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Abstract. This article explores the structure, usage, and meaning of Balkan Slavic (Bulgarian and Macedonian) nominal expressions which include an article as well as a demonstrative, both elements traditionally considered definite determiners. Two distinct types of multiple determination constructions exist, one literary/standard and one colloquial, with different characteristics. The standard type always involves a quantifier and sometimes arguably consists of two phrases in apposition. The colloquial, non-quantifier type is not appositive but a single DP which optionally exhibits extended definiteness agreement and has a particular semantic and pragmatic profile. The Bulgarian and Macedonian constructions differ in their repertoire of demonstratives and articles as well as in some syntactic characteristics which hint at different DP structures in the two languages.

1. Introduction

This study of some aspects of Bulgarian and Macedonian nominal phrases is dedicated to my dear friend Marc Greenberg, who appreciates South Slavic languages and enjoys a good colloquial construction. The problem under consideration is the structure and function of nominal phrases (DPs) with more than one determiner, a little-studied and rather unusual construction for a Slavic language.

Bulgarian and Macedonian nominal phrases normally contain no more than one definite determiner, either an article or a demonstrative but not both; as in (1) (Bulgarian) and (2) (Macedonian). The definite article in both languages is suffixed to the first element of the phrase, roughly speaking; the status and position of the article is among the puzzles discussed below. In (1–2) it follows an adjective and is glossed def. Demonstratives and articles are boldfaced throughout the paper.

Thanks are due to Elena Dimova, Victor Friedman, Boris Harizanov, Brian Joseph, Christina Kramer, Vesela Simeonova, and Steven Franks for helpful discussion and for assistance with the data.
(1) a. tezi hubavi snimki
    these pretty photos
    ‘these pretty photos’

    b. hubavite snimki
    pretty_def photos
    ‘the pretty photos’

(2) a. tie ubavi sliki
    these pretty photos
    ‘these pretty photos’

    b. ubavite sliki
    pretty_def photos
    ‘the pretty photos’

However, it is possible in both languages for an article and a demonstrative to cooccur in some circumstances. Such multiple determination\(^2\) (MD) exists to a very limited extent in the standard literary languages, appearing only with certain adjectival quantifiers, with meanings like ‘all,’ ‘whole,’ ‘same’. An example is Bulgarian sông- and Macedonian ist- in (3).

(3) a. tazi sôngata kâšta
    this same_def house
    ‘this very same house’

    b. taa istata kuķa
    this same_def house
    ‘this very same house’

In non-standard/colloquial usage determiner + article constructions are more widespread, though subject to both syntactic and pragmatic constraints. A Bulgarian example is given in (4) and a Macedonian one in (5).

(4) tazi nejnata banica
    this her_def banica
    ‘that banica (pastry) of hers’

\(^2\) Other terms for this and similar phenomena include polydefiniteness and double determination. MD constructions are found in other Balkan languages including Greek, Balkan Romance, and Albanian and Romany (Friedman 2006, Joseph (To appear), Friedman and Joseph (To appear)), suggesting a possible Sprachbund connection. But they also occur in various other languages worldwide; for instance, see Rudin (1993, 2017) for discussion of some Native American languages.
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The goal of the present paper is to explore the meaning, usage, and structure of MD constructions in Balkan Slavic, including differences between Bulgarian and Macedonian. Standard-language MD with quantifiers, as in (3), has very different properties from colloquial MD constructions like (4–5). Semantically/pragmatically the colloquial type has an emotive flavor lacking in the quantifier type in the standard language, and they differ in structure as well. Syntactically MD raises numerous issues. Tentative conclusions at this stage of research include that the cooccurrence of demonstrative with article argues for an elaborated structure of nominals with demonstratives as either a separate DP or occupying a specifier position; the possibility of repeated articles supports analysis of definiteness as morphological agreement; and other aspects of these constructions suggest that the colloquial type generally constitutes a single nominal phrase while the quantifier type at least sometimes consists of two separate phrases. Though very similar overall, Bulgarian and Macedonian MD constructions differ in some significant details, suggesting differences in the structure of nominal phrases in the two languages.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes MD in quantifier constructions of the type seen in (3), where the article is generally obligatory and the meaning one of uniqueness, while sections 3 through 6 present aspects of the colloquial MD constructions like (4–5). Section 3 discusses their pragmatic function of signaling speaker involvement and evaluative attitude. Section 4 discusses the choice of demonstrative and article, from among the differing menu of determiners available in each language. Section 5 introduces differences between Macedonian and Bulgarian regarding which lexical categories can be articulated in MD constructions. Section 6 looks at the occurrence of multiple articles. Section 7 briefly addresses some issues in the syntax of both types of MD constructions, section 8 makes some observations about the semantics of MD, and section 9 is the conclusion.

