

## Balkan Syntax and Semantics

# Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today

*Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today* (LA) provides a platform for original monograph studies into synchronic and diachronic linguistics. Studies in LA confront empirical and theoretical problems as these are currently discussed in syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology, and systematic pragmatics with the aim to establish robust empirical generalizations within a universalistic perspective.

## Series Editors

Werner Abraham  
University of Vienna

Elly van Gelderen  
Arizona State University

## Advisory Editorial Board

Guglielmo Cinque  
University of Venice

Ian Roberts  
Cambridge University

Günther Grewendorf  
J.W. Goethe-University, Frankfurt

Ken Safir  
Rutgers University, New Brunswick NJ

Liliane Haegeman  
University of Lille, France

Lisa deMena Travis  
McGill University

Hubert Haider  
University of Salzburg

Sten Vikner  
University of Aarhus

Christer Platzack  
University of Lund

C. Jan-Wouter Zwart  
University of Groningen

## Volume 67

Balkan Syntax and Semantics  
Edited by Olga Mišeska Tomić

# Balkan Syntax and Semantics

*Edited by*

Olga Mišeska Tomić

Leiden University

John Benjamins Publishing Company  
Amsterdam/Philadelphia



<sup>TM</sup> The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

#### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Balkan syntax and semantics / edited by Olga Mišeska Tomić.

p. cm. (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, ISSN 0166-0829 ; v. 67)

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

1. Balkan Peninsula--Languages--Syntax. 2. Balkan Peninsula--Languages--Semantics. I. Mišeska Tomić, Olga. II. Linguistik aktuell ; 67.

P381. B3B27 2004

409'.496-dc22

2004045059

ISBN 90 272 2790 X (Eur.) / 1 58811 502 X (US) (Hb; alk. paper)

© 2004 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands  
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

# Table of contents

Preface	VII
Map of the Balkans	IX
List of abbreviations	XI
The Balkan Sprachbund properties: An introduction <i>Olga Mišeska Tomić</i>	1
<b>Spread of the Balkan sprachbund morpho-syntactic properties</b>	
On the areal distribution of syntactic properties in the languages of the Balkans <i>Andrej N. Sobolev</i>	59
The typology of Balkan evidentiality and areal linguistics <i>Victor A. Friedman</i>	101
<b>The nominal phrase</b>	
Polydefinite constructions in Modern Greek and in Aromanian <i>Héctor Campos and Melita Stavrou</i>	137
Balkan possessive clitics: The problem of case and category <i>Roumyana Pancheva</i>	175
Optional movement of Bulgarian possessive clitics to I: Some implications for Binding Theory <i>Christo Moskovsky</i>	221
<b>The root clause</b>	
Datives and the non-active voice: Reflexive clitics in Balkan Languages <i>Maria Luisa Rivero</i>	237

On the clitic switch in Greek imperatives <i>Željko Bošković</i>	269
Complementizer-headed main clauses for volitional moods in the languages of South-Eastern Europe: A Balkanism? <i>Andreas Ammann and Johan van der Auwera</i>	293
Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkans <i>Daniela Isac and Edit Jakab</i>	315
On left periphery and focus <i>Virginia Hill</i>	339
Syncretic and analytic tenses in Romanian: The Balkan setting of Romance <i>Yves D'Hulst, Martine Coene and Larisa Avram</i>	355
<b>The complex sentence</b>	
Subjunctive relatives in Balkan languages <i>Eleni Bužarovska</i>	377
The syntax-semantics of modal existential wh constructions <i>Alexander Grosu</i>	405
Interpreting empty subjects in nontensed complement clauses: Child and adult strategies <i>Danijela Stojanović and Marijana Marelj</i>	439
On Judeo-Spanish conditionals <i>César Montoliu and Johan van der Auwera</i>	461
Author index	475
Index of languages, dialects and toponyms	481
Subject index	487

## Preface

The contributions to this volume originated as papers presented at the *Conference on the Balkan Sprachbund Properties*, held at the University of Leiden, 7–9 June 2001, within the framework of the Spinoza Project “Lexicon and Syntax.”<sup>1</sup> They analyze individual syntactic or semantic properties of nine Balkan language – the Slavic languages Macedonian, Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian; the Romance languages Romanian, Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian; Albanian; Modern Greek; and the Arli Balkan Romani dialect. Serbo-Croatian is spoken as a majority language in Bosnia and Hercegovina, Croatia and Serbia and Montenegro, and as a minority language in areas in Hungary and Romania adjacent to Croatia and Serbia.<sup>2</sup> Macedonian is spoken as a majority language in Macedonia, and as a minority language in a large area in Northern Greece, as well as in areas in Albania adjacent to Macedonia. Albanian is spoken as a majority language in Albania and the (Southern Serbian) province of Kosovo, and as a minority language in Western Macedonia and Northwestern Greece. Romanian is spoken as a majority language in Romania, and as a minority language in areas in Serbia and Bulgaria adjacent to Romania. Modern Greek is spoken as a majority language in Greece and as a minority language in Southern Albania. Bulgarian is spoken as a majority language in Bulgaria and as a minority language in a restricted area in Serbia adjacent to Bulgaria. Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian and Balkan Romani are not spoken as majority languages in any country on the Balkans or anywhere else. Balkan Romani is spoken by scattered communities throughout the Balkans; Arli is one of the Balkan Romani dialects spoken in and around the capital of Macedonia, Skopje. Megleno-Romanian is spoken by a few thousand people originally living in a few villages in what is now Southeastern Macedonia and the adjacent part of Greece. Aromanian is spoken in central and western Macedonia, Southern Albania and Central and Northwestern Greece. (see Map)

For comments on individual contributions, thanks are due to the following reviewers: Artemis Alexiadou, Wayles Browne, Željko Bošković, Héctor Campos, Violeta Demonte, Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Donka Farkas, Victor Friedman, Helen Goodluck, Alexander Grosu, Amin Hetzer, Virginia Hill, Daniela Isac, Edit Jakab, Uwe Junghanns, Dalina Kallulli, Dimitra Kolliakou, Christina Kramer, Iliyana Krapova, Brian Joseph, Pieter Muysken, Roumyana Pancheva, Cecilia Poletto, Maria Louisa Rivero, Joseph Schallert, Penka Stateva, Melita Stavrou, Anna

Szabolczi, Arhonto Terzi, Sarah Thomasson. During the preparation of the final version of the book, I profited very much from the comments of the series editors, Werner Abraham and Elly van Gelderen, to whom I owe my gratitude. For continuous support in my work, I am specifically indebted to Pieter Muysken.

Olga Mišeska Tomić

## Notes

1. For information about the areas, the team and the task of the Project cf. <http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/spls>
2. Upon the disintegration of Yugoslavia, Serbo-Croatian dissolved into Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian. The grammatical structures of the three “successors” do not, however, substantially differ from one another.

# Map of the Balkans





# List of abbreviations

(language names and grammatical notions)

## *Language names*

ABR	= Arli Balkan Romani
Al(b)	= Albanian
Ar, AR	= Aromanian
Bu(l)	= Bulgarian
Biz.Greek	= Byzantine Greek
Cr	= Croatian
ClA	= Classical Arabic
ClG	= Classical Greek
Cze	= Czech
Fr	= French
Ger	= German
Gr(e)	= (Modern) Greek
Hi	= Hindi
Hu	= Hungarian
It	= Italian
JSp	= Judeo-Spanish
Lat	= Latin
litt.ModPort	= literary Modern Portuguese
Ma(c)	= Macedonian
MG	= Modern Greek
MH	= Modern Hebrew
Mod Rom	= Modern Romanian
MR	= Megleno-Romanian
NWM	= Northwest Macedonian
Old Rom	= Old Romanian
OSp	= Old Spanish
Po(l)	= Polish
Ro(m)	= Romanian
Ru	= Russian

SC	= Serbo-Croatian
Serb	= Serbian
SES	= Southeastern Serbian
SIIt	= Southern Italian
Slo	= Slovenian
Sp(a)	= Spanish
Tu	= Turkish

