VICTOR A. FRIEDMAN
(Chicago)

PRAGMATICS AND CONTACT IN MACEDONIA:
Convergence and Differentiation in the Balkan Sprachbund

Pavle Ivić's work on structural dialectology (e.g., 1961–62, 1962, 1964) is still recognized as a classic in the field. In that pioneering work, as in subsequent work of his students (most recently Alexander 2000) the focus is on internal or genetic factors in dialectological differentiation, with particular attention to that of the Southern West South Slavic area (but cf. Ivić 1958). Here I wish to focus on what can be thought of as external factors, namely language contact and sociolinguistic processes engendered by standardization. Moreover, while classic dialectology focuses on phonology and morphology as its chief areas of interest, I shall concentrate here on how pragmatics illuminates both the convergences that produced the Balkan *Sprachbund* and the more recent processes that have led to its disintegration (cf. also Topolinska 1998).[1] My methodology will involve the examination and comparison of three phenomena differentiating Macedonian and Bulgarian — object reduplication, omission of the auxiliary 'be' in the third person of the old perfect, and the rise of the new perfect in 'have'. By placing these phenomena in the context of Balkan pragmatics, I shall try to demonstrate that in a language contact situation

---

[1] I use *pragmatics* to mean the study of those features in language that are facultative, i.e. the search for the explanation of **choices** on the part of the speaker. In this sense, pragmatics contrasts with the rules of grammar that are obligatory as opposed to choices determined by the discourse context. Thus in Macedonian, for example, agreement according to gender or the forms of the vocative are determined by grammatical rules, whereas the **use** of the vocative, because it is not obligatory, must be viewed as pragmatic. Pragmatics and grammar can also overlap, as in the case of the Albanian admirative, which from a morphological point of view is grammatical, and whose exclusion for certain contexts (cf. Friedman 1983) is likewise grammatical, but whose actual use is always pragmatically determined, since it can never be obligatory. From the point of view of first language acquisition, my observations indicate that the admirative is acquired relatively late, which indicates, perhaps, a primacy of grammatical rules over pragmatic ones.

the relationship between pragmatic devices and their grammaticalization is both a function of complexity of language contact and the time of literary codification. Moreover, many classic Balkanisms can be viewed in this context.[2]

This process of standardization combined with the dissolution a unified Balkan political entity (the Ottoman Empire) resulted in the reduction — both deliberate and unplanned — in the degree of similarity observable among the relevant languages. While individual dialects of these languages in contact retain their shared features and even continue to approach one another in certain respects (e.g., lexicon and syntax), the codified norms of these languages have sometimes moved in the opposite direction. Thus for example, the phonological inventories of standard Albanian, Macedonian, and Turkish are highly divergent, whereas the inventories of respective dialects in contact often share significant features and processes, e.g. the loss of /x/ and/or merger of strident palatal affricates (/č, dž/) with various mellow or dorso-palatal occlusives in dialects of all three languages, the loss of nasality in Debar Albanian, the loss of front rounded vowels in some West Rumelian Turkish dialects as well as in East Central Geg and their rise in the Macedonian of the Korča region, etc. (Friedman 1982, Gjinari 1989:108, 220–23, Mazon 1936). The same processes are seen in the rise of nasal vowels and final devoicing in Montenegrin dialects of Serbian under Albanian influence (Ivić 1956:159–61, cf. also Ivić 1958 and 1989–90 on Balkan processes attested in the dialects of the Serbian dialects of the Banat).

Similarly, the discouragement or elimination of Turkisms from all the Balkan standard languages (in part because they were felt to represent the heritage of a period of oppression or unenlightened rule, in part due to a perceived striving for modernization, cf. Kazazis 1977), reduces the amount of what was once shared vocabulary. Colloquial variants, however, tend to preserve such items, thereby providing a common element linking the colloquial registers of different Balkan languages to one another and opposing them to their respective norms.[3] Thus, on the one hand, dialectal contact continues within the boundaries of the states that emerged from the Ottoman Empire, on the other, the rise of standard languages in these states has reduced shared linguistic features both by re-

---

[2] Cf., e.g., Byron 1985, Dyer 1992, Fielder 1990, Friedman 1985, Jašar-Nasteva 1992, Leafgren 1992, McClain 1991, Saramandu 1981, Topolinska 1992 on various aspects of pragmatics and of codification in Balkan languages.