2. MD with Universal Quantifiers

In standard Bulgarian a demonstrative and a definite article regularly cooccur with certain adjectival quantifiers; roughly ones with universal or identity meaning. This is also true in standard Macedonian, though with some differences, as discussed below. We have already seen one Bulgarian example in (3); more are given in (6):

(5) ovie vrabotenive
those employees_def
‘those employees’

Though very similar overall, Bulgarian and Macedonian MD constructions differ in some significant details, suggesting differences in the structure of nominal phrases in the two languages.
With some quantifiers (c jal ‘whole’, sâšt ‘same’) the definite article is required, while with vsički ‘all’ it is optional, at least for some speakers. These universal quantifier elements differ from ordinary adjectives in being able to occur before the demonstrative as well, as in (7); in fact, this is the more usual order. Adjectives in general must follow the demonstrative; see (8).

3 Tasseva-Kurktchieva (2006) finds the article -te to be optional in both (6a) and (7a), while Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Tomić claim it is optional in (7a) but required in (6a).

4 Hauge (1999), for instance, discusses examples of the type in (7) without mentioning the possibility of the order in (6). Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Tomić (2009) consider quantifier > demonstrative “the default order” and suggest demonstrative > quantifier is derived from it by movement.

5 As already noted, the article -te here is nonstandard, possible only in colloquial language.
In Macedonian as well, the same group of quantifiers occurs with a definite article and a demonstrative. Phrases corresponding to Bulgarian (7) are grammatical (with the slight difference that the article in (9a) is obligatory).

(9) a. site tie knigi
    all_{def} these books
    ‘all of these books’

b. celoto toa čekanje
    whole_{def} this waiting
    ‘all this waiting’

c. istite tie knigi
    same_{def} these books
    ‘these same books’

Demonstratives normally precede adjectives, as in Bulgarian. However, the order demonstrative > quantifier is impossible in Macedonian, unlike in Bulgarian; compare (10) to (6).

(10) a. *tie site knigi
    these all_{def} books

b. *toa celoto čekanje
    this whole_{def} waiting

c. *tie istite knigi
    these same_{def} books

Constructions with an articulated quantifier and a demonstrative have been noted by several authors, for Bulgarian and/or Macedonian: Giusti and Dimitrova-Vulchanova (1994), Arnaudova (1998), Tasseva-Kurktchieva (2006), Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Tomić (2009), Franks (2001). But though the data are well established, it is less clear what to make of them. As mentioned above, the quantifiers involved are a limited group, generally identified as universal in some sense. The use of an article on these quantifiers probably has to do with their semantics; Boris Harizanov (pc) suggests that the required article with sâšt- ‘same’ is related to its “uniqueness” meaning, which is inherently specific. This does not explain, however, why a demonstrative alone is not sufficient marking of definiteness/specificity/uniqueness—that is, why MD is not only licensed here but actually required.

A likely partial explanation is that a string like Bulgarian vsičkite tezi činii is in fact not a single nominal phrase but two separate nominals; an appositive construction. Franks (2001), citing data from Giusti & Dimitrova-Vulchanova
(1994), suggests that several lines of evidence show \textit{vsičkite} is a separate DP in Bulgarian in situations like the following:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{kni} \textit{g}i \textit{pročeto} \textit{vsičkite}
\textit{books} \textit{def} them \textit{read} \textit{1sg} \textit{all} \textit{def}
\textbf{‘the books I read them all’}

\item \textit{*kni} \textit{g}i \textit{pročeto} \textit{xubavite}
\textit{books} \textit{def} them \textit{read} \textit{1sg} \textit{nic} \textit{def}
\textbf{‘the books I read them nice’}

\item \textit{vsičk}i \textit{nas/nie}
\textit{all} \textit{us/we}
\textbf{‘all of us/we all’}

\item \textit{moi} \textit{vsičk}i \textit{kni} \textit{g}
\textit{my} \textit{def} \textit{all} \textit{def} \textit{books}
\textbf{‘all my books’}
\end{enumerate}

Comparing (11a–b) shows that Bulgarian \textit{vsičkite}, unlike ordinary adjectives, can occur separated from \textit{kni} \textit{g}i as a clearly independent phrase. The fact that it can occur with a pronoun in (11c), again unlike ordinary adjectives, also suggests that it is outside DP. The occurrence of two articles in (11d) also seems to suggest two DPs (though see section 6 below for a different view of repeated articles). Given all this, it seems reasonable to conclude that \textit{vsičkite} is also a separate DP in a string like \textit{vsičkite tezi činii}. Similar facts could be adduced for the other quantifiers and for Macedonian.

I take it, then, that at least some MD constructions with quantifiers are appositive, in both languages, and that this is probably the correct analysis of (7) and (9), with quantifier > demonstrative order; this preserves the generalization that a demonstrative is normally the leftmost element in DP. It remains an open question whether the Bulgarian structure with demonstrative > quantifier as in (6) is also an appositive structure. If anything, the demonstrative here might be a separate constituent: [tezi][\textit{vsičkite činii}]. More likely it is a single DP, as I argue for the colloquial MD construction below.