*Grammatical notions*

1	= first person
2	= second person
3	= third person
ACC, ACC	= accusative
ADJ	= adjective
ADJDET	= adjectival determiner
ADM	= admirative
AGR	= agreement
AgrDO	= direct object agreement
AgrIO	= indirect object agreement
AgrP	= agreement phrase
AgrS	= subject agreement
AgrSP	= subject agreement phrase
ANAPH	= anaphoric
AO, Aor	= aorist (tense)
AP	= adjective phrase
Applicative ZP	= logical form correspondent to a Topic Phrase
ART	= article
AUX, AUX	= auxiliary
AuxP	= auxiliary phrase
BD	= binding domain
BE	= invariant form of the “be” auxiliary
BQ	= bare quantifier
BT	= Binding Theory
C	= complement
CardP	= cardinality phrase
CH	= chain
CL	= clitic
CO, COND	= conditional (marker)
CP	= complement phrase
D <sup>0</sup>	= determiner node

---

DAT	= dative
D- Disclosure	= dative disclosure
DECL	= declarative
DEF	= definite
DefP	= definite phrase
DET	= determiner
D/G	= dative/genitive
DIS	= dislocation
D-modifier	= determiner-modifier
DO	= direct object
DP	= determiner phrase
E	= event time
ECC	= extended clitic cluster
EPEN	= epenthetic
EPP	= extended projection principle
E- Strategy	= ethical strategy
ETH	= ethical
EV, Evid	= evidential (marker)
EXCL	= exclamative
F	= feminine
F	= functional node
FCI	= free choice item
Fd <sup>0</sup>	= dative-case valuating functional head
FdP	= phrasal projection of Fd <sup>0</sup>
Fg <sup>0</sup>	= genitive-case valuating functional head
FgP	= phrasal projection of Fg <sup>0</sup>
FN	= factive nominalization
FocP	= focus phrase
FP	= functional phrase
FREE	= free relative
FU(T)	= future
Gen, GEN	= genitive
GQ	= generalized quantifier
I	= inflexion
IM(F), IMPERF	= imperfect (tense), imperfective (aspect)
IMP	= imperative
IMPERSONAL	= impersonal
IN	= intransitive marker
IND(IC)	= indicative
INT	= intentional
INF	= infinitive

INF.MARK	= infinitive marker
INS(TR)	= instrumental
INT	= interpretable
INTER	= interrogative (marker)
INTERJ	= interjection
INV	= inverted
IP	= inflexion phrase
IRR	= irrealis
IRRM	= irrealis modal
L	= lexical marking
LF	= logical form
LOC	= locative
M	= masculine
Max	= maximality operator
Md	= modification (function)
MEC	= modal existential wh construction
MOD	= modal
ModP	= Modal Phrase
MoodP	= Mood phrase
M-P	= medio-passive (voice)
MP	= modification-purpose (function)
MP/Md	= modification-purpose (function) with modification prevailing
MR	= modification performed by a prototypical relative clause
N	= noun
NEG	= negation/negative marker
NegP	= negation phrase
NEU(T)	= neuter (gender)
NFN	= non-factive nominalization
N-modifier	= noun modifier
NOM	= nominative (case)
NON-ACT	= non-active (voice)
NP	= noun phrase
OBL	= oblique (case)
OPT	= optative
OSR	= object subjunctive relatives
P	= purpose (function)
PART, PT	= participle
PASS	= passive
PAST	= past
PC	= particle of concord
PD	= past definite (tense)

---

PE, PERF	= perfect (tense), perfective (aspect)
PEJ	= pejorative
PF	= phonetic form
PI	= past indefinite (tense)
PL	= plural (number)
PM	= purpose-modification (function) with a purpose slant
POSS	= possessive
PredP	= predicate phrase
PRES, PRS	= present (tense)
pro	= dropped subject
PRO	= unexpressed subject (of infinitives)
PROG	= progressive
QR	= quantifier raising
R	= reference time
REFL	= reflexive
S	= speech time
SG	= singular (number)
Spec	= specifier
SU	= modal subordinator
SUBJ	= subjunctive
Subj.Mark	= subjunctive marker
SV	= subject – verb
SVO	= subject – verb – object
SVOR	= subject – verb – object – relative subjunctive clause
SVOP/R	= subject – verb – object – purpose or relative subjunctive clause
T	= tense
T1, T2	= time1, time 2
TP	= tense phrase
UG	= universal grammar
V	= verb
voc	= vocative (case)
VS	= verb – subject
X, Y, Z	= any constituent
XP, YP, ZP	= any phrase

### *Symbols*

*	= ungrammatical
?, ??	= possibly acceptable
%	= acceptable in some dialects
≠	= interpretatively anomalous

$\supset$	= involves existence of
$\exists$	= existential quantifier
$\lambda$	= universal quantifier
$\leftarrow, \rightarrow$	marks directionality of cliticization
–	links items pronounced as a single phonological word
capital letters	mark stressed words or syllables

# The Balkan Sprachbund properties

## Introduction

Olga Mišeska Tomić

University of Leiden Centre for Linguistics

The author examines some of the shared Balkan Sprachbund properties, paying specific attention to those properties which are analyzed in the volume: nominal cases and articles, pronominal clitics, subjunctives and evidentials. The phenomena are predominately illustrated with examples from Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, Aromanian, Albanian, Modern Greek and Balkan Romani.<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Overview

Whether in close genetic relationship or not, the languages of the Balkans share sets of typological properties. The oblique forms of their nominal systems have extensively been replaced by prepositional phrases and their verbal systems are analytical to a considerable degree. There is a general tendency towards explicit marking of grammatical functions with specific uninflected function words.

The phenomenon was first signalled by Jernej Kopitar (1829), who pointed out that the languages spoken south of the Danube have analogous forms expressed through “different language material”. Miklosich (1861) examined the facts more closely and singled out a number of shared properties of the languages in the area. Nikolai Trubetzkoy (1928:18) referred to relationships such as the ones exhibited among the languages in the Balkans as “Sprachbund”, arguing that the languages of a Sprachbund (a) are remarkably similar in sentence-structure and word-formation but show no systematic sound correspondences and (b) have a great number of common “cultural” words.

#### 1.1 Origin

The awareness of the existence of the Balkan Sprachbund properties inevitably led to the construction of theories about their origin. Kopitar, Miklosich and Weigand

(1928) maintained that the Balkan Sprachbund properties developed under the influence of an ancient substrate – that of the indigenous Balkan languages Thracian, Dacian or Illyrian. The linguistic material “left” by those languages is, however, extremely limited and does not allow the verification of the presence or absence of any of the Balkan Sprachbund properties in any of them. Moreover, the Balkan Sprachbund properties developed in the post-Byzantine period and it is unrealistic to assume that any property of any substratal language had been dormant for centuries, to become active long after the language itself had disappeared.

On another theory, whose most distinguished proponent is Sandfeld (1926/1930), the source of the Balkan Sprachbund properties was Greek – the language which, “in spite of all decadences, has never ceased to transmit a civilisation superior to that of its neighbours” (cf. Sandfeld 1930: 17). In Greek, however, the Balkanisms are postclassical innovations.

On a third theory, defended most recently by Solta (1980), the source of the Balkan Sprachbund properties was a more recent substrate language – Latin, the language of the Roman empire, which ruled over the Balkans for several centuries at the beginning of the new era. But, unfortunately, the Balkan Sprachbund properties are hardly present in Latin.

Gołąb (1984:9) argues that the Balkan Sprachbund results from the relationship between language substrata and language superstrata, claiming that the Balkan properties in Macedonian are actually structural borrowings or “linguistic calques” from Aromanian. But why should a language spoken by a limited number of inhabitants of the peninsula be the source of these calques? Moreover, since the Balkan Sprachbund properties are not typical for all Romance languages, their provenance in Aromanian would still be in need of explanation.

It is definitely difficult to find a single donor of the Balkan Sprachbund properties, though knowledge of the history of the Balkan languages is not lacking – at least Greek and Balkan Slavic are well documented for the relevant period. There simply isn't a single donor. The Balkan Sprachbund properties result from convergence of languages in a multilingual environment.<sup>2</sup> As pointed out by Lindstedt (2000), we are here dealing with a shared drift – parallel changes that are not simple transfers from a single substrate, nor from one of the languages themselves.

The convergence model is corroborated by the fact that the Balkan Sprachbund properties are most numerous in those parts of the Balkans where the greatest number of languages are co-territorial.<sup>3</sup> The epicentre of Balkanisms seems to be in the area around the southern parts of the lakes of Ohrid and Prespa, where Greek, Albanian, Macedonian and Aromanian intersect. The structures of the local dialects of the languages spoken in this area are actually very perspicuously similar to each other.

