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MACEDONIAN LEXICOGRAPHY AND EAST SOUTH SLAVIC LINGUISTICS: PERSPECTIVES, PROBLEMS, AND THE ROLE OF GRAMMATICAL INFORMATION

by Victor A. Friedman

Although Macedonian dialectal lexicography has a tradition going back at least as far as the Kostur dictionary of the sixteenth century (Gianelli and Vaillant, 1958), we shall be concerned here with the relationship of lexicography to the grammatical structure of the Macedonian standard language during the period of its official standardization, i.e. from 1944 onwards. The Modern Macedonian lexicographic tradition is unique in many respects among the Slavic languages. On the one hand, it has been directly affected by the input of modern linguists, on the other it is the only Slavic national literary language without a standard monolingual dictionary - insofar as the major three-volume dictionary (Koneski, 1961, 1965, 1966 reissued in 1986 in one volume) makes use of Serbo-Croatian translations either as a supplement to or in lieu of definitions (see below). Moreover, Macedonian lexicographic practice highlights other important issues, among them the relation of grammatical prescription to implementation, the differentiation of Macedonian and Bulgarian, and the interaction of grammatical categories and the lexicon. In this paper, I shall examine these issues and their implications for the relationship of grammar to lexicography in the Slavic languages and in general.

When discussing the concrete role of grammatical information in lexicography, if we have in mind the dictionary as the object of lexicography, then an essential consideration is the target audience. The level and type of information necessary for a monolingual dictionary...
directed at native speakers can be treated differently from that required in a bilingual dictionary. Saloni, Szapkowicz and Widzinski (1990) argue that even the monolingual dictionary is intended for "students or other less competent language users" as well as teachers, foreigner, and the inquisitive. However, these groups do not necessarily constitute a single audience. In the case of Macedonian, however, a specific type of audience - in a sense intermediate between the native speaker audience of a monolingual dictionary and the non-native audience of a bilingual dictionary - was the primary target for the standard dictionary mentioned above, namely native speakers who were mastering the standardized form of their language. At the same time, however, these speakers found themselves in a linguistic environment in which their national language was dominated at the federal level by another language, viz. the former Serbo-Croatian. The result was a dictionary that tried to combine the prescriptive capabilities of a monolingual dictionary with the glosses of a bilingual one. While the dictionary was an important landmark in the standardization of Macedonian, the effort at combining these two functions was, however, not always successful. The dictionary gives Serbo-Croatian translations of all the entries, and, for some entries, Macedonian definitions and examples of usage as well as some grammatical and prescriptive-stylistic information, but it suffers in two ways: (1) many words are identical in Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian and are given without any definition, e.g., abadžija (maker of coarse woolen cloaks), and in this respect it is merely orthographic or bilingual. (2) With its 64,522 main entries there are still many words that were not included. The Institute for the Macedonian Language has an enormous card file for a new, revised dictionary, but as yet there are no concrete plans for its publication. Instead, the Institute has been engaged in the production of specialized dictionaries such as those of folk poetry (Dimitrovski, 1983, 1987, 1993), proper names (Stamatoski, 1994), and verbal syntax (Korubin, 1992) - none of which have yet been completed.

Macedonian bilingual dictionary practice has seen the production of several dictionaries that play close, albeit not always consistent, attention to grammatical information - usually at the levels of morphology and phraseology. Of these, the Russian-Macedonian diction-

ary by Tolovski and Illic-Svytic (1963) was a landmark, particularly because of its outline of Macedonian grammar by Illic-Svitic, although a new dictionary by R. P. Usikova due to be published soon promises to create a new standard in this area. The two-way Polish dictionary by Vidoeski, Pianka, & Topolinska (1990) and the two-way Romanian dictionary by Mile Tomik (1986) are also worth mentioning. The English-Macedonian dictionary by Misiksa-Tomik et al. (1994) does not give Macedonian grammatical information, and the use of only the imperfective in citation forms is problematic for non-Macedonian users. The editors of the Macedonian to English translation begun by R. G. A. de Bray of the Institute dictionary -- Kevin Windle, Peter Hill, and Suncica Mircavskova -- are concentrating on the updating and selection of vocabulary and examples rather than innovations in the presentation of grammatical information (cf. Windle, 1996).