\section*{3. A First Look at Colloquial MD: Usage}

MD constructions without universal quantifiers differ from those discussed in the previous section in several ways. Their usage is colloquial and the definite article in them is optional. The semantic and pragmatic contribution of the article differs from that with quantifiers. Syntactically, the order of elements is different and more rigid, with the demonstrative always first, and ev-
idence for appositive structure is lacking. In this section I present some initial data on colloquial MD. The following several sections refine and expand on these facts, highlighting some differences between the two languages. Examples (12a–b) are typical of the construction under discussion. A demonstrative is followed by an articulated word, in this case an adjective.

(12) a. **tija nova te**lefon i (Bulgarian)
   b. **ovie nova te**lefon i (Macedonian)
   ‘these new phones’

Although such phrases are colloquial, they are readily accepted by speakers in both languages and have been recognized to some extent in the linguistic literature. For Macedonian they are discussed by Ugrinova-Skalovska (1960/61), Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Tomić (2009), and most extensively by Friedman (2016). Ugrinova-Skalovska bases her discussion on examples found in literary fictional dialogue, while Friedman (2016) analyzes numerous examples of MD from the “Bombi” (Prizma 2015), a corpus of recorded phone conversations.6 For Bulgarian they are noted by Tasseva-Kurktchieva (2006), Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Tomić (2009), and in passing by Hauge (1999). Mladenova (2007) discusses the existence of MD constructions in Old Bulgarian manuscripts as well as in modern dialects and colloquial language. Examples can easily be found in social media and other informal writing as well as in speech. Unless otherwise noted, in this paper Macedonian examples are from the Bombi, while Bulgarian examples are from online sources, confirmed by speakers.

One characteristic of MD constructions is their pragmatic function of heightened personal involvement. Friedman (2016) finds 101 examples of MD in the first 14 hours of the Macedonian Bombi, and analyzes them with particular attention to the emotive tone they add to the utterance. Often, this is a negative flavor, as in (13a), but it can also signal a positive affect. The same is true in Bulgarian: MD constructions tend to have an emotive, non-neutral nuance, ranging from sneering to gushing, as in (13b). (For ease of reading, in longer examples the relevant nominal phrase is enclosed in square brackets.)

---

6 These recordings, which reveal widespread corruption in the Macedonian government, caused a major scandal. Heartfelt thanks to Victor Friedman for making me aware of the Bombi, checking my translation of some examples, and soliciting judgments on modified versions of other examples from Macedonian colleagues. Friedman’s article is not concerned with the political content of the recordings, but simply takes them as a corpus of “real, colloquial,” even “street language” Macedonian as actually spoken in the 21st century.
(13)  

a. Da vidime Ȉo\'tja drugi\u0107 u\u0223\u017d to see\textsubscript{pl} with those other\textsubscript{def} cattle what will se prai. (Macedonian) ref\textsubscript{pl} do

‘Let’s see what to do about those other dumb animals.’

b. Ej [tazi na\u0161ata prijatelka] napravo ni ostavi bez hey this our\textsubscript{def} friend straight us left\textsubscript{3sg} without dumi. (Bulgarian) words

‘Wow, this friend of ours simply left us speechless.’

It is very common for the MD construction to include a first person possessive (moj ‘my’/na\u0161 ‘our’), or less commonly second person; this seems to align with its function of expressing personal involvement. Several Macedonian examples are given in (14), and some Bulgarian ones in (15) as well as (13b).

(14)  

a. [Ovoj na\u0161i\u0107 ov\v{c}ovek] e tuka zna\u0107i. that our\textsubscript{def} person is here means

‘So, this guy of ours is here.’

b. [Tie tvoi\v{t}e] od lista te cinkarat. these your\textsubscript{def} from list\textsubscript{def} you squeal\textsubscript{3pl}

‘These guys of yours from the [electoral] list are squealing on you.’

c. Taka mi pi\u0161aa [ovi\v{t}e moi\u0107e]. thus me wrote those my\textsubscript{def}

‘That’s what those guys of mine wrote me.’

(15)  

a. [Tija moi\v{t}e volta\u0161i] normalni li sa? these my\textsubscript{def} voltages normal \textsubscript{Q} are

‘Are these voltages of mine normal?’

b. Samo \u0167te razp\u0161ane\u0161 [onaja tvoj\u0107a \v{c}arovna usmivka] only will stretch that your\textsubscript{def} charming smile

‘You’ll only stretch out that charming smile of yours.’

4. Which Demonstrative and Which Article?

Bulgarian and Macedonian each have more than one set of demonstratives and/or articles, and these interact in subtle ways with each other and with the MD construction. In Bulgarian the facts are very simple. There are two sets
of demonstratives, which differ stylistically. Those in (16a) are more formal, while those in (16b) are informal, more colloquial:

(16) a. tozi/tazi/tova/tezi ‘this m/f/n/pl’  
onzi/onazi/onova/onezi  ‘that m/f/n/pl’

b. toja/taja/tuj/tija ‘this m/f/n/pl’

onja/onaja/onuj/onija  ‘that m/f/n/pl’

Both types do occur with MD constructions. The toja set is seen in (17a) and the tozi set in (17b) in a very similar context. However, not surprisingly, given their informal and emotionally-tinged flavor, MD constructions much more commonly occur with the more colloquial set, and some speakers find them more natural with this group of demonstratives.