## 1.2 Membership

Not all Balkan languages have an equal share in the Balkan Sprachbund. Weigand (1928) sees Albanian, Romanian and Bulgarian as typically Balkan languages, taking Greek, Serbian and Turkish to be only “geographically Balkan”. Sandfeld (1926/1930) finds that the Balkan properties are typically exhibited in Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian and possibly Serbian, while Turkish has many lexical concordances with each and everyone of them. For Schaller (1975), Albanian, Romanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian are Balkan languages of first degree, Greek and Serbian – Balkan languages of second degree, while Turkish is a Balkan language of third degree. For Birnbaum (1968), Romanian and Aromanian are “most Balkan”; then come Bulgarian, Macedonian, Modern Greek and Albanian, in this order. Solta (1980:7) maintains that, when individual dialects are taken into consideration, the northern Greek and southeastern Serbian dialects could also be treated as true Balkan language codes.<sup>4</sup>

According to Sobolev (this volume), not the (standard) Balkan languages but rather individual dialects of those languages are responsible for the rise of the Balkan Sprachbund, because it is at the level of dialects that century-long language contacts have been achieved. Consequently, one should aim at maximally deep descriptions of an optimal number of Balkan dialects which make up a representative corpus of relevant data. This would make it possible to perceive the diasystem of a single language as a product of the systems of all its territorial units.

Sobolev (this volume) analyses the areal distribution of 65 grammatical properties, partly mapped on 17 maps drawn by the team of the project “Small Atlas of the Balkan Dialects”, which in the period 1996–2000 collected data in eleven villages in Montenegro, eastern Serbia, western Macedonia, eastern and southern Bulgaria, central and southern Albania and northwestern Greece (cf. Sobolev 2003). The analysis suggests that the traditional idea of the existence of common Balkan linguistic type should be rejected, while the set of “typical Balkan properties” should be relativized.

## 1.3 Shared properties

A typological language property has been assumed to be areal if (a) shared by at least three languages of the area, at least two of which belong to different genetic families, but (b) not present in all the languages of the genetic family to which the language of the area belongs (if it belongs to a language family, at all).<sup>5</sup> Since the amount, the extent and the limit of areal typological properties, necessary for granting membership into the Balkan union has not and cannot be assessed independently, linguistic discussion on Sprachbund membership has centred on specific properties.<sup>6</sup> Different analyses single out different arrays of properties, though

most of them agree on one phonological property – the presence of the schwa phoneme, and six grammatical properties: (1) substitution of synthetic declension markers by analytic ones; (2) grammaticalization of the category of definiteness through postpositive definite articles; (3) pronominal doubling of objects; (4) analytic expression of futurity; (5) analytic perfect with a “have” auxiliary; (6) loss of the infinitive and its substitution by subjunctive clauses.<sup>7</sup>

In a book considered a classic, Sandfeld (1926/30) registered over one hundred Balkan Sprachbund concordances (i.e. properties), making a distinction between “general concordances” and “concordances between different (i.e. individual) Balkan languages”. Sandfeld’s morphosyntactic general concordances include: (a) postpositive articles; (b) extinction of the infinitive; (c) formation of the future with a “will” modal auxiliary; (d) shared genitive-dative forms; (e) simultaneous use of a “self-standing” and a not “self-standing pronoun” as well as “the use of a pronoun in association with a noun” (i.e. pronominal clitic-doubling); (f) constructions with a pronominal and a propositional complement, in which the former has the same reference as the subject of the latter; (g) verbs which take two direct objects; (h) loss of distinction between question words which in Latin are represented by *ubi* and *quo*, on the one hand, and *ibi* and *eo*, on the other; (i) use of conjunctions with the meaning ‘and’ at the beginning of affirmative clauses which follow negative ones; (j) use of a paratactic conjunction with the meaning ‘and’ instead of a hypotactic one.<sup>8</sup> Sandfeld offers numerous examples from Albanian; Balkan Romance – mostly from (Daco-)Romanian, but also from Aromanian and sometimes from Megleno-Romanian; Balkan Slavic – Bulgarian and Macedonian though he refers to the latter language as “Bulgarian speech in Macedonia”; and Modern Greek.

Schaller (1975) makes a distinction between primary and secondary Balkanisms. Among the primary Balkanisms, he lists seven morphosyntactic phenomena: (a) merger of the Dative and the Genitive; (b) postpositive articles; (c) analytic comparison; (d) loss of the infinitive and its replacement by subordinate clauses; (e) use of the “will” modal auxiliary in the construction of periphrastic future tenses; (f) doubling of objects (by “short” pronominal forms); (g) use of the “short pronominal form” for the expression of possessiveness. The secondary Balkanisms are, according to him, phenomena that are restricted in coverage or play minor role in the structure of the language.

Solta (1980) concentrates on six grammatical Balkanisms, which he classifies in three groups. The first group, labelled “morphological Balkanisms,” comprises the existence of the postpositive article and the merge of the Genitive and the Dative. The second group, called “syntactic Balkanisms,” includes loss of the infinitive and synthetic expression of futurity. The third group, referred to as “other,” “different” or “special” (*sonstiges*), contains the Vocative “as a living category” and the periphrastic comparison of adjectives. According to Solta (1980:223), the pheno-

mena of the third group are not Balkanisms in the strict sense of the word, though they are characteristic (!!) for the Balkan languages.

Gołąb (1984) is impressed by the “striking” similarity (or even identity) of the grammatical forms of the Balkan languages as opposed to the dissimilarity of their lexical substance. He singles out one negative similar or identical structural pattern – lack of the infinitive and its replacement by subjunctive clauses – and ten positive similar or identical structural patterns: (a) future tense formation with a particle which etymologically represents the third person singular form of the verb “want” + subjunctive mood of a given verb; (b) the so-called “future-in-the-past” – “a pattern derived from the future tense through the replacement of present tense markers by past tense ones” (Gołąb 1984:6); (c) present optative-subjunctive mood, formed by a modal particle + present tense of the verb; (d) imperfect optative-subjunctive mood, formed in the same manner as the present optative-subjunctive mood, but with the imperfect tense of the verb; (e) compound perfect, formed by the present tense of the auxiliary verb *have* + an indeclinable form of the perfect participle; (f) compound pluperfect – a derivative of the compound perfect, through the replacement of the present tense of the auxiliary by its imperfect tense; (g) *futurum exactum* or future perfect – a derivative of the compound perfect, through the replacement of the present tense of the auxiliary by its future tense; (h) postpositive definite articles; (i) dative-possessive as a single morphosyntactic category. Gołąb illustrates these patterns with examples from two languages belonging to different language families: Macedonian – a Slavic language, and Aromanian – a Romance language.

Lindstedt (2000) singles out twelve grammatical Balkanisms and examines their distribution in five language groups of the Sprachbund: Greek, Albanian, Balkan Romance – including Romanian, Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, Balkan Slavic – including Bulgarian, Macedonian and the Torlak Serbian dialects, and Balkan Romani. The twelve Balkanisms fall into three groups. The first group contains six argument-marking Balkanisms: (a) enclitic articles, (b) object reduplication, (c) prepositions instead of case endings, (d) dative/possessive merger, (e) goal/location merger, and (f) *relativum generale*. The second group includes five Balkanisms pertaining to the verbal system: (g) Aux (+ Comp) + finite verb, (h) *volo* future, (i) future in the past as conditional, (j) *habeo* perfect, (k) evidentials. The third group consists of only one Balkanism – (l) analytic comparison (of adjectives and adverbs). Lindstedt assigns the Balkan languages one point if they have a given feature and half a point if the feature is present only in some of its dialects. Summing up the points, he “calculates” the “Balkanization indices” of the language groups discussed. The scores are as follows: Balkan Slavic 11.5; Albanian 10.5; Balkan Romance and Greek 9.5 each; Romani 7.5. According to Lindstedt’s computation, the Balkan Slavic languages are the most Balkanized ones.<sup>9</sup>

The morphosyntactic Balkan Sprachbund properties discussed by individual authors are summed up in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Morphosyntactic Balkan Sprachbund properties discussed by individual authors

	Sandfeld	Schaller	Solta	Gołąb	Lindstedt
postpositive articles	+	+	+	+	+
prepositional cases					+
Dat/Gen merger	+	+	+		+
location/direction merger	+				+
clitic doubling of objects	+	+			+
two direct objects	+				
Dat clitics in NP		+		+	
Voc case markers			+		
loss of infinitives (and use of subjunctives)	+	+	+	+	+
“will” future	+	+	+	+	+
“will” future in the past + subjunctive				+	
“have” perfect				+	+
“have” pluperfect				+	
future perfect (used as conditional)				+	+
general relativizer					+
periphrastic comparison			+		
“and” instead of “but”	+				

Many of the typical Balkan Sprachbund properties can also be found in what we might call “peripheral” Balkan languages. Montoliu and Auwera (this volume) show that Judeo-Spanish uses the indicative imperfect in both the protasis and the apodosis of conditional sentences with a vague *potentialis*/present *irrealis* as well as a past *irrealis* reading, as does Modern Greek. Compare (1a) (Montoliu and Auwera’s example (9)) to (1b) (Montoliu and Auwera’s example (20)):

- (1) a. *Si me yamavan, ya iva.* JSp  
 if I.OBL call.3PL.IND.IMPERF Particle go.1SG.IND.IMPERF  
 1. ‘If they called me, I would go.’  
 2. ‘If they had called me, I would have gone.’
- b. *An mu to leje, tha ton*  
 if I.DAT it.ACC say.3SG.IND.IMPERF will.MOD.CL he.ACC  
*pijena EGO.* MG  
 go.1SG.IND.IMPERF I.NOM  
 1. ‘If he asked me, I personally would take him there.’  
 2. ‘If he had asked me, I personally would have taken him there.’