[3] On the colloquialization of some standard registers and the resurgence of Turkisms in most Balkan standard languages since 1989, see Friedman (1996).

stricting contact via closed or regulated borders — which stimulates divergence through the natural tendency of drift — and by purpose fully discouraging both local dialectal features and certain pan-Balkan features. It should also be noted, however, that the new norms are drawn closer together by so-called internationalisms, i.e. vocabulary of Greco-Latinate origin used for new technology, imported ideas and concepts, etc., thus creating a new pan-Balkan colloquial/normative opposition.

Leafgren (1992) demonstrates that object reduplication in Bulgarian is used pragmatically to mark *topicality*, which he defines as the speaker's directing the attention of the addressee to the object in question rather than to the subject of the sentence, which is ordinarily (although not necessarily always) the topic of the sentence. Topicality is itself independent from both givenness and communicative dynamism, and while it often coincides with such features as definiteness and unusual word order, these latter factors are not the ones determining the use of reduplication in Bulgarian. Leafgren demonstrates that in Bulgarian, reduplication occurs in only 2% — 3% of those contexts in which it would be possible at least in principle. It is also quite clear from his data that reduplication is more characteristic of colloquial style and virtually never occurs in scientific prose. Although it is not made clear whether this restriction is due to the northeastern dialectal base of Literary Bulgarian or due to a conscious avoidance of a characteristic of colloquial style (this is outside the goals of the dissertation), in any case it is clear that the Bulgarian phenomenon is motivated by pragmatic considerations and stylistic nuances.

In Literary Macedonian and the West-Central dialects on which it is based, object reduplication is a fully grammaticalized phenomenon. It is required for all definite objects and even occurs with some specific indefinite objects in colloquial contexts. Reduplication is also differentiated in the stylistic opposition colloquial/literary. According to Ugrinova-Skalovska (1960–61), failure to reduplicate the object is a characteristic of Macedonian "folkspeech" particularly in the imperative and with the verbal l-form. Thus, whereas in Bulgarian object reduplication is facultative and pragmatically conditioned and at the same time characteristic of colloquial style, in Macedonian object reduplication is grammaticalized, i.e. obligatory at least in some contexts, and just the opposite from Bulgarian, it is the omission of the clitic pronoun that is characteristic of certain levels of colloquial style and hence pragmatically conditioned.

In Balkan Slavic verbal systems, the most significant innovation has been the rise of grammaticalized expressions of the speaker's commitment to the truth of the statement, the so-called "witnessed/reported" distinc-

tion.[4] Connected with this innovation is the preservation of resultativity and its spread to new constructions and paradigms. In traditional Bulgarian grammar, reportedness is treated as expressed in special paradigms derived diachronically from the past indefinite, i.e. the old resultative perfect, the only difference being the presence versus the absence of the auxiliary in the third person.[5] In my own work (Friedman 1980), based on numerous texts where the third person auxiliary could be either present or absent in the same narrative — and even in the same sentence — for the same type of event, I argued that absence of the auxiliary in the past indefinite did not mark a grammatical category such as reportedness. In a subsequent work, Fielder (1990) convincingly argued that the omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the past indefinite is a discourse function, i.e. a pragmatic device, characterizing the narrator's psychological distance from the narrated events with omission signaling foregrounding and presence indicating backgrounding.

