THE DIFFERENTIATION OF MACEDONIAN AND BULGARIAN IN A BALKAN CONTEXT

by Victor A. Friedman

In the history of Balkan linguistics, the relevant phenomena have most often been examined in the context of the traditional fields of grammatical investigation, i.e. phonology, morphology, semantics and syntax. Nonetheless, there are also relatively new approaches to the general problem of the study of language which can contribute to our subject, e.g. discourse analysis and pragmatics, which have begun to be utilized in comparative Balkan studies (e.g. Topolinska, 1992; cf. also Yokoyama, 1994). Such approaches have the potential to cast significant light not only on the processes of Balkan convergence but also on the processes of Balkan divergence. When we examine Macedonian and Bulgarian, we see that the convergence is in the direction of Macedonian towards its neighbouring non-Slavic languages while the divergence is precisely the differentiation of Macedonian and Bulgarian, with Macedonian tending towards the strengthening of certain innovative tendencies. By pragmatics I mean here the study of those features of language that are facultative and the search for the motivations of speakers' choices. From this point of view, pragmatics is opposed to grammar as such by the fact that the rules of grammar are obligatory while the choices of pragmatics are conditioned by the speech context and the desires of the speaker. Thus, for example, in Macedonian gender agreement and the forms of the vocative are grammatical, whereas the use of the vocative forms, insofar as it is not obligatory, must be described in terms of pragmatics.
This brings us to the difference between grammaticalization and the use of pragmatic devices. These processes can move in both directions, i.e. from pragmatic device to grammatical rule and vice versa. For example, the development of definite articles in the modern Balkan Slavic languages began in the Common Slavic period with the postponing of demonstrative pronouns for focus or topicalization, which in the course of time in the Balkans became grammaticalized as the grammatical category of definiteness. On the other hand, the Common Slavic vocative case, which was fully integrated into the substantival inflectional system, is only used now in Macedonian (and part of Bulgarian) with affective meanings, i.e. it has shifted from a grammatical to a pragmatic function. When we compare various phenomena connected with these two directions of change, we find that often Macedonian moves in the direction of grammaticalization or systemic change whereas Bulgarian either chooses the level of pragmatics or opts for a different type of grammaticalization. This can be seen in the examples such as object reduplication as well as in various verbal categories, as we will demonstrate below.

There is a whole range of grammaticalized distinctions between the two languages in which the path of differentiation must have been via pragmatics. Examples are grammaticalized syntactic and phono-syntactic phenomena that distinguish the two Balkan Slavic languages in such a way that Macedonian is closer to its non-Slavic neighbours, i.e. Albanian, Arumanian, and Greek, such as the shift of the clitics to a position in front of the finite verb and the limitation of stress to positions no further from the end of the word than the antepenultimate syllable. These two phenomena are arguably associated with one another. In Arumanian and Greek, grammatical rules require that stress fall on one of the last three syllables of the words, while in Albanian, the tendency of the stress to fall on the last syllable of the stem results in its practical limitation to the last three syllables of the word. The Balkan tendency to limit the stress to the last three syllables of the word may well have given impetus to the shifting of clitics from the end to the beginning of the verbal phrase. Moreover, in this as in other phenomena which we shall analyze below, there is a distinct inclination for the tendency to become stronger as one moves to the south and west, e.g. the place of the stress becomes increasingly fixed. Insofar as shifts in the placement of stress and the position of clitics must have taken place by means of variation during a certain period of time, we can suppose that there must have been a period when the two systems were in competition via pragmatic nuances. In Bulgarian we still have competition with regard to the place of the stress in certain words or types of words (e.g. prógramá, zúbrih), whereas in Macedonian we have a grammaticalized solution.

I should now like to turn our attention to the two phenomena I mentioned earlier: object reduplication and certain verbal categories, particularly those of status and resultivity. The synchronic and diachronic distribution of these developments reflects the tendency for pragmatic devices to be grammaticalized precisely where linguistic contact is most complex and intense. From this it can be argued that the adoption of pragmatic devices can serve as the entry points for structural change.