Some of the properties with respect to which Judeo-Spanish is similar to Modern Greek – vagueness reading between present and past *irrealis*, and mood harmony when the *apodosis* is in the imperfect – also appear in Old Spanish and the difference between Judeo-Spanish and (Old or Modern) Spanish may be due to a development internal to Judeo-Spanish. Yet, as argued by Montoliu and Auwera (this volume), the possibility that Modern Greek has had an influence upon Judeo-Spanish conditionals should be seriously considered. The more so, since constructions that allow both present and past *irrealis* readings are encountered in another peripheral Balkan language, Turkish.

The properties typical for the Balkan Sprachbund can be encountered in languages outside of the Balkans. Ammann and Auwera (this volume) demonstrate that the modal construction consisting of a complementizer and an independent main clause, i.e. the subjunctive construction which appears independently and not as a complement of a verb, is used to express volition not only in the languages of the Balkans, but also elsewhere in southern Europe. Thus, alongside Modern Greek (Ammann and Auwera's example (1)), Romanian (Ammann and Auwera's example (2)), Albanian (Ammann and Auwera's example (6)),<sup>10</sup> and Macedonian (Ammann and Auwera's example (7)), we have Puglian southern Italian (Ammann and Auwera's example (19)):

- |        |  |     |
|--------|--|-----|
| (2) a. | <i>Na zísete!</i>                            | MG  |
|        | that.MOD live.2PL.PERF.PRES                  |     |
|        | ‘May you live (a long life)!’                |     |
| b.     | <i>Să ne vedem sănătoși!</i>                 | Ro  |
|        | that.MOD us see.1PL.PRES healthy.M.PL        |     |
|        | ‘May we see each other healthy!’             |     |
| c.     | <i>Ti bëftë mirë!</i>                        | Al  |
|        | you.SG do.3SG.OPT.PRES well                  |     |
|        | ‘May it be agreeable to you!’                |     |
| d.     | <i>Da pukneš!</i>                            | Ma  |
|        | that.MOD burst.2SG.PERF.PRES                 |     |
|        | ‘May you burst!’                             |     |
| e.     | <i>Ku fáttsa ćće bbóle!</i>                  | Sit |
|        | that.MOD do.3SG.SUBJ.PRES what want.3SG.PRES |     |
|        | ‘Let him do what he wants!’                  |     |

Ammann and Auwera suggest that at least some of the Balkan properties are properties common to a wider Mediterranean area. The non-uniqueness of individual properties does not, however, contradict the possible uniqueness of their combination. What is actually remarkable about the Balkans is the combination of linguistic properties whose dynamic equilibrium contributes to the uniqueness of the union (cf. Civjan 1979).

In the following sections, some of the most prominent morphosyntactic Balkan properties in nine Balkan languages<sup>11</sup> – Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian,<sup>12</sup> Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian, Albanian, Modern Greek and the Arli dialect of Balkan Romani – will be examined. Particular attention will be paid to those properties which relate to the properties analyzed in the contributions to this volume.

## 2. Nominal cases and articles

The nominal inflections in the Balkan languages have been replaced to a considerable extent by prepositions. Paradigms with distinct forms for all nominal types have been preserved only in Serbo-Croatian, though the locative case is represented by prepositional phrases with nouns in the dative case, when expressing location, and by prepositional phrases with nouns in the accusative case, when expressing direction.<sup>13</sup> Arli Balkan Romani has nominal and pronominal paradigms with distinct nominative, genitive, ablative, dative, accusative, vocative, instrumental and locative case forms, but the ablative and locative case forms alternate freely with prepositional phrases with nouns in the nominative case. In Albanian, there are four distinct nominal oblique case forms – dative, accusative, ablative and vocative, but the accusative and ablative forms show up only with some nouns or in some specific cases. In Romanian and Aromanian, there are distinct dative forms for all nouns and vocative forms for some nouns. In Modern Greek, masculine nouns with *o*-stems have distinct genitive, accusative and vocative case forms; all other nouns have only one oblique case form – a genitive one, though accusative case is overtly marked on the article. In Macedonian and Bulgarian only the vocative case is systematically marked by distinct case markers, while accusative forms exist in some dialects and/or for some nouns. In Megleno-Romanian vocative case forms are the only oblique nominal case forms.

The tendency towards analyticity of the nominal case system, by itself, is not specific to the Balkan languages – it is encountered in many other Indo-European languages. Characteristic for the Balkan Sprachbund, however, are a number of phenomena that accompany this tendency, such as unification of declension types, analogous vocative case forms, syncretism of the genitive and dative cases, analogous selection of prepositions for the expression of case relations, postpositive articles.

## 2.1 Vocative case forms

Typically, the Balkan Sprachbund languages have distinct case markers for the vocative case. In Arli Balkan Romani there are specific vocative forms for all singular nouns referring to human beings, as well as for singular nouns denoting personified animals or inanimate objects:

- (3) a. *Romnie, so kerea?* (Nom *romni*) ABR  
 woman.F.SG.VOC what do/make.2SG  
 ‘You woman, what are you doing?!’
- b. *Manuša!* (Nom *manuš*) ABR  
 man.M.SG.VOC  
 ‘You man!’
- c. ‘*Na mangljum te avel* (Nom *mačho*) ABR  
 not want.1SG.PAST SUBJ.MARK go.1SG  
*odori, mačhea, vakhergja ov.*  
 thither fish.M.SG.VOC say.3SG.PAST he  
 ‘I didn’t want to go there, fish’, said he.’

In Balkan Slavic (Macedonian, Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian), personal and geographic names, human common nouns in the singular, and some (personified) non-human common nouns also have distinct vocative case forms:<sup>14</sup>

- (4) a. *Stojane!* (Nom *Stojan*) Ma/Bu/SC  
 Stojan.M.VOC  
 ‘Stojan!’
- b. *Sestro!* (Nom *sestra*) Ma/Bu/SC  
 sister.M.VOC  
 ‘Sister!’
- c. *Profesorke!* (Nom *profesorka*) Ma/Bu  
*Profesorice!* (Nom *profesorica*) SC  
 professor.F.VOC  
 ‘(Madam) Professor!’
- d. *Dunave!* (Nom *Dunav*) Ma/Bu/SC  
 Danube.M.SG.VOC  
 ‘You, the Danube (river)!’
- e. *Bože moj!* (Nom *bog*) Ma/Bu/SC  
 god.M.SG.VOC my.M.SG  
 ‘My god!’
- f. *Grade*<sup>15</sup> *naš!* (Nom *grad*) Ma/SC  
 town.M.SG.VOC our.M.SG  
 ‘My town!’

In Romanian, distinct vocative case forms appear with singular human common nouns and personal names; with masculine nouns, the vocative case marker often showing up on the definite article:

- (5) a. *Soro!* (Nom *soră*) Ro  
 sister.F.SG.VOC  
 ‘Sister!’  
 b. *Popescule!* (Nom *Popescu*) Ro  
 Popescu+the.M.SG.VOC  
 ‘Popescu!’

Distinct vocative case forms for singular human nouns also exist in Megleno-Romanian and Aromanian, but the vocative forms of the feminine nouns are pejorative:

- (6) a. *Profesore!* (Nom *profesor*) MR/Ar  
 professor.M.SG.VOC  
 ‘Professor!’  
 b. *Soro!* (Nom *soră/ă*) MR/Ar  
 sister.F.SG.VOC.PEJ  
 ‘Sister!’