In Literary Macedonian, as in the west-central dialects and in contrast to some of the eastern dialects, the question of the presence or absence of the auxiliary in the third person of the old perfect is irrelevant because that auxiliary never appears. Thus the meaning of 'nonconfirmativity' (Friedman 1980, 1983) has no special forms distinguishing it from the old perfect.[6] Thus while in Bulgarian the presence or absence of the third person auxiliary is manipulated pragmatically to indicate the narrator's relation to the text, in Macedonian omission of the auxiliary is completely grammaticalized leaving only the basic opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative to indicate that relationship.[7]

Closely connected to these semantic nuances in the Balkan Slavic past indefinite is the rise of new resultative constructions with the auxiliary verb 'have'. As is generally known, these constructions originated in southwestern Macedonia and spread thence to the north and east. It is worthy of note that similar constructions occur in the Bulgarian dialects of Thrace, and in Literary Bulgarian one can encounter examples such as *Imam pisana statija po tozi vapros* 'I have written an article on that ques-

---

[4] While there have been many important innovations in the Balkan Slavic verb, I would argue that this is the most significant in that it involves the rise of a grammatical category that was not present in Common Slavic, namely status, or, as it is more commonly known, evidentiality (see, e.g., Friedman 1983).

[5] New paradigms of the type *bil četjal, štjal da dojde* in Bulgarian, *imal dojdeno, ḱe dojdel* in Macedonian are excluded from the scope of this discussion.

[6] But see footnote three.

[7] In some western dialects semantic isoglosses differ from morphological isoglosses in this respect, see Friedman (1988).

tion' and *Imam pisano po tozi vapros* 'I have written about that question'. Nonetheless, taking into account the following facts, it is clear that the Bulgarian constructions are open syntagms that do not constitute paradigms:

1. Such constructions, like the past passive participle on which they are based, cannot be formed from intransitive verbs.

2. The participle must agree in gender with the object unless the object is omitted (cf. the examples given above).

3. The subject in such constructions must be animate, and so **Vinoto go ima xvatan* 'The wine has gone to his head' is unacceptable in Bulgarian, although in Macedonian once can say *Vinoto go ima fateno* (Kostov 1972).

The Bulgarian constructions can only be used for strong, transitive resultativity with an animate subject, while the corresponding Macedonian paradigm expresses resultativity in general. In other words, the use of 'have' constructions in Bulgarian must be explained in terms of pragmatics, whereas in Macedonian the 'have' constructions constitute completely grammaticalized paradigms.

As we have seen thus far, whereas the three features under consideration here are treated as discourse functions in Bulgarian, they are either grammaticalized or eliminated in Macedonian. These phenomena are also differentiated in the stylistic opposition colloquial/literary. Object reduplication is colloquial in Bulgarian and absent from scientific prose while failure to reduplicate the object is a characteristic of Macedonian "folk speech". Third person auxiliary omission is a normatively regulated pragmatic device in Bulgarian but in Macedonian presence of that auxiliary is a dialectism. The 'have' perfect is a grammaticalized resultative that is both paradigmatic and, in some contexts, obligatory (see Friedman 1977), whereas in Bulgarian it is a relatively marginal syntagm whose use is most frequent in dialects.

Although many features that are treated as pragmatic in Bulgarian are grammaticalized in Macedonian, the opposite direction of differentiation also occurs. Thus, for example in the exploitation of the morphological expression of obliqueness, Literary Bulgarian has created an artificial grammatical distinction as a dialectal compromise between two shapes of the definite article while Literary Macedonian has relegated an actually occurring oblique/non-oblique opposition in certain masculine animates to facultativity. In the process of the codification of Literary Bulgarian, the masculine definite article /-a/ was assigned the value 'nominative' while the shape /-a/ was assigned the value 'oblique', although in fact no Bulgarian dialect makes such a distinction. In Macedonian, special oblique forms

for certain masculine proper names and four other nouns ('person, God, devil, Lord') are permitted but not required, and the oblique forms of other masculine animates are considered dialectisms.[8]

Evidence from Macedonian, Bulgarian, and other Balkan languages suggests that classic Balkanisms such as object reduplication began with pragmatically conditioned constructions that became grammaticalized to varying degrees in different languages. The motivation for the differentiating factors can be sought in both the complexity of language contact and the time of codification. Multilingual contact was more complex in southwestern Macedonia than in northeastern Bulgaria, which were the regions where the respective codification movements arose during the 19th century. Northeastern Bulgaria was dominated by Bulgarian and Turkish, with other Balkan languages represented only by a few villages or urban quarters. In southwestern Macedonia, relatively compact Macedonian, Albanian, Greek, and Aromanian speaking areas all converged along with significant populations speaking Turkish, Romani, and Judezmo. It can thus be suggested that the more complex multilingualism of southwestern Macedonia and the resultant greater need for clarity in communication contributed to the strengthening of pragmatic devices into grammaticalized features as well as to their acceptance in the codified norm.