In his doctoral dissertation, Leafigren (1992, cf. also Guentchőva, 1994), showed that in Bulgarian the factor determining object reduplication is topicalization, i.e. turning onto the object the attention of the addressee normally (but not always) paid to the subject. Topicalization often coincides with such phenomena as definiteness and unusual word order, but these features do not determine when topicalization will occur. Leafigren demonstrates that in Bulgarian object reduplication occurs only in 2% to 3% of those contexts in which it would be at least theoretically possible. Leafigren’s work also makes it
clear that in literary Bulgarian object reduplication is considered to be a characteristic of colloquial style and that it is never encountered in scientific prose. This limitation is in all likelihood due to the northeastern dialectal base of the Bulgarian literary language and/or a conscious effort to avoid a construction considered characteristic of colloquial style. Thus, it is clear that object reduplication in Bulgarian is pragmatically motivated and carries stylistic nuances.

In literary Macedonian and Albanian, as in Arumanian, object reduplication - chiefly for definite objects but also for indefinite specific and indirect - is a completely grammaticalized phenomenon. It is true that there are some exceptions to the regularity of object reduplication, as shown for Macedonian by Ugrino-Skalovska (1960-61), Crvenkovska (1986) and Minova-Gjurkova (1994:196-200) and for Albanian by Buchholz and Fiedler (1987:445-46; see Golab, 1984:53 for Arumanian). Moreover, there are more exceptions to reduplication in contexts where it would not be allowed or expected in Macedonian, e.g. in idioms and in subordinate clauses with verbs of perception and thinking: Albanian la hipi kalit vs. Macedonian *mu-go javna [na] konjot 'he mounted the horse'; or Albanian E dija se do té vonohet vs. Macedonian *Go znaev deka (e) zadochni, 'I knew that he would be late'.

And thus, with regard to object reduplication we come to a striking difference between the Bulgarian on the one hand and Macedonian - together with Albanian and Arumanian - on the other. While in Bulgarian (as in Greek and Romanian) object reduplication is almost always facultative and thus pragmatically determined as well as characteristic of colloquial style, in Macedonian, Albanian and Arumanian object reduplication is grammaticalized, i.e. obligatory at least in most of the appropriate contexts, and it is the absence of object reduplication that is unusual and apparently pragmatically conditioned. To this we can add that object reduplication in Albanian appears to be more grammaticalized insofar as it is triggered by certain types of dependent clauses and in some idioms.

Let us now consider some verbal paradigms and constructions. It is arguable that in the verbal systems of the Balkan Slavic literary languages and dialects as well as in the Albanian language and its dialects (and also in some Balkan Romance dialects), the most significant innovation is the development of the grammaticalization of the degree to which the speaker vouches for that which is being said. In Balkan Slavic grammatical tradition, this opposition is frequently described as witnessed/reported, and in Albanian as admirativity.4 In the case of Albanian, we have the transformation of variation in the resultative paradigm into a new series of paradigms marked for non-confirmation, i.e. the grammatical category of status (for example, the variation between ka qenë = qenë ka 'has been' becomes transformed into the opposition of ka qenë 'has been' and qenka 'apparently is').5 A similar process also occurs in Megleno-Romanian, e.g. am fost vs. fost-am (Atanasov, 1984, 1990:220).

In traditional grammatical descriptions of the Bulgarian literary language, reporteness is treated as a separate category expressed by independent paradigms which, from a diachronic point of view, are descended from the past indefinite, i.e. the old resultative perfect. Indeed, the so-called dubitative paradigms of the type bil čel/bil četał in Bulgarian, like the Macedonian perfect of the type imal dojdeno, represent similar but independent innovations connected with the grammaticalization of the verbal category of status, because such forms developed after the verbal l-form (or resultative participle) was already associated with the meaning of 'non-confirmation'. Nonetheless, in the old perfect itself, these nuances are communicated not due to grammaticalization but through pragmatic conditioning, i.e. they come from the context.
Thus, for example, on the basis of Bulgarian examples in which the third person auxiliary can be either present or absent in the same sentence, in the same context, when describing the same events or types of events, Friedman (1980) has shown that in Bulgarian the so-called reported does not constitute a separate paradigm but rather the facultative omission of the third person auxiliary in the past indefinite. In her work on the same problem, Fielder (1990) shows that in the omission of the third person auxiliary in the past indefinite in Bulgarian is pragmatically conditioned to express the connection of the narrator to the text or the opposition foreground/background, with auxiliary omission signaling foregrounding, as in the following example: Vednaž e patuval ot Burgas nadolu, kam granicata - selo Fakija - patuval toj... (Roth, 1979:177-179). Here the first instance e patuval sets the scene, i.e. the background, whereas the second occurrence patuval continues the story, i.e. foregrounds the action.