In Modern Greek the vocative case is distinctly marked by a suffix only with masculine singular human nouns with *o*-stems.<sup>16</sup>

- (7) *ánthrope* (Nom *ánthropos*) MG  
 man/human being.M.SG.VOC  
 ‘Man!’

## 2.2 Accusative case forms and case markers

Accusative case forms are encountered on a regular basis only in Serbo-Croatian<sup>17</sup> and Arli Balkan Romani, but even here nominative forms are used to express accusative case relations – for all neuter and masculine inanimate nouns (in Serbo-Croatian) or for all inanimate nouns (in Arli Balkan Romani). Compare the case of the nouns in (8a) and (9a) to (8b) and (9b), respectively:

- (8) a. *Video sam tvoga brata.* (Nom *brat*) SC  
 seen.M.SG.PART am your.ACC brother.M.ACC  
 ‘I saw your brother.’  
 b. *Izgubio sam tvoj nož.* SC  
 lost.M.SG.PART am your.M.SG.NOM knife.M.NOM  
 ‘I lost your knife.’

- (9) a. *Dikhljum e bašne.* (Nom *bašno*) ABR  
 see.1SG.PAST the.OBL cock.M.ACC  
 ‘I saw the cock.’
- b. *Ov čhingja o mas.* ABR  
 he cut.3SG.PAST the.M.SG.NOM meat.M.NOM  
 ‘He cut the meat.’

In Albanian, specific accusative nominal forms are used only when the nouns are definite. Thus, the definite noun in direct object position in (10a), *librin*, is in the accusative case, while the indefinite noun in the same position in (10b), *lule*, is in the nominative case:

- (10) a. *E ka lexuar këtë librin.* Al  
 3SG.ACC.CL has read.PART this book+the.M.SG.ACC  
 ‘(S)he has read this book.’
- b. *Agimi i dërgoi Dritës lule.* Al  
 Agim+the.M.SG 3SG.DAT.CL send.3SG.PAST Drita+the.F.SG.DAT  
 flower.F.SG.NOM  
 ‘Agim sent Drita flowers.’ (lit. ‘Agim sent Drita flower.’)

In Modern Greek, distinct accusative nominal forms exist only for masculine nouns with *o*-stems; with all other nouns, accusative case is marked only on the article:<sup>18</sup>

- (11) a. *Ton vlepo to(n) Jorgo.* MG  
 3SG.M.ACC.CL see.1SG the.M.SG.ACC Jorgos.M.SG.ACC  
 ‘I see Jorgos.’
- b. *Ti(n) vlepo ti(n) gata.* MG  
 3SG.F.ACC.CL see.1SG the.F.SG.ACC cat.F.SG  
 ‘I see the cat.’

In Macedonian and Bulgarian, accusative forms appear very selectively – with masculine proper names and masculine human common nouns denoting family relationships:<sup>19</sup>

- (12) a. *Go vidov Stojana/* Ma  
 3SG.M.ACC.CL see.1SG.PAST Stojan.M.SG.ACC  
*Petreta/%brata ti.*  
 Petre+the.M.SG.ACC/brother.M.SG.ACC 2SG.DAT.CL  
 ‘I saw Stojan/Petre/your brother.’
- b. *%...za da ostavi edno pismo na djadja*  
 ...for SUBJ.Mark leave.3SG a letter to uncle.ACC

*Moska.* Bu  
 Mosko.ACC  
 ‘... in order to leave a letter to uncle Mosko.’

Bulgarian grammars (eg. Andrejčin 1978; Tilkov et al. 1982–1983; Bojadžiev, Kucarov, & Penčev 1999) make a distinction between a Nom masculine singular and an Acc masculine singular form of the definite article – *-ăt* and *-ă*, respectively. But there is no consistency in usage and, as pointed out by Zuzanna Topolińska (p.c.), it may well be the case that the “short form” originated in some dialects by dropping of the final consonant (analogous to the dropping in the southern Macedonian dialects), and was subsequently codified as an accusative form.

The Balkan Romance languages have no accusative nominal forms. In Romanian, however, the prepositions *pe* is used as an accusative case marker with all proper names, as well as with [+human, +specific] bare common nouns and nouns preceded by the indefinite article. Thus, it is used in (13a) but not in (13b):<sup>20</sup>

- (13) a. *L-am văzut pe Ion/ pe* Ro  
 3SG.ACC.CL.-have.1SG seen ACC.MARK Ion ACC.MARK  
*profesor/ pe un profesor.*  
 professor ACC.MARK a professor  
 ‘I saw/have seen Ion/the professor/a (specific) professor.’
- b. *Caut (un) profesor.* Ro  
 look-for.1SG a.M.SG professor  
 ‘I am looking for a/any professor.’

### 2.3 Dative/genitive case forms and case markers

An outstanding feature of the Balkan Sprachbund is the dative/genitive “merger”. Dative relationships in the clause and genitive relationships in the DP are expressed by the same nominal/pronominal case form or by prepositional phrases with same prepositions.<sup>21</sup>

Dative case forms for nouns of any type exist not only in Serbo-Croatian and Arli Balkan Romani – languages which have nominal paradigms with many distinct forms – but also in Albanian, Romanian and Aromanian. Whereas in Albanian the dative case marker appears at the right periphery of the noun, whether definite or indefinite, in Romanian and Aromanian the dative case marker always appears to the right of the article, so that, in the case of indefinite nouns, it is “carried” by the pronominal indefinite article.<sup>22</sup> In Aromanian, dative DPs are obligatorily preceded by the preposition *a* ‘to’. Examples:

- (14) a. *Agimi i dërgoi Dritës/* Al  
 Agim+the.M.SG 3SG.DAT.CL send.3SG.PAST Drita+the.F.SG.DAT  
*një vajze(je) lule.*  
 a girl.DAT flower  
 ‘Agim sent Drita/a girl flowers.’
- b. *Petru i-a dat fetei/ unei* Ro  
 Petru 3SG.DAT.CL-have.3SG given girl+the.F.SG.DAT a.F.DAT  
*fete o floare.*  
 girl.OBL a.F.SG flower  
 ‘Petru gave the girl/a girl a flower.’
- c. *Petre lji are dată a featiljei/* Ar  
 Peter 3SG.DAT.CL have.3SG given.PART to girl+the.F.SG.DAT  
*a unei feată lilice.*  
 to a.F.DAT girl flower  
 ‘Peter has given flowers to the girl/a girl.’

In Aromanian, Romanian and Albanian, dative case forms are also used to express genitive case relationships. In all the three languages, nominal dative modifiers appear to the right of their referents. In Aromanian, all dative modifiers are preceded by the preposition *a* ‘to’. In Romanian, the first modifier immediately follows its referent, while every other modifier is conjoined to the preceding modifier by the conjunction *și* ‘and’ and related to its antecedent by an agreement clitic.<sup>23</sup> In Albanian, any modifier has to be related to its referent by an agreement clitic.<sup>24</sup>

- (15) a. *sor-sa a profesorului* Ar  
 sister+his.M.SG.CL to professor+the.M.SG.DAT  
 ‘the professor’s sister’
- b. *limba animalelor și a* Ro  
 language+the.F.SG animal+the.F.PL.DAT and F.SG.Agr.CL  
*păsărilor*  
 bird+the.F.PL.DAT  
 ‘the language of the animals and the birds’
- c. *koka e profesorit* Al  
 head+the.F.SG DAT/ACC.Agr.CL professor+the.M.DAT  
 ‘the professor’s head’

In Modern Greek, there are no dative case forms – genitive case forms are used to express both genitive and dative case relationships.<sup>25</sup>

- (16) a. *Edhosa to vivlio tis Marias.* MG  
 gave.1SG.AOR the.NEUT.SG.ACC book the.F.SG.GEN Maria.GEN  
 ‘I gave the book to Maria.’

- b. *Tis epese [tis Marias]*  
 3SG.F.GEN.CL fall.1SG.AOR the.F.SG.GEN Maria.F.GEN  
 [*to potiri [tu patera]*]. MG  
 the.NEUT.SG.AC glass the.M.SG.GEN father.GEN  
 ‘Maria dropped her father’s glass.’ (lit. ‘To Maria fell  
 her father’s glass.’)
- c. *Tis epese [to potiri [tu patera [tis Marias]]]* MG  
 3SG.F.GEN.CL fall.1SG.AOR the.M.SG.ACC glass the.M.SG.GEN  
 father.GEN the.F.SG.GEN Maria.GEN  
 ‘She dropped Maria’s father’s glass.’ (lit. ‘To her fell Maria’s  
 father’s glass.’)