(17) a. Offf, [toja novija ajfon] ne e ništo osobeno.  

‘Oof, this new iPhone isn’t anything special.’

b. Iskam da se maxna [tozi novija profil].

I want to get rid of this new profile.

Macedonian has a more complex and interesting story. Unlike Bulgarian, Macedonian boasts a three-way proximity distinction in both demonstratives and articles: neutral forms with -t-, proximal forms in -v- and distal forms in -n-. More than two-thirds of the MD constructions in the Bombi corpus use the proximal -v- article and demonstrative forms, as in (18) as well as (12a, 13a, 14a,c); Friedman (2016) suggests this reflects a shift in meaning of -v- forms from representing physical proximity to instead carrying an affective meaning of personal involvement, expressivity, or subjectivity, exactly the semantic nuances characteristic of MD.

(18) a. [Ovie kartive] site se ispečateni.8

‘Those ballots are all printed up.’

---

7 Some dialects of Bulgarian do have a 2- or 3-way system of articles marked for proximate vs. distal deixis, but the standard language has only the -t- based article.

8 This example is slightly modified from the Bombi; the original had a false start.
(18) b. [Ovie moronive] od A1 me prašuvaa za ova.
  those moronsDEF from A1 me asked about that

  ‘Those morons from A1 were asking me about that.’

Most of the remaining third have the neutral -t- article and demonstrative forms, as in (19). Far fewer (only 3% in the portion of the Bombi analyzed by Friedman 2016) have the distal -n- forms; one example is given in (20). All of Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Tomić’s examples of Macedonian MD have proximate (-v-) determiners, supporting Friedman’s observation that this is the usual case.9

(19) a. Sega odime na [toj pomaliot objekt]
  now go1PL to that smallerDEF structure

  ‘Now we’re going to that smaller structure.’

  b. Vidi, mene ne mi se dopaѓa [toa našeto],
  look me neg me refl like that ourDEF
  iskreno da kažam.
  truthfully to say1SG

  ‘Look, I don’t like that guy of ours, to tell the truth.’

(20) More, če ja preselam [onaа zgradana] što e kaj
  well will it move1SG that buildingDEF that is near
  Bristol.

  ‘Well, I’ll move that building that’s near [the Hotel] Bristol.’

5. MD with Nouns

A distinct difference exists between Macedonian and Bulgarian in what articulated lexical categories are possible following the demonstrative. In both languages a nominal modifier (adjective or possessive) can bear the article, whether it occurs before a noun (possibly with further modifiers) or stands alone as in (21c).

9 Though the demonstrative and article usually agree in deixis, certain types of deixis mismatch do occur, namely a demonstrative in -v- or -n- with an article in -t-. See discussion of example (34) below.
(21) a. Ax, [tezi tvoite krasivi oči]!
   ah these your\textsubscript{DEF} beautiful eyes
   ‘Ah, those beautiful eyes of yours!’

   b. [Tija bogatite xlapeta] imali po dva roleksa
   those rich\textsubscript{DEF} kids have\textsubscript{EVID} apiece two rolexes
   ‘Those rich kids supposedly have two rolexes each.’

   c. [Tija bogatite] samo za pari misljat.
   these rich\textsubscript{DEF} only of money think
   ‘These rich people only think about money.’

These examples are Bulgarian, but exactly parallel ones could be given for
Macedonian; in fact we have already seen a number of similar cases. The inter-
esting difference occurs in phrases with a true noun (as opposed to a “nom-
inalized adjective” like bogati ‘rich (people)’ in (21c), which is presumably just
an adjective accompanied by a null noun: bogatite \textsubscript{N} with meaning equiva-
 lent to bogatite hora ‘the rich people’). In Macedonian a noun can unproblemat-
ically bear the article, as in (22); cf. also (18a-b; 20) above.

(22) a. taa tetratkata\textsuperscript{10}
   this notebook\textsubscript{DEF}
   ‘this notebook’

   b. ovie deca
   those children\textsubscript{DEF}
   ‘those children’

   c. toj čovekot
   this person\textsubscript{DEF}
   ‘this person’

On the other hand, in Bulgarian this is impossible; the MD construction in
Bulgarian always contains the definite form of an adjective or other modifier,
not a definite noun. Examples like those in (23), the counterparts of the Mac-
edonian phrases in (22), are rejected by speakers who otherwise readily accept
MD constructions.

\textsuperscript{10} Thanks to Christina Kramer for providing this example, which she noticed on an
old postcard; one of the few pre-internet written examples I have seen.
(23) a. *[tazi tetradkata]
    this notebook$_{DEF}$

   b. *[onija decata]
    those children$_{DEF}$

   c. *[toja čoveka]
    this person$_{DEF}$

I return to this difference in the conditions on MD in Bulgarian vs. Macedonian below, in section 7.