In literary Macedonian, as in the west central dialects on which it is based (and unlike some of the eastern dialects), the third person auxiliary in the past indefinite is always absent and thus it can be said that the phenomenon of auxiliary loss has been completely grammaticalized. On the other hand, the new resultative perfects with the auxiliary ima ‘have’ (e.g. ima dojden ‘has come’) are completely grammaticalized precisely in those dialects where the auxiliary sum ‘be’ is always absent in the third person of the past indefinite. Moreover, the more limited the past indefinite, the more the new perfect is used. Thus, for example, in the Ohrid dialect the past indefinite is strictly limited to non-confirmative contexts and in the Korča-Kostur dialects, the I-form only occurs in a few admiring and dubitative expressions while the new perfect has almost completely replaced the old one. The continuum of the new perfect extends through Aegean Macedonia to the Bulgarian dialects of Thrace (v. Friedman, 1991b).

Constructions of the type Imam pisana statija po tozi vapros or even Imam pisano po tozi vapros ‘I have written on that question’ occur in literary Bulgarian, but these are open syntags and do not constitute paradigms. This is demonstrated by the fact that the participle must agree in gender with the direct object except in the absence of an explicit object. The Bulgarian constructions with ima only occur in strongly resultative contexts with an animate subject and a transitive verb. Thus, for example, while in Macedonian one can say vinoto go ima fateno ‘the wine has gotten him’ (= gone to his head) or toj ima dojdeno, the Bulgarian equivalents (*vinoto go ima hvatano/*toj ima dojdeno) are unacceptable. Thus, the use of ima constructions in Bulgarian is pragmatically conditioned, whereas in Macedonian, the paradigms in ima are completely grammaticalized.

In Albanian, the grammaticalization of non-confirmativity is even stronger insofar as the inverted perfect (ka qeni -> gen-ka) developed into an entire series of paradigms (present, imperfect, perfect and pluperfect), strictly limited to the meaning of non-confirmativity. Thus those meanings (surprise, doubt, reportedness) connected with non-confirmativity in the old perfect in Slavic - except in the south-westernmost dialects of Macedonian where that perfect has indeed become limited to non-confirmativity - have become the basis of a series of paradigms that have been fully grammaticalized in Albanian.

As Atanasov (1984) first observed, the inverted perfect in Megleno-Romanian is also used precisely for non-confirmative, but until now such a phenomenon has not been found in Arumanian. However, during fieldwork among the Frasheriote Vlahs of Gorna Belica (Beala di sus), Struga region, with the help of Marjan Marković, scientific worker at the Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, I discovered admira-
Apparently based on the Albanian third person singular present
admirative morpheme (the most frequent), which was appar-
etly interpreted as a marker of admirativity, e.g. Mi l'oi di
minti: "A be tora fuska avut om!" 'I was amazed: Well, now
you are a rich man!'.

And so we have a continuum from Bulgarian with its
pragmatic opposition resumptive perfect/non-confirmed past
through Macedonian (and perhaps here also Megleno-
Romanian), with a grammaticalized resumptive perfect but
pragmatically conditioned non-confirmative to Albanian (and
southwest Macedonian) with a grammaticalized resumptive
perfect and a grammaticalized non-confirmative past, and at the
end the Frasieriote Arumanian dialect of Gorna Beica with a
clearly borrowed marker of non-confirmativity.

We should note here in passing that while it is often the
case that a pragmatically conditioned feature in Bulgarian will
be grammaticalized in Macedonian, differentiation in the op-
posite direction also occurs. For example, the subject-
ive/objective distinction in certain masculine proper names and
the words čovek, Bog, gavol, Gospod (person, God, devil, Lord)
which occurs in the western dialects is facultative and thus
pragmatically conditioned while in Bulgarian the secondary
grammatical opposition nominative/non-nominative has been
created and is expressed by means of the two forms of the mas-
culine definite article: -a/-ja for the nominative, -a/-ja for the
so-called indirect case. Similarly, the use of the quantitative
plural is much more restricted in Macedonian than in Bulgar-
ian. In Macedonian, the numerical plural in -d, e.g. dva ženski
glasa 'two female voices', is used almost exclusively with the
numeral 'two' and with a few frequently quantified nouns such
as den 'day', dener 'denar', etc. The use of such forms in Ma-
cedonian is facultative to such an extent that it can be consid-
ered to be pragmatic rather than grammatical in Macedonian as
opposed to Bulgarian, where this development is grammatical-
ized.