A major linguistic innovation in the relationship of grammatical information to Macedonian lexicographic practice, however, occurred in the early years of codification as the direct result of the influence of Horace Lunt, now professor emeritus at Harvard University. This innovation represents one of the few examples where linguists participated in a more rational arrangement of standard dictionary entries. Macedonian (like Bulgarian, the other East South Slavic literary language) lacks the infinitive, which is the traditional citation form in most Slavic dictionaries. In the 1950 orthographic dictionary (Koneski and Toshev, 1950) - the first book-length modern Macedonian dictionary, albeit quite modest in size - the authors followed the classical tradition, which was also the practice in Bulgarian, of using the first singular (present) as the citation form for verbs. In literary Macedonian, as well as in the West Central dialects on which it is based, a verb can have one of three stem-vowels in the present tense: a, e, i, e.g., 3sg glekam 'look,' here 'gather,' nosi 'carry.' However, whereas the third singular constitutes the bare present stem, from which all other parts of the vast majority of verbs are completely predictable, the first singular ending, -aml, completely neutralizes the opposition, e.g., lsg glekam, beram, nosam. Thus the use of the first singular as the citation form rendered the stem class of the verb mor-
phologically opaque, which in turn required the citation of another
person (the second in Koneška and Tosev, 1950), which in turn re-
quired the use of more ink and paper, and moreover made the correct
conjugation harder to remember. This was not merely a problem for
the non-native speaker. In the various Macedonian dialects, including
many of those in the west, the /e/ and /e/ classes of verbs had under-
gone various mergers during the pre-modern period (see Elson, 1983
for an explanatory account), so that the standard verb class was often
not obvious to the native attempting to master the new norm. It was
Lunt who, in his 1951 article *Morfologija na makedonskiot glagol*
(The Morphology of the Macedonian Verb) published in vol. 2 of
*Makedonski jezik*, convinced the codifiers of the literary language
to use the third singular rather than the first as the standard citation
form (see Lunt, 1951). This innovation was put into practice in the three-
volume Institute dictionary, which thus gave each entry more predic-
tive power. It also helped spread the standard use of stem vowels
(see Friedman, 1985 38-40). Thus, the integration of grammatical
knowledge into lexicographic practice had a direct effect on the in-
creased efficiency of the dictionary as a tool of standardization.

In the case of Bulgarian, the insistence on the classical use of the
first person singular results in a lack of predictability. While it is
ture that the /e/-conjugation is always predictable (1sg.-am) and the
/e/-conjugations generally follow certain patterns (1sg.-ar and
/at, respectively), there remain a number of ambiguities that would be
eliminated if the third person were chosen, as seen in the following
1sg-3sg examples:

\[ \text{plate-plate} \ '\text{weep'} \text{ BUT plati-plaši} \ '\text{scare'} \]
\[ \text{kupja-kupi} \ '\text{buy'} \text{ BUT kupija-kupce} \ '\text{drip'} \]

This difference highlights two types of distinctions between
Macedonian and Bulgarian in both grammar and lexicographic prac-
tice. One is the fact that the greater degree of neutralization in the
first singular in Macedonian reflects an overall tendency in the lan-
guage to simplify certain morphological features reducing the amount
of grammatical information to be specified in the lexicon (see below).

the other is the greater efficiency of basic Macedonian lexicographic
practice thanks to the fact that it was codified at a later date than lit-
ary Bulgarian and was thus in a position to benefit from modern ling-
ustic science.

Although, as mentioned above, the majority of Macedonian
verbs are entirely predictable on the basis of the third person singular
present, this is not the case for all verbs. The major source of syn-
chronically unpredictable morphophonemic alternation is the aorist,
whose first singular provides the most predictability for verbs that do
alternate. Similarly, the regularity of the grammatical rules for pluraliz-
ing nouns and inflecting adjectives for gender/number/definiteness ren-
der the amount of unpredictable morphological information needed
in the lexicon to be relatively small. Moreover, the fixed antepenultimate
stress of Macedonian means that only exceptions need to be marked.
This is all in marked contrast to Bulgarian, which has both unpre-
dictable stress - including morphophonemically alternating stress - and a
much higher rate of other unpredictable morphophonemic alternations.
Consider the following examples, which illustrate unpredictable mor-
phonemic alternations in Bulgarian where the Macedonian equiva-
Ients represent either the elimination of an old alternation or the fact
that Macedonian did not develop new alternations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kon konjat</td>
<td>konj konjat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desen desno 'right'</td>
<td>desen desno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mogu može 'can'</td>
<td>mogu može</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaže -kaža 'say'</td>
<td>kaže -kaža</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, this is not to say that Macedonian is totally
lacking in morphophonemic alternation, information concerning which
is generally included in the better bilingual as well as in orthographic
dictionaries. However, the high degree of leveling of morphophonemic
alternations - perhaps the highest in the Slavic world - points to the
central position of Macedonian as the contact language *par excellence*
in the Balkan linguistic league. In other words, another feature differ-
entiating Macedonian from Bulgarian is the fact that the former has gone much further in the direction of regularizing its morphology, which can be taken as a symptom of a higher degree of complex language contact over the centuries.

In the case of certain types of grammatical categories in Macedonian, their facultative nature raises the possibility that they must now be considered as lexicalized for the purposes of a dictionary of the literary language, and so it becomes necessary to observe the transfer of certain forms from the realm of grammar to that of the lexicon. In this sense, the dictionary participates in the determinate case of that which is to be considered grammatical as opposed to lexicalized remnants. We can cite problems in the use of the numerical plural and the animate numerals as typical in this respect. Although Macedonian has a special plural in -а for quantified non-human masculine nouns (два дена ‘two days’, pet dena vs pet denari ‘five denars’ [Macedonian currency]) and a special series of numerals for masculine humans, e.g. две жена, троја, четвртата ‘twosome, threesome, four-some’, etc., in fact these grammatical phenomena are limited in their occurrence to a few lexical items, so we have, for example три братра instead of троја браќа ‘three brothers’, две камундзиди and not две жена kamundžidi ‘two truck drivers’, pet kompijuteri and not pet kompjuter ‘five computers’, etc.