6. Multiple Articles

Up to this point, MD constructions seems to follow the normal rule of placement of the article within the nominal phrase, if we just ignore the demonstrative. That is, there is a single article, appearing suffixed to the first nominal element of the phrase. However, this is not entirely true. In fact, it is also possible to find repeated articles, in both Macedonian and Bulgarian. In Macedonian an article can appear on both adjective and noun. Franks (2001) gives the example (24a), citing Koneski; (24b–c) are from the Bombi:

(24) a. onoj mojot najmalot
    that my$_{DEF}$ smallest$_{DEF}$
    ‘that youngest (one) of mine’

   b. [ovie našive polupismenive] što gledaat denes ...
    those our$_{DEF}$ semiliterates$_{DEF}$ that watch$_{3PL}$ today
    ‘those semiliterates of ours who are watching [tv] today …’

   c. Neka mu se javam na Slave, na [ovoj
    let him$_{REFL}$ call$_{1SG}$ to Slave to that
    koordinatorov našiov].
coordinator$_{DEF}$ our$_{DEF}$
    ‘Let me call Slave, that coordinator of ours.’

In Bulgarian as well repeated articles occur, but, in keeping with the general Bulgarian prohibition on articulated nouns in MD constructions, only if the second articulated word is another adjective, either a second prenominal adjective, as in (25a) or one without a following noun, as in (25b). Similar to bogati discussed above, polugramotni ‘semiliterates’ presumably modifies a null NP here, as does the Macedonian equivalent polupismeni in (24b); it could be rephrased as polugramotni hora ‘semiliterate people’.
(25) a. tija vašite interesnite knigi
   these your interesting books
   ‘these interesting books of yours’

   b. onija našite polugramotnite
      those our semiliterates
      ‘those semiliterates of ours’

This contrasts with non-adjectival nouns like banica ‘savory pastry’ in (26),
which cannot have the article suffixed to it in the same configuration as (25b).

(26) a. [Tazi nejnata banica] e straxotna.
      this her banica is great
      ‘That banica of hers is great.’

   b. *[Tazi nejnata banicata] e straxotna.
      this her banica is great

This double-article phenomenon is highly problematic for the usual syntactic
analysis of the definite article in Balkan Slavic languages as a clitic, presum-
ably in D, which either attracts the first nominal element of DP to raise to D
to support it or in some analyses undergoes some type of movement onto the
following constituent at PF. It is less problematic for an account which treats
what is traditionally called the “postposed article” as an inflectional affix, a
morphological form of nouns and adjectives inflected for definiteness. There
are good reasons to prefer such an account independent of MD constructions.
Franks (2001) argues convincingly for treating the Bulgarian article as inflec-
tion, noting that the form of the article depends on the phonological form of
the host word, that articles are phonologically more closely integrated in the
host word than clitics, blocking final devoicing and metathesis from occur-
ring in the host, and that some intrinsically definite nouns cannot take an
article -- that is, they have an idiosyncratic zero definiteness inflection. He
concludes that definiteness is a feature associated with the XP below DP, in a
structure like (27) and is realized as an affix on the head X of that XP: Q, A, or
N depending on which of these categories are projected.
To account for multiple articles in MD constructions, it appears necessary to tweak this only slightly. The [+definite] feature could optionally be realized on the head of more than one projection—for instance on both AP and NP heads; that is, it is a case of definiteness agreement spreading within the nominal phrase.\(^{11}\)

Note, however, that this definiteness agreement requires the presence of a demonstrative, in both Balkan Slavic languages. It is not possible for two adjectives or adjective plus noun to be articulated without an accompanying demonstrative. Examples (28) and (29) show that although phrases of the form [Dem X+definite Y+definite] occur naturally in Macedonian (in the Bombi, in this case) and are readily accepted by native Macedonian speakers, the same phrases without the demonstrative are judged ungrammatical. Example (29a) (= (24c)) has the rather marked order of possessive adjective following rather than preceding the noun, but is perfectly grammatical. The same sequence of articulated adjective and noun is not possible without the demonstrative, in either Adj > N or N > Adj order.

(28) a. \textit{ovie našive polupismenive}  
\hspace{1cm}‘those semiliterates’  
\hspace{1cm}DEF  
\hspace{1cm}‘those semiliterates of ours’

b. *\textit{našive polupismenive}

(29) a. \textit{ovoj koordinatorov našiov}  
\hspace{1cm}‘that coordinator’  
\hspace{1cm}DEF  
\hspace{1cm}‘that coordinator of ours.’

b. *\textit{koordinatorov našiov}

\(^{11}\) A reviewer suggests that definite adjectives in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian provide a parallel to and circumstantial support for the agreement analysis, even in a language without articles. BCS definite adjectival endings occur after demonstratives and possessives: \textit{ovaj/moj novi} (*\textit{nov}) \textit{kompjuter} ‘this/my new computer’ and can be seen as agreeing in definiteness with the demonstrative/possessive.
(29)  c. *нашиков координаторов

The same is true in Bulgarian. For instance, though (30a) with repeated articles is fine, the same sequence of two definite constituents is ungrammatical without the determiner onija.