When we examine other phenomena associated with the
Balkan Slavic verb, we can observe that in terms of restrictions
on verbal aspect (e.g. the loss of the imperfective aorist, the
limitation of the perfective present and imperfect to subordinate
or modal clauses) and analyticism in verbal particles
(Macedonian ke as opposed to Bulgarian šta, šteč, štajah, šteče,
Macedonian bi as opposed to Bulgarian bīh, bīhme, etc.) Ma-
cedonian shows greater simplification than Bulgarian. On the
other hand, the development of the past passive participle into a
verbal adjective (e.g. dojden) at the expense of the resultative
participle represents an extension on the part of Macedonian. In
general it appears that Macedonian shows a greater tendency to
grammaticalize changes in the verbal system whereas Bulgarian
tends more to grammaticalize changes in the nominal one. This
can be seen not only in the development of the relevant verbal
categories, but at the syntactic level also in the grammaticaliza-
tion of object reduplication, insofar as that phenomenon is
linked with the expression of verbal voice, i.e. the relationship
of the noun to the verb and the expression of the noun as such

With regard to the relationship of pragmatics and gram-
mar as such in a Balkan context, we have tried to show that at
least some Balkanisms can be described as continua from the
pragmatic to the grammaticalized. Koneski, Vidoeski, and
Jašar-Nasteva (1968) show that the most significant innovation
find their most developed expression in the southwestern zone
of Macedonia, where linguistic contact is most intense and most
complex: with Albanian, Arumanian, Greek and Turkish. The
grammaticalization of pragmatic phenomena in Macedonian
suggests that narrative functions can not only be borrowed, but
can even serve as points of entry for structural change (v.
Prince, 1988, Mithun, 1992). It thus appears that the grammati-
calization of narrative functions occurs most frequently where linguistic contact is most complex and where the speakers of different languages are attempting to communicate more effectively.

The Macedonian and Bulgarian languages are the children of the same south Slavic parent, just as Norwegian and Swedish are children of the same North Germanic parent. As in every linguistic differentiation, different factors are responsible for various developments, but it appears that the interaction between pragmatics and grammaticalization was especially important in the differentiation of Macedonian and Bulgarian. It is especially interesting in this regard that Macedonian evidences a long period of complex linguistic contact and coexistence. From the point of view of dialectal zones, there are a series of transitions for individual features, but what is most important here is that the crystallization of the most characteristic differences between Macedonian and Bulgarian took place precisely in that region foreseen more than ninety years ago by Krste P. Misirkov as the source for the basis of the Macedonian literary language.

NOTES

*Research for this publication was supported in part by a grant from the International Researches and Exchanges Board, with funds provided by the national Endowment for the Humanities. Neither of these organizations is responsible for the views expressed.

1 The phenomenon known as object reduplication in Balkan linguistics refers to the use of clitic pronouns that agree in gender, number, and case with the objects to which they refer, e.g. Macedonian mu ja davam na mom/sto koronati 'I'm giving the lad the book', literally 'to-him it I-give to-the-lad the-book'.

2 The only exceptions are the rare examples of unstressed derivational affixes, e.g. the participle of *fēheh 'hide' is *fēhehur 'hidden', and when the unaccented adverbial suffix -aci is added, the result is *fēhehuraci 'secretively'.

3 Another solution, which is found in Greek and also in some Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects, is double accentuation. This phenomenon is also areal, but since it is absent from the Balkan Slavic literary languages and is in any case not yet sufficiently studied, we mention it here simply in passing (cf. Alexander 1989-90, forthcoming).

4 On the comparison of these phenomena with Turkish see Friedman (1978, 1981).

5 I use the term status to refer to phenomena connected with the speaker's evaluation of the truth value of the event, as opposed to mood which expresses the ontological evaluation of such an event (v. Friedman, 1977:7).
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A mong the 12 members states of the EU Greece is not doubt the country in which the idea of a multicultural and plurilingual Europe finds least response, except if the promotion of Greek is at stake. Although Greece is one of the most homogenous Balkan countries, six minority languages are spoken on its territory: Albanian, Arumanian, Macedonian, Pomak, Romany and Turkish. After 14 years of EC membership most of these languages continue to be completely marginalized. Only Turkish is officially recognized, the other minority languages are either ignored or repressed. It seems thus worthwhile to examine this extreme example in the context of European unification. In the first part of my paper I will address the situation of minority languages from the 19th century until the moment when Greece joined the EU. Then I will sketch the reaction of Greek authorities to the various European initiatives in favour of minority languages. Finally, I will try to offer some explanations for the extreme stand Greece has taken on this issue, in the light of past and present developments.