In the Slavic Balkan languages and Megleno-Romanian, both dative and genitive case relations are expressed through case marking prepositions. In Bulgarian, the preposition *na* ‘on/to’ marks dative as well as genitive case relations:

- (17) a. *Dadox knjigata na Jana/Stojan/* Bu  
 give.1SG.AOR book+the.F.SG to Jana/Stojan/  
*dedoto.*  
 grandpa+the.NEUT.SG  
 ‘I gave the book to Jana/Stojan/the grandpa.’
- b. *Zagubixme knjigata na Ana/ Stojan/* Bu  
 loose.1PL.AOR book+the.F.SG to Ana/ Stojan/  
*dedoto.*  
 grandpa+the.NEUT.SG  
 ‘We lost Jana’s/Stojan’s/grandpa’s book.’

In Macedonian, to express dative relationships one uses the preposition *na* ‘on/to’, while for the expression of genitive relationships *na* is an alternative to the preposition *od* ‘of/from’.<sup>26</sup>

- (18) a. *Mu ja dadov knjigata na* Ma  
 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.F.ACC.CL give.1SG.PAST book+the.F.SG to  
*Stojana/studentot/edno dete.*  
 Stojan.ACC/student+the.M.SG/a boy  
 ‘I gave the book to Stojan/the student/a boy.’
- b. *Ja zaginavme knjigata od/?na* Ma  
 3SG.F.ACC.CL loose.1PL.PAST book+the.F.SG of to  
*Ana/Stojana.*  
 Ana/Stojan.ACC  
 ‘We lost Jana’s/Stojan’s book.’

- c. *Ja popraviv nogata od/??na masata.* Ma  
 3SG.F.ACC.CL repair.1SG.PAST leg+the.F.SG of to table+the.F.SG  
 ‘I repaired the leg of the table.’

Megleno-Romanian indirect objects are introduced by the preposition *la* ‘to/at’, while DPs expressing possessive relationships are introduced by the preposition *al* ‘of’ if animate, and by the preposition *di* ‘from’ otherwise:

- (19) a. *Petre ăi deadi la feata flor.* MR  
 Peter 3SG.DAT.CL give.3SG.AOR to girl+the.F.SG flour  
 ‘Peter gave a flower to the girl.’
- b. *capu al profesoru/ mața* MR  
 head+the.M.SG of professor+the.M.SG/ cat+the.F.SG  
 ‘the head of the professor/the cat’
- c. *picioru di masa/ una masă* MR  
 leg+the.M.SG from table+the.F.SG/ a.F.SG table  
 ‘the leg of the/a table’

## 2.4 Position and use of the definite articles

All the Balkan languages other than standard Serbian and standard Croatian have articles.<sup>27</sup> In Modern Greek and Arli Balkan Romani, the articles occur pre-nominally,<sup>28</sup> whereas in the other Balkan languages they encliticize to the noun, if the noun is the only constituent of the DP, and to its first lexical modifier, otherwise.<sup>29</sup>

- (20) a<sub>1</sub> *nedelata* Ma  
 week+the.F.SG  
 ‘the week’
- a<sub>2</sub> *mojata prva rabotna nedela* Ma  
 my.F.SG+the.F.SG first.F.SG working.F.SG week.F.SG  
 ‘my first working week’
- b<sub>1</sub> *rokljata* Bu  
 dress+the.F.SG  
 ‘the dress’
- b<sub>2</sub> *tvojata xubava ljatna roklja* Bu  
 your.F.SG+the.F.SG beautiful.F.SG summer.ADJ.F.SG dress.F.SG  
 ‘your beautiful summer dress’
- c<sub>1</sub> *castelul* Ro  
 castle+the.M.SG  
 ‘the castle’

c <sub>2</sub>	<i>frumosul</i>	<i>și marele</i> <sup>30</sup>	<i>castel</i>	Ro
	beautiful+the.M.SG	and big+the.M.SG	castle	
	'the beautiful (and) big castle'			
d <sub>1</sub>	<i>porcu</i>			MR
	pig+the.M.SG			
	'the pig'			
d <sub>2</sub>	<i>micu</i>	<i>alb</i>	<i>porc</i>	MR
	small+the.M.SG	white	pig	
	'the small white pig'			
d <sub>1</sub>	<i>feata</i>			Ar
	girl+the.F.SG			
	'the girl'			
d <sub>2</sub>	<i>mushata</i>	<i>mintimenă</i>	<i>feată</i>	Ar
	beautiful+the.F.SG	clever.F.SG	girl	
	'the beautiful clever girl'			
e <sub>1</sub>	<i>vajzat</i>			Al
	girl+the.F.PL			
	'the girls'			
e <sub>2</sub>	<i>të</i>	<i>mjerat</i>	<i>vajza</i> <sup>31</sup>	Al
	AGR.CL	miserable+the.F.PL	girls	
	'the miserable girls'			

Except in Albanian and Romanian, postnominal adjectives are, as a rule, emphatic. In Modern Greek, in this case, both the noun and the adjective are always preceded by definite articles, though DPs with prenominal adjectives can also have more than one article. As a matter of fact, we have the following alternatives:

- (21) a. *to megalo omorfo spiti* MG  
 the.NEUT.SG big.NEUT.SG beautiful.NEUT.SG house
- b. *to megalo to omorfo*  
 the.NEUT.SG big.NEUT.SG the.NEUT.SG beautiful.NEUT.SG  
*to spiti* MG  
 the.NEUT.SG house
- c. *to spiti to megalo to*  
 the.NEUT.SG house the.NEUT.SG big.NEUT.SG the.NEUT.SG  
*omorfo* MG  
 beautiful.NEUT.SG  
 'the big beautiful house'

Traditional Greek grammars, as well as certain current analyses (cf. Androu-tso-poulou 1995; Manolessou 2000), take the DPs with more than one definite article to be stylistic variants of the DPs with only one definite article. Campos and Stavrou (this volume), however, show that DPs with more definite articles,

to which, following Kolliakou (1995), they refer as “polydefinite”, differ from DPs with only one definite article, i.e. from “monadic” DPs – syntactically, semantically and phonologically.

Campos and Stavrou relate the Modern Greek polydefinite constructions to Aromanian constructions in which a noun with a definite postpositive article is followed by a demonstrative and an adjective with a definite postpositive article, as in (22):

- (22) *Lu chirui stilulu atsel Ar*  
 3SG.M.ACC.CL loose.1SG.AOR fountain pen+the.M.SG that.M  
*lailu.*  
 black+the.M.SG  
 ‘I lost the BLACK fountain pen.’

Campos and Stavrou argue that polydefinite DPs include a functional predicative category PredP, which is headed by the “adjectival” definite article. PredP takes an adjective phrase as its complement, and *pro* as its specifier, the latter being identified by the articulated noun in the specifier of the DP. While in Aromanian, polydefinite constructions with prenominal adjectives are excluded, in Modern Greek, polydefinites with prenominal adjectives, such as (22b) are derived from (basic) polydefinite DPs with postnominal adjectives, by movement of the article plus adjective complex.

The analysis for Aromanian, presented by Campos and Stavrou, is compatible with analyses that assume that the Balkan postpositive definite article is not a clitic, but rather a suffix attached pre-syntactically to the noun (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1998; Ortmann & Popescu 2000; Dobrovie-Sorin 2000).

### 3. Pronominal clitics

The Balkan Sprachbund languages have full and clitic dative/genitive and accusative pronominal forms.<sup>32</sup> The accusative forms function as direct objects, whereas the dative/genitive forms function as indirect objects or possessive modifiers. When in direct or indirect object position, the pronominal clitics occur in clusters with auxiliary clitics, the negation marker, the subjunctive marker, and occasionally, with monosyllabic adverbs. The Serbo-Croatian clausal clitic clusters are phonologically enclitic second position clitics; their Macedonian, Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, Aromanian, Albanian and Modern Greek counterparts are syntactically preverbal and phonologically typically proclitic, while the Bulgarian clausal clitic clusters are syntactically preverbal, but phonologically enclitic. In Arli Balkan Romani there are only first person singular, second person singular,

third person singular and third person plural accusative pronominal clitic, which function in both accusative and dative position.