(30)  a. onija нашите полуграмотни те полуграмотни те 'those semiliterates of ours'
b. *нашите полуграмотни

Thus, if double articulation is an agreement phenomenon, it must be licensed by the presence of a higher demonstrative. I suggest that the D head receives an additional feature—call it [+dem]—by Spec-Head agreement with the demonstrative, and it is this feature which is then passed down the chain of heads and realized as an article/definiteness suffix. The fact that this agreement can reach into NP in Macedonian but stops above NP in Bulgarian is probably related to an independently proposed difference in the structure of DP in the two Balkan Slavic languages (Franks 2015); see section 7.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that repeated articles can also occur in the quantifier type of MD construction discussed in section 2. The Bulgarian example in (31a) has both an articulated quantifier and an articulated adjective; (31b) shows that this is no longer grammatical without the demonstrative tija.

(31)  a. във същите тиа винени in same these wine 'in these same wine (glasses)'
b. *във същите винени
c. във същите, винени ‘in the same ones, the wine (glasses)’

The final example in this set, (31c) shows that separating the two articulated constituents with a pause, indicated by the comma, gives an acceptable result but with a different meaning and structure: here “the same ones” and “the wine

---

12 This example, the answer to a question of which glasses to serve the whiskey in, is from a transcribed conversation in Angelova (1994). In addition to showing double articulation in a quantifier-type MD construction, it could also be seen as simultaneously exemplifying both the quantifier type (with същите plus a demonstrative) and the colloquial type of MD construction (with the more colloquial demonstrative тиа instead of тези, followed by an articulated adjective).
glasses” are two separate phrases, clearly in apposition. This leads us naturally into the next section, where I consider the structure of MD constructions including the question of whether they are appositives.

7. Structure of MD Constructions

Both types of MD constructions (the quantifier type discussed in section 2 and the colloquial type discussed in sections 3-6) raise questions of syntactic analysis. If MD constructions constitute a single phrase, they require a structure that can accommodate both a demonstrative and one or more articles (or definiteness agreement) in a single DP. On the other hand, it is likely that the universal quantifier type of MD is at least sometimes an appositive construction consisting of two separate DPs (see section 2), and it is worth asking whether the colloquial type of MD could also be appositive.

As hinted in (31c), one of the clearest diagnostics for appositive structure is comma intonation or pause. By this diagnostic none of the MD constructions considered in this paper appear appositive. They are not written with commas, in general (though punctuation in social media should perhaps not be taken too seriously as a criterion). And at least in the Bombi recordings, they are spoken smoothly, without a pause. Word-order shifting is another characteristic of classic appositives. We saw in section 2 that the possibility of separating the articulated quantifier from the demonstrative + noun is an argument in favor of treating (some) quantifier-type MD constructions as appositive. The postposing of vsičkite in (32c) is a fairly strong indication that (32b) (though perhaps not (32a)) consists of two separate DPs.

\[
(32) \begin{align*}
a. \text{tezi } & \text{vsičkite } \text{činii} \\
& \text{these all}_\text{DEF} \text{ dishes} \\
& \text{‘all these dishes’} \\
b. \text{vsičkite tezi } & \text{činii} \\
c. \text{tezi } & \text{činii } \text{gi } \text{izmixme } \text{vsičkite} \\
& \text{these dishes them washed}_\text{IPL} \text{ all}_\text{DEF} \\
& \text{‘We washed all those dishes / Those dishes, we washed them all’}
\end{align*}
\]

13 This observation is due to Victor Friedman (pc). After listening to clips he provided I agree that phrases like ovite našive polupismenive ‘those semiliterates of ours’ (= (24b/28) above) are pronounced as single intonational phrases.
This argument does not extend to the colloquial type of MD, however. In (33), the demonstrative must be the leftmost element, and cannot occur separated from the rest of the phrase, nor can the phrase be otherwise broken up.

\[(33)\]

a. \textit{tazi našata prijatelka}  \\
\hspace{1em} this our\textit{DEF} friend  \\
\hspace{1em} ‘this friend of ours’

b. *\textit{našata tazi prijatelka}  \\

c. *\textit{našata prijatelka ja posreštnah tazi}  \\
\hspace{1em} our\textit{DEF} friend her met\textit{1SG} this  \\
\hspace{1em} (Intended: ‘I met our friend, this one.’)

d. *\textit{tazi prijatelka ja posreštnah našata}  \\
\hspace{1em} this friend her met\textit{1SG} our\textit{DEF}  \\
\hspace{1em} (Intended: ‘I met this friend, our one.’)

