e. its development was influenced by language contact in the Balkans.

### Abbreviations

AOR	aorist
DAT	dative
DD	double determination
DEF	definite article
DEM	demonstrative pronouns
DL	distal
DMS	dental modal subordinator (subjunctive marker <i>da, tĕ sǎ, na, te</i> )
F	feminine
GEN	genitive
IMPF	imperfective
IMV	imperative
ITR	intransitive
M	masculine
MP	medio-passive
N	noun
NEG	negator
NL	neutral
OPT	optative

---

<sup>37</sup> Romani here is represented by those dialects closest to Greek.



PC	particle of concord
PL	plural
PRS	present
PST	past
PX	proximal
SBJV	subjunctive
SG	singular
VAdj	verbal adjective

### Sources

Prizma. *Kompleten materijal od site bombi što gi objavi opozicijata*, 2015, <http://prizma.mk/kompleten-materijal-od-site-bombi-na-opozitsijata/> (last accessed 6/6/2018).

Vuković, Teodora. *Spoken Torlak dialect corpus 1.0 (transcription)*, 2020, Slovenian language resource repository CLARIN.SI, <http://hdl.handle.net/11356/1281>, and [https://www.clarin.si/noske/run.cgi/first\\_form?corpname=torlak;align=](https://www.clarin.si/noske/run.cgi/first_form?corpname=torlak;align=) (last accessed 6/10/2020).

## CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i> .....	5
-----------------------	---

### Part 1

Victor A. Friedman, Catherine Rudin, <i>Double Determination in Balkan Slavic and Albanian: Typology &amp; Areality</i> .....	9
---	---

Petya Assenova, Christina Markou, <i>Grammaticalisation et modalité des formes du futur balkanique</i> .....	25
--	----

Ekaterina Tarpomanova, Bilyana Mihaylova, <i>Future in the Past and Conditional in the Balkan Languages</i> .....	37
---	----

Mihaela-Mariana Morcov, <i>Parallélismes morpho-syntaxiques entre l'albanais et les langues romanes occidentales en contraste avec le roumain</i> .....	61
---	----

Artur Karasiński, <i>On the Issues of Albanian Word Formation. The Variation of Word Formation Units in the Albanian Word-Formation System</i> .....	73
--	----

Irena Sawicka, <i>The Phonetic Convergence in the Balkans</i> .....	81
---	----

Dana-Mihaela Zamfir, Oana Uță Bărbulescu, <i>Variations historiques et dialectales dans la flexion et l'aspect phonétique des mots roumains grâu « blé », frâu « frein », brâu « ceinture » et pârâu « ruisseau » et de leurs correspondants en albanais</i> .....	89
--	----

### Part 2

Helmut W. Schaller, <i>Turkish Influence on Balkan languages: the Example of Bulgarian</i> .....	149
--	-----

Ion Giurgea, Cristian Moroianu, Monica Vasileanu, <i>The Project of a New Etymological Dictionary of Romanian (Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române – DELR)</i> .....	155
--	-----

Mihaela Marin, <i>Deux termes roumains avec des équivalents en albanais...</i>	173
Cătălina Vătășescu, <i>Un livre important dans le développement des études concernant l'union linguistique balkanique : Th. Capidan, Limbă și cultură (Bucarest, 1943)</i> .....	183
Bibliography.....	191
The Contributors.....	207