### 3.1 Pronominal clitics functioning in the clause

In Serbo-Croatian, the pronominal clitics behave uniformly in all environments; the pronominal clitics of the other Balkan languages, however, show distinct behaviour in some environments.

Being phonologically enclitic, the Bulgarian pronominal clitics have to have a lexical host to their left, except when they follow modal clitics or the negation marker. Thus, (23a) is not a well-formed sentence, while (23b) and (23c) are:

- (23) a. \**Mu go e dal.* Bu  
 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.M.ACC.CL is.CL given.M.SG./-PART  
 purported meaning: ‘He has given it to him.’
- b. *Ne mu go e dal.* Bu  
 not 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.M.ACC.CL is.CL given.M.SG./-PART  
 ‘He hasn’t given it to him.’
- c. *Šte mu go dade utre.* Bu  
 will 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.M.ACC.CL give.3SG tomorrow  
 ‘(S)he will give it to him tomorrow.’

The well-formedness of sentences such as (23b) and (23c) can be explained through the distinct phonological directionality of *ne* and *šte*: while the auxiliary and pronominal clitics are phonologically enclitic, the negation operator *ne* and the modal clitics *šte* are phonologically proclitic. Echoing the position of Inkelas (1989) that clitics may lean on one another to satisfy each other’s prosodic requirements, Halpern (1992: 283–287) suggests that, when a proclitic clitic is followed by an enclitic one, we must allow for the prosodic subcategorizations to “cancel”, so that the combination as a whole is not prosodically dependent. It is this “cancellation”, and the stress that the complex acquires as a result of it, which make it possible for the negation operator *ne* to appear clause-initially and form a phonological unit with the clitic following it, to the exclusion of the verb. As for the modal clitics *šte* and *bi(x)*, they influence the behaviour of the other clitics: when the modal clitics are cluster-initial, the cluster forms a local domain with the following verb, and, consequently, can appear clause-initially (cf. Tomić 1996, 1997).

The Macedonian pronominal clitics (all clausal clitics, as a matter of fact) are, as a rule, syntactically preverbal and phonologically proclitic. In clauses with [+V, +N] heads, however, they can be and preferably are syntactically second-position and phonologically enclitic.<sup>33</sup>

- (24) a<sub>1</sub> *Im* → *gi* → *DAdov* *KNigite.* Ma  
 3PL.DAT.CL 3PL.ACC.CL give.1SG.PAST books+the.PL
- a<sub>2</sub> \**DAdov* ← *im* ← *gi* *KNigite.* Ma  
 give.1SG.PAST 3PL.DAT.CL 3PL.ACC.CL books+the.PL  
 ‘I have given them the books.’
- b<sub>1</sub> ?*Mu* → *e* → *SKInato* *PALtoto.* Ma  
 3SG.M.DAT.CL is.CL torn.NEUT.SG coat+the.NEUT.SG
- b<sub>2</sub> *SKInato* ← *mu* ← *e* *PALtoto.* Ma  
 torn.NEUT.SG 3SG.M.DAT.CL is.CL coat+the.NEUT.SG  
 ‘His coat is torn.’

In positive imperative clauses, in all the languages considered, the pronominal clitics occur to the immediate right of the verb and encliticize to it.

- (25) a. *Daj* *mu* *go!* Ma/Bu  
 give.2SG.Imp 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL  
 ‘Give it to him.’
- b. *Du-* *te!* Rom  
 go.2SG.IMPER 2SG.ACC.CL  
 ‘Go!’
- c. *Hape* *derën!* Al  
 open.2SG+3SG.ACC.CL door+the.F.ACC  
 ‘Open the door!’
- d. *Dhos* *mu* *to!* MG  
 give.2SG.Imp 1SG.GEN.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL  
 ‘Give it to me!’

Bošković (2001), who adopts the copy theory of movement and assumes that a lower copy of a non-trivial chain can be pronounced instead of the head of the chain iff this is necessary to satisfy a PF (phonetic form) requirement (see also Franks 1998; Bošković 2002), accounts for the occurrence of the clitics to the right of the imperative verb through the existence of an underlying PF affix to the left of the verb, with which the verb has to merge. In underlying structure, both indicatives and imperatives have clitic-verb order, with a lower copy of the pronominal clitic following the verb. In indicatives, the higher copy of the clitic can be, hence must be pronounced. In imperatives, on the other hand, pronunciation of the higher copy of the clitic leads to a Stranded Affix Filter violation; so the lower copy of the clitic, to the right of the verb, is pronounced.

In most Balkan languages, in positive imperative clauses, the accusative clitics follow the dative clitics, as they do in indicative clauses. In Modern Greek positive imperative clauses, however, both genitive accusative and accusative genitive ordering of clitics is possible. Thus, alongside (25d) we have (26):

- (26) *Dhos to mu!* MG  
 give.2SG.IMP 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL 1SG.GEN.CL  
 ‘Give it to me!’

Bošković (this volume) argues that the accusative genitive clitic order in imperative clauses is made possible by the pronunciation of the lower copy of the clitics, forced by the presence of the PF affix. The accusative clitic can actually precede the genitive clitic only when the clitics are pronounced in a lower position, which is the case in imperatives. The optionality of the accusative-genitive ordering is related to an element X, possibly AgrDO (direct object agreement), to which the genitive clitic has to move. Without the presence of X, the Gen-Acc-V complex will be immediately formed, which leads to genitive accusative order of clitics in the postverbal position. When X is present in the structure, however, one gets accusative genitive order in postverbal position.

In negative imperative clauses, in Serbo-Croatian, (standard) Macedonian and Arli Balkan Romani the pronominal clitics occur to the right of the verb, while the negation operator occurs to its left:<sup>34</sup>

- (27) a. *Ne – Uzimaj ← mu ← ga!* SC  
 not.CL take.2SG.IMPERF.IMP 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL  
 ‘Don’t take it from him!’
- b. *Ne – daVAJ – mu – go!* Ma  
 not.CL give.2SG.IMPERF.IMP 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL  
 ‘Don’t give it to him!’
- c. *Ma – biČHAV ← le MANgje!* ABR  
 not.MOD send.2SG.IMP 3SG.M.ACC.CL 1SG.DAT.PRON  
 ‘Don’t send it to me!’

In Bulgarian and Balkan Romance negated imperative clauses, as well as in negated imperative clauses in the Northwestern Macedonian dialects (cf. Tomić 2001), the clitics occur between the negation operator and the verb.<sup>35</sup>

- (28) a. *Ne – MU – go DAvaj!* Bu  
 not.CL 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL give.2SG.IMPERF.IMP  
 ‘Don’t give it to him!’
- b. *NU ← te du!* Ro  
 NEG 2SG.ACC.CL go.2SG.IMPER  
 ‘Don’t go!’
- c. *NU ← la MANcǎ!* MR  
 not 3SG.M.ACC.CL eat.2SG.IMP  
 ‘Don’t eat it!’

- d. *NU* ← *u* *MĀcā!* Ar  
 not 3SG.F.ACC.CL eat.2SG.IMP  
 ‘Don’t eat it!’
- e. *NE* ← *ja* *JAdi!* NWM  
 not 3SG.F.ACC.CL eat.2SG.IMP  
 ‘Don’t eat it!’

In Albanian negated imperative clauses, the clitics also appear between the negation operator and the verb, but in this language we have a specific modal operator *mos*, distinct from the indicative negation operator *nuc*.<sup>36</sup>

- (29) a. *Mos shko!* Al  
 not.MOD go.2SG.IMPER  
 ‘Don’t go!’
- b. *Mos i trego azjë!* Al  
 not.MOD 3SG.DAT.CL say/tell.2SG.IMPER nothing  
 ‘Don’t tell him/her anything!’

In Modern Greek, verbs with imperative morphology cannot be negated and prohibition is expressed by negated subjunctive clauses and other negated structures.<sup>37</sup> Bošković (this volume) points out that Miyoshi (2002) accounts for the ban on negative imperatives in Modern Greek by assuming the existence of a PF affix, which in negative contexts is separated from the verb by the negation marker. Just as the English finite verb, when separated from its past tense affix by a negation operator, resorts to a different verb form, namely infinitive (in addition to “do-support”), the Modern Greek imperative verb, when separated from its PF affix by a negation marker, resorts to another verb form – that of the subjunctive. Under Bošković’s analysis, the presence of the imperative PF affix is thus ultimately responsible for the accusative-genitive clitic switch, the postverbal position of clitics in imperatives, as well as the ban on negative imperatives.