As a result of these leveling, material that entered the literary language as grammatical phenomena now seem better treated as lexical specificities. Similarly, the facultative nature of the Macedonian vocative as well as of the animate oblique forms make those parts of the grammar potential candidates for lexical rather than (or in addition to) grammatical treatment. Here, too, in the case of Bulgarian certain types of opposition, e.g. the use of the oblique definite article, are followed more consistently at least in prescriptive practice. Anecdotal evidence, however, indicates that in Bulgarian, too, certain categories such as the vocative are becoming obsolete, especially in Sofia, the capital.

Looking at the categories of aspect, diathesis, and subjecthood, we find a situation in East South Slavic - and in Macedonian in particular - that differs significantly from the situation in the rest of the Slavic languages. The imperfectizing suffix -ну is highly productive in Macedonian - even more in the colloquial than in the standard - and, according to recent research by Daniel Humphries of the University of Chicago, seems to be encoding a new subordinate aspectual distinction, namely, -а as marker of general truth, -ну as on-going at the moment. In other words, -ну retains an element of the perfectivity of the verb, as in the following example: Тоj исха крв низ уста... Еве и сега исхваля! ‘He’s spitting blood (general situation). Look, he’s spitting (actual moment of speech) [lit] even now!’ (Humphries, 1997). This fact combined with the loss of the imperfective aorist, which involves a significant restructuring of the subordinate aspectual system (cf. Friedman, 1993), would suggest the need to list derived imperfectives with their perfectives while listing underived imperfectives separately.

The expression of diathesis in Macedonian is another feature that differentiates it sharply from the rest of the Slavic languages, including literary Bulgarian. Unlike the other Slavic languages, Macedonian permits the use of intransitive verbs as causatives if the direct object is definite, e.g. мајка го спее детето ‘mother puts the child to sleep’, што те љубим низ градот ‘I’ll take you around the city’, go umre двете ‘he killed the person’. Thus, specification for voice in the lexicon takes on different implications for Macedonian than for the other Slavic languages (see Aronson, 1997).

Another difference between Macedonian and Bulgarian -- one that involves both paradigmatic and the encoding of animacy - is the treatment of perfect constructions using the auxiliary verb имам ‘have’. In Macedonian, the verb имам is used with the neuter verbal adjective of any verb to form the perfect, e.g. jas imam dojdeno ‘I have come’, tovob во око имам вицено ‘this here that knife has cut me’ (Krle, 1972, 234). The Bulgarian perfect construction with има, however, is limited to transitive verbs, which alone can form the past passive participle and which in turn must agree with the direct object (unless unspecified, e.g. имам пишано за този виждам ‘I have written [something] on that question’). Moreover, the Bulgarian construction can only take a human subject which has implications for lexical limi-
tions in Bulgarian that do not exist in Macedonian. Thus, for example, it is grammatically incorrect in Bulgarian to say \textit{vinoto go ima xvaranu} ‘the wine has gone to his head (literally ‘grabbed him’)’ or \textit{kot- kata ima jakona eedn miska} ‘the cat has eaten a mouse’, whereas the equivalent Macedonian sentences - \textit{vinoto go ima fatemo} and \textit{makata ima jakemo eden glude} - are perfectly acceptable. The \textit{ima} perfect is completely paradigmaticized in Macedonian and thus entirely part of the grammar, but the restrictions on \textit{ima} constructions in Bulgarian have implications for the definition of animacy or human-ness and its representation in the lexicon.

Based on the foregoing exposition, we can conclude by observing that a study of the relationship of grammar to lexicography in Macedonian highlights a variety of problems and processes relating to the codification of the literary language, to the differentiation of Macedonian and Bulgarian, to changes in the grammatical structure of Macedonian in the direction of the lexicalization of certain phenomena, and to general problems of aspect, diatheses, and animacy. In considering that which is universal and that which is specifically Slavic about the relationship of grammar to the lexicon, we see that such specificities as morphophonemic alternations, case structure, as well as developments in grammatical categories such as aspect and transitivity and the problem marginal categories such as morphological markers of quantification and the vocative present specific problems that render differences between Balkan Slavic, i.e. East South Slavic, and Non-Balkan Slavic in sharp relief, but also within Balkan Slavic, show the synchronic and diachronic differentiation of Macedonian and Bulgarian.

NOTES

1 On 19 January 1951 the Macedonian Ministry of Education appointed a commission for the compilation of a dictionary of the Macedonian language. The first of the three volumes appeared ten years later, but the second two (1965, 1966) were delayed by the terrible Skopje earthquake (26 July 1963).