Language was and remains the chief battleground for Macedonian cultural identity. While Bulgarian achieved political independence and literary codification in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Macedonian efforts at autonomy and standardization were blocked by Bulgaria, Greece, and Serbia until 1944. As aresult both of the prevailing language beliefs of the earlier period and different degrees of need for solidarity, the codified Bulgarian norm displays more distance from colloquial reality than does the codified Macedonian norm.This too appears to affect the relationship of pragmatic devices to grammaticalization, insofar as when there is a potential pragmatic/grammatical opposition, there is more of a tendency to artificial grammaticalization in older codified norms and more of a tendency to grammaticalize the colloquial in newer norms.

In conclusion, I have attempted to present evidence from Macedonian and Bulgarian supporting the following two points that indicate new directions for the study of Balkan linguistics.

---

[8] Cf. Faik Konitza's proposal to create an artificial gender distinction that would have incorporated the Geg and Tosk indefinite articles, *nji,* and *nj',* respectively.

[9] In some cases, what must have begun as pragmatic has been fully grammaticalized in all the languages, e.g. the analytic future using the auxiliary meaning 'will', the replacement of the infinitive, analytic expression of case, etc.

1. Balkanisms arose when speakers of different languages attempted to communicate more effectively. The place of these Balkanisms in the systems of the various languages can be described in terms of a continuum from pragmatic to grammaticalized, which in turn suggests that discourse functions are not merely subject to borrowing but actually serve as entry points for the development of structural change (cf. Prince 1988). The grammaticalization of discourse functions tends to occur in those regions where multilingualism is most complex. Moreover, grammaticalization of pragmatic devices is itself a dialectal function, and thus an additional category of isoglosses, viz. degree of grammaticalization, is worthy of study in a Balkan context.

2. The extent to which pragmatic devices are encoded reflects the time at which language planning took place, which in the Balkans is intimately connected with political autonomy. In this respect Bulgarian and Macedonian occupy distinct positions on a continuum of Balkan languages. The left of the continuum is characterized by earlier codification, higher degree of artificially created devices, higher degree of pragmatic versus grammatical approach to Balkanisms, and a history of less linguistic oppression. The colloquialization of many Balkan literary languages (Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Romanian) since the rise of multi-party politics in the countries where they are official reflect the cyclical nature of language planning, as identified by Radovanović (1992:95). Lexical changes are obvious manifestations of these changes, but the manipulation of pragmatics and grammar should also prove a fruitful field of study in this respect.

REFERENCES

Alexander, Ronelle. 2000. *In Honor of Diversity: The Linguistic Resources of the Balkans*. (Kenneth E. Naylor Memorial Lecture Series in South Slavic Linguistics, No. 2). Columbus: Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures, The Ohio State University.

Byron, Janet. 1985. "An Overview of Language Planning Achievements among the Albanians of Yugoslavia." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 52.59–92.

Dyer, Donald L. 1992. *Word Order in the Bulgarian Simple Sentence: A Study in Grammar, Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Fielder, Grace E. 1990. "The Bulgarian Evidential: A Pragmatically Determined Category? Paper read at the Third International Conference of the International Pragmatics Association, Barcelona, 9–13 July.

Friedman. Viictor A. 1977. *The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative*. Columbus: Slavica.

_____. 1980. Reportedness in Bulgarian: Category or Stylistic Variant? *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 25/26.149–63.