Another potential argument also does not go through. Deixis mismatches, though fairly rare, do occur in Macedonian MD; for instance, in (34) the proximal demonstrative \textit{ovaa} agrees with the neutral -\textit{ta} article in number and gender but not in proximity marking.

\[(34)\] \textit{Ovaa celata rabota} \textit{ke se istera kako što treba}.  \\
\hspace{1em} this whole matter will \textit{refl} turn.out how that should  \\
\hspace{1em} ‘This whole thing will turn out as it should.’

This could be taken as evidence that the demonstrative is a separate phrase, but this would be a mistake. Mismatches are limited to a demonstrative in -\textit{v}- (proximal) or -\textit{n}- (distal)\textsuperscript{14} cooccurring with an article in -\textit{t}-. As argued by Franks (2001), the neutral -\textit{t}- is less specified and thus an article in -\textit{t}- is formally non-distinct from and compatible with any type of demonstrative governing it within DP.

Further investigation is needed. Appositives are not well understood theoretically or cross-linguistically, and the question of whether any MD constructions are appositive is not resolved here. It is clear, however, that not all MD are appositive, and in particular I know of no reason not to consider the colloquial MD type a single DP.

Given the arguments above for treating the articles as definiteness inflection, I assume that definiteness in fact is a morphological marking in Bulgarian, not a syntactic process of moving and attaching a clitic. Adopting Franks’

\textsuperscript{14} See (24) above for an example of the -\textit{v}- > -\textit{t}- type.
analysis of demonstratives as specifier of DP, I suggest the following structure for the colloquial MD construction in both Macedonian and Bulgarian, as well as MD with demonstrative > universal quantifier order in Bulgarian (recall that Macedonian allows only quantifier > demonstrative).

\[(35) \quad \text{DP} \rightarrow \text{Demonstrative} \rightarrow \text{D}' \rightarrow \text{XP} \rightarrow X_{+\text{DEF}} \rightarrow Y_{+\text{DEF}} \rightarrow ZP\]

The DP has a demonstrative in its specifier position and a null head, indicated by outline font D. Definiteness is realized as an affix on the highest phrase under DP (here “XP”) and, in the presence of the feature [+dem] on D, this affix optionally instantiates definiteness agreement on heads of lower phrase(s) as well, as indicated by +def in parentheses on Y. Other analyses are possible, particularly for the demonstrative. Tasseva-Kurktchieva (2006) argues that Bulgarian demonstratives head their own projection, a DemP above DP. Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Tomić (2009) claim that the demonstrative sits in a left-peripheral “topic” position within the nominal phrase. The exact status of demonstratives requires deeper investigation, as does their role in licensing multiple definiteness agreement.

As previously noted, a fact needing explanation is the difference between Macedonian and Bulgarian in whether definiteness can be marked on a noun in MD constructions, including whether agreement can extend into NP in cases of multiple articles. There are other differences in nominal structure between the two Balkan Slavic languages as well, especially in the acceptability of possessive (oblique) clitics within DP. In Bulgarian these are normal in all types of DP, including MD constructions with two possible word orders (36b-c), but in Macedonian clitics are allowed only with a small group of kinship terms, and even there cannot occur in MD, nor with a definite article. In (37) the only grammatical use of the clitic mi is in a simple phrase with the kinship noun tatko.

\[\text{15} \quad \text{I have no examples of more than two +def phrases (two articles), but in principle it should be possible.}\]
(36) Bulgarian
a. obuvkite mi
   shoes$_{DEF}$ my
   ‘my shoes’

b. tija mi novite obuvki
   these my new$_{DEF}$ shoes
   ‘these new shoes of mine’

c. tija novite mi obuvki

(37) Macedonian
a. *banica(ta) mi
   banica$_{DEF}$ my

b. tatko mi
dad my
   ‘my dad’

c. *toj mi tatko
   this my dad

d. *toj tatko mi

Franks (2015) suggests that Macedonian DP cannot accommodate the possessive clitic because it has a less elaborated structure than Bulgarian DP; specifically, it lacks the KP projection. It is possible that the KP layer above NP in Bulgarian blocks spreading of definiteness agreement, accounting for the lack of participation of N in MD definiteness marking. Exploring this idea here would lead us too far afield; suffice it to say that there are clearly differences in the structure of DP between the two languages which are deserving of deeper study and which correlate with the difference in marking of N in MD constructions.

8. A Few Words on Semantics

In addition to raising syntactic issues, MD constructions also bring up questions of meaning. Although the intuitions are subtle, several Bulgarian speak-

---

16 Rudin (2018) develops this idea somewhat further. An obvious problem with KP blocking definiteness marking is that nouns do routinely take the definite article suffix in “ordinary” DPs: knigata ‘the book’. The article as instantiation of definiteness agreement in MD behaves differently from the single article in non-MD phrases in ways which suggest they are actually distinct phenomena.
ers have commented that the meaning of MD constructions is not quite the same as those with just a demonstrative and certainly not the same as a phrase with just an article.