_____. 1982. Balkanology and Turcology: West Rumelian Turkish inYugoslavia as Reflected in Prescriptive Grammar. *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 2.1–77. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

_____. 1983. Grammatical Categories and a Comparative Balkan Grammar. *Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik. (Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen*, Vol. 8), 81–98. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

_____. 1985. The Sociolinguistics of Literary Macedonian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 52.31–57.

_____. 1986. Romani *Te* in a Balkan Context. *Językowe studia bałkanistyczne* 1.39–48. Wrocław: PAN.

_____. 1988. Morphological Innovation and Semantic Shift in Macedonian. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 24/1.34–41.

_____. 1996. The Turkish Lexical Element in the Languages of the Republic of Macedonia from the Ottoman Period to Independence. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 32,2.133–150.

_____. 1999. *Linguistic Emblems and Emblematic Languages: On Language as Flag in the Balkans*, (Kenneth E. Naylor Memorial Lecture Series in South Slavic Linguistics, No. 1). Columbus: Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures, The Ohio State University.

Gjinari, J. 1989. *Dialektet e gjuhës shqipe*. Tiranë: AShARPSSh.

Ivić, Pavle. 1956. *Dijalektologija srpskohrvatskog jezika*. Novi Sad: Matica Srpska.

_____ 1961–62. Osnovni aspekti strukture dijalektske diferencijacije. *Makedonski jazik* 11/12.183–201.

_____. 1962. On the Structure of Dialectal Differentiation. *Word* 18.33–53.

_____. 1964. Structure and Typology of Dialectal Differentiation. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*, ed. by Horace G. Lunt, 115–122. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1958. Les balkanismes naissants dans les parlers serbes du Banat. *Cercetari de lingvistica* 3.217–226.

_____. 1989–90. Odnos između karaševskog i sviničkog govora. *Makedonski jazik* 40/41.201–215.

Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera. 1992. Soziolinguistische Aspekte des Makedonischen und der anderen Sprachen in der Republik Makedonien. *Die Welt der Slaven* 37.188–210.

Kazazis, Kostas. 1977. Review [Dizikirikes G. S., 1975. Να ξετουρκευσουμε την γλωσσαν μας. Athens: Angyra.] *Folia Slavica* 1,2:301–306.

Kostov, Kiril. 1972. Semantische Beobachtung über die Verbindung von imam mit dem Partizipium Perfecti Passivi im Bulgarischen. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 17,3.371–379.

Leafgren, John. 1992. *Object Reduplication and Topicality in Bulgarian*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia.

McClain, Katya. 1991. Pragmatic Considerations in Complementation. Paper read at the 24th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, San Francisco 27–30 December.

Mazon, André. 1938. *Documents, contes et chansons slaves de l'Albanie du sud.* Paris: Droz.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930. *La linguistique balkanique.* Paris: Klincksieck.

Saramandu, Nicolae. 1981. Variation dialectale et variabilité sociolinguistique. *Logos Semantikos: Studia Linguistica in honorem Eugenio Coseriu*, 89–98. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Prince, Ellen. 1988. On Pragmatic Change: The Borrowing of Discourse Functions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12.505–518.

Radovanović, Milorad. 1992. Standard Serbo-Croatian and the Theory of Language Planning. In *Language Planning in Yugoslavia*, Ranko Bugarski and Celia Hawkesworth (eds.), 93–100. Columbus: Slavica.

Topolinska, Zuzanna. 1992. Za pragmatičnata i semantičnata motivacija na morfo-sintaksički balkanizmi. *Prilozi: Oddelenie za lingvistika i literaturna nauka — Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite* 1991. 16,1.119–27.

_____. 1995. Convergent Evolution, Creolization and Referentiality. *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers*, Volume I, Eva Hajičova et al. (eds.), 239–247. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

_____. 1998. Dali e potreben poimot "jazičen sojuz"? Paper read at the First International Congress of the Macedonian Applied Linguistics Association, University of Skopje, 8–10 May.

Ugrinova-Skalovska, R. 1960-61. Dve stilski osobenosti vo našiot govoren jazik. *Makedonski jazik* 11/12.105–111.