(37) a. taja interesnata kniga
    this interesting<sub>DEF</sub> book
    ‘this interesting book (!)’

b. taja interesna kniga
    this interesting book
    ‘this interesting book’

c. interesnata kniga
    interesting<sub>DEF</sub> book
    ‘the interesting book’

While (38c) is simply definite or “old information” and (38b) is “pointing” to a certain specific book, (38a) has a sense that is not simply a combination of definite and specific, indicated clumsily in the gloss with an exclamation point. It is difficult to pin down exactly what the difference in meaning is, especially between (38a) and (38b). One speaker comments “comparing examples with both DEM and DEF to examples with just DEM, I have the intuition that DEF makes some sort of uniqueness contribution;” that is, (38a) is more “unique” than (38b); perhaps more strongly focused on unique aspects of this particular book. Another speaker suggests that the non-MD tezi naši prijateli ‘these friends of ours’ can be used “to pick out a subset of the set of our friends: these friends of ours as opposed to those friends of ours,” while the MD tezi našite prijateli does not have this sense, but would always be used to make some evaluative statement about (perhaps all of) our friends. These two apparently divergent insights can be combined into a statement that MD highlights some salient aspect of a unique item or set; the demonstrative focuses attention on an already definite entity. As noted several times above, this focus tends to have affective overtones, either positive or negative.

It may not be too far-fetched to suggest a link between this and some uses of demonstratives with inherently or situationally definite nouns in English:

(38) a. That Alfred! What a character!

b. I’m fed up with that husband of yours.

c. Come on, lift those knees!
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Here the demonstrative *that* or *those* does not pick out a certain item, but rather focuses attention and expresses the speaker’s attitude. *That Alfred* is not opposed to other people named Alfred, but admired. *That husband* is not contrasted with “your” other husbands, but denigrated. If the exercise leader tells me to *lift those knees*, I am not, unless wilfully uncooperative, going to ask “which knees”? *Knees* in this context is a specific, definite set, the only two knees I possess. The demonstrative does not encode definiteness or specificity here, but gives the exhortation more energy. *Lift your knees* might be said by a nurse trying to smooth the sheet beneath them, but not by someone motivating you to work harder in aerobics class. The details are not the same as in Balkan Slavic—there is no article in these English examples—but the phenomenon is similar.\(^\text{17}\)

The semantic contribution of the demonstrative and of the article (definiteness suffix) in Bulgarian and Macedonian MD is among the many aspects of the construction needing further work.\(^\text{18}\) As a first approximation it seems promising to posit that the attention-focusing meaning of the demonstrative combines with the definiteness of the article to produce a vivid comment on some aspect of a given item. Pragmatically, this comment tends to be taken as affective/emotive, expressing the speaker’s evaluation of the item.

### 9. Conclusions

This paper describes the MD constructions of Bulgarian and Macedonian, takes some steps towards a syntactic and semantic analysis of them, and raises a number of issues to address in future work.

Two types of MD constructions with quite different characteristics are found in both languages. In the standard literary languages MD occurs only with certain universal-quantifier adjectives. In both languages an articulated quantifier can be followed by a demonstrative; in this case the quantifier is arguably a separate DP and the MD construction is appositive, with each determiner (demonstrative and article) in its own DP. In Bulgarian but not Macedonian...
donian, the order demonstrative > quantifier is also possible; this more closely aligns with the second type of MD construction and is probably a single DP.

The second type of MD is found only in colloquial, informal usage in both languages and differs both syntactically and semantically from the first type. In addition to always placing the demonstrative first, it has no evidence of appositive structure and its meaning involves subjective attitude of the speaker instead of quantification. I speculated that this affective meaning is produced by the combination of definiteness (the article) and focus on an already specified individual or group (the demonstrative).

All MD constructions raise similar questions for the analysis of DP structure across languages, namely what kind of structure can accommodate both demonstrative and definite article (and in some cases in Balkan Slavic, repeated articles). My answer is that the demonstrative and the articles occupy different positions and fill different functions, so they do not interfere with each other. The demonstrative is higher (probably in SpecDP), while the articles are the manifestation of a definiteness feature on the head of projections below DP. They each contribute some meaning to the construction.

Repeating articles occur only in MD and not in ordinary DPs without a demonstrative. The “attention focusing” demonstrative (as opposed to contrastive-pointing demonstrative in non-MD nominals) both cooccurs with an article and enables definiteness agreement to reach further down into lower projections within DP. I suggested that this is due to a [+dem] feature on D.

As is so often the case in these very closely related languages, Bulgarian and Macedonian MD constructions are extremely similar but not quite identical. The main differences, aside from the issue of different repertoires of lexical demonstratives and presence or absence of a proximity distinction, are the almost complete impossibility of possessive clitics in Macedonian and the resistance in Bulgarian to definite marking (article) on nouns as opposed to adjectives and other categories within DP. These suggest a different structure of DP in the two languages, likely involving different projections, though details are left for further research.

References


Joseph, Brian D. (To appear) “Multiple determination in Greek and the Balkans,” Celebrating Twenty Years of the Kenneth E. Naylor Lectures in South Slavic and Balkan Linguistics (= Balkanistica 32).