### 3.2 Clitic doubling

The Balkan dative and accusative clitics can double lexical indirect and direct objects, respectively. In Macedonian, Megleno-Romanian and Aromanian, direct-object clitic-doubling is contingent on definiteness, while indirect object clitic-doubling is contingent on specificity. Thus, we have the following acceptability judgements:

- (30) a. *Ana mu go dade*  
 Ana 3SG.M/NEUT.DAT.CL 3SG.M/NEUT.ACC.CL give.3SG.PAST

- pismoto na deteto/ edno dete.* Ma  
 letter+the to child+the a.SG.NEUT child  
 ‘Ana gave the letter to the child/a (specific) child.’
- b. *Ana \*mu \*go dade* Ma  
 Ana 3SG.M/NEUT.DAT.CL 3SG.M/NEUT.ACC.CL give.3SG.PAST  
 (*edno*) *pismo na (edno) dete.*  
 a.SG.NEUT letter to a.SG.NEUT child  
 ‘Ana gave a letter to a child.’
- (31) a<sub>1</sub> *Petre i-u ari dat* MR  
 Petre 3SG.DAT.CL-3SG.F.ACC.CL have.3SG given.PART  
*la feata/ una feată floarea.*  
 to girl+the a girl flower+the  
 ‘Petre has given the flower to the girl/a (specific) girl.’
- a<sub>2</sub> *Petre \*i-u ari dat* MR  
 Petre 3SG.DAT.CL-3SG.F.ACC.CL have.3SG given.PART  
*la (una) feată (ună) floari.*  
 to (a) girl (a) flower)  
 ‘Petre has given a flower to a girl.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Petre lj-u deade cartea* Ar  
 Petre 3SG.DAT.CL-3SG.F.ACC.CL give.3SG.PAST book+the/  
*a featiljei/ unei feată.*  
 to girl+the.DAT a.DAT girl  
 ‘Petre has given the book to the girl/a (specific) girl.’
- b<sub>2</sub> *Petre \*lj-u deade a (unei)* Ar  
 Petre 3SG.DAT.CL-3SG.F.ACC.CL give.3SG.PAST a a.DAT  
*feată una carte.*  
 girl a book  
 ‘Petre has given a book to a girl.’

In standard Serbian and standard Croatian, there is no clitic-doubling, but in some southeastern Serbian dialects, direct objects can optionally be clitic-doubled when definite and indirect objects when specific. Examples:

- (32) a. *Nesăm (ga) videl* SES  
 not+ am.AUX.CL 3SG.M.ACC.CL seen.M.SG.I-PART  
*ovčara(toga).*  
 shepherd+the.M.SG.ACC  
 ‘I haven’t seen the shepherd.’
- b. *Dala sam (mu) cveće na* SES  
 given.F.SG.I-PART am.AUX.CL 3SG.M.DAT.CL flowers to

*šefa na edno dete.*  
 chief.ACC to a.NEUT.SG child  
 ‘I gave (the) flowers to the chief/a child.’

In Bulgarian, both direct and indirect objects are clitic-doubled if specific and topicalized (or rather not focused).<sup>38</sup> Thus, we have the following contrasts:

- (33) a<sub>1</sub> *Ana \*go čete PISMOTO/* Bu  
 Ana 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL read.3SG letter+the.NEUT.SG  
*EDNO PISMO.*  
 a.NEUT.SG letter  
 ‘Ana is reading the letter/a letter.’
- a<sub>2</sub> *ANA go čete pismoto/* Bu  
 Ana 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL read.3SG letter+the.NEUT.SG  
 (%*edno pismo*).  
 a.NEUT.SG letter  
 ‘It is Ana that is reading the letter/a letter.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Ana \*mu pomaga na DETETO/* Bu  
 Ana 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL help.3SG to child+the.NEUT.SG  
*na EDNO DETE.*  
 to a child  
 ‘Ana is helping the child/a child.’
- b<sub>2</sub> *ANA mu pomaga na deteto/* Bu  
 Ana 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL help.3SG to child+the.NEUT.SG  
*na edno dete.*  
 to a child  
 ‘It is Ana that is helping the child/a child.’

In Albanian, all specific indirect objects are clitic-doubled, whereas direct objects are clitic-doubled if specific and topicalized (i.e. not focused). Thus, though both the direct object in (34a) and the one in (34b) are specific, only the direct object in (33a), which is not focused, can be clitic-doubled:

- (34) a. *Do ta pi me kënaqësi* Al  
 will.MOD.CL SUBJ.MARK+3SG.ACC.CL drink.1SG with pleasure  
*një birë.*  
 a beer  
 ‘I will gladly drink a beer.’
- b. *Agimi \*e piu MADJE* Al  
 Agim+the.M.SG 3SG.ACC.CL drink.3SG.AOR even  
*NJË BIRRË para se të shkonte.*  
 a beer before that SUBJ.MARK go.3SG  
 ‘Agim drank even a beer before he left.’

In Modern Greek, specific direct objects – whether definite or indefinite – are clitic-doubled if topicalized.

- (35) a. *Ton Jani ton kseri i* MG  
 the.M.SG.ACC Janis.ACC 3SG.M.ACC.CL know.3SG the.F.SG  
*Maria.*  
 Maria  
 ‘Janis, Maria knows.’
- b. *Ena vivlio tha su to* MG  
 a.NEUT.SG.ACC book will.MOD.CL 2SG.GEN.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL  
*paro.*  
 take.1SG.PERF.PRES  
 ‘As for a book, I will take it for you (but don’t ask for more).’

*In situ* direct objects are also clitic-doubled if discourse linked or familiar, especially if they are definite.

- (36) a. *Tus PIRA tus markadhorus.* MG  
 3PL.M.ACC.CL took.1SG.AOR the.M.PL pencils.M.ACC  
 ‘I did take the pencils.’
- b. (%*Tis*) *ELISA merikes askisis me diskolia.* MG  
 3PL.F.ACC.CL solve.1SG.AOR some.PL exercises with difficulty  
 ‘Some exercises I did solve with difficulty.’

Modern Greek indirect objects are, however, clitic-doubled only when definite. Thus, we have the following contrast:

- (37) a. *Tu EDHOSA tu Jorghu* MG  
 3SG.M.GEN.CL give.1SG.AOR the.M.SG.GEN Jorgos.M.GEN  
*to vivlio.*  
 the.NEUT.SG.ACC book  
 ‘I did give the book to Jorgos.’
- b. (\**Tu*) *EDHOSA enos filu mu* MG  
 3SG.M.GEN.CL give.1SG.AOR a.M.SG.GEN friend.GEN 1SG.GEN.CL  
*to vivlio.*  
 the.NEUT.SG.ACC book  
 ‘I did give the book to a friend of mine.’

In Romanian, direct object clitic doubling is contingent on specificity, topicality and humanness. Human direct objects are clitic-doubled even when not topicalized or specific:<sup>39</sup>

- (38) a. *L-am văzut pe un profesor.* Ro  
 3SG.ACC.CL.-have.1SG seen ACC.Mark a professor  
 ‘I saw/have seen a professor.’

Non-human direct objects are clitic-doubled only when topicalized. Thus, we have the following contrast:

- (39) a. *Filmul ăsta l-am văzut.* Ro  
 film+the.M.SG this.M.SG 3SG.M.ACC.CL-have.1SG seen  
 ‘This film, I have seen.’
- b. *Am mâncat pește.* Ro  
 3SG.M.ACC.CL-have.1SG eaten fish+the.M.SG  
 ‘I ate/have eaten the fish.’

Clitic-doubling of Romanian indirect objects is typically subject to specificity. Examples:

- (40) a. *Petru i-a dat o floare fetei/* Ro  
 Petru 3SG.DAT.CL-has given a.F.SG flower girl+the.F.SG.DAT  
*unei fete.*  
 a.F.DAT girl.OBL  
 ‘Petru gave a flower to the girl/a (specific) girl.’
- b. *I-am pus borcanului ăcest* Ro  
 3SG.DAT.CL-have.1SG put.PART pot+the.M.SG.DAT this.M.SG  
*capac.*  
 lid  
 ‘I covered the pot with this lid.’

In Arli Balkan Romani clitic-doubling, as a rule, occurs only with emphasized pronouns and with quirky accusative subjects in sentences in which V is instantiated by the impersonal verb *isi* ‘be’ or its negative counterpart *na(n)e* ‘not be’:<sup>40</sup>

- (41) a. *Diklja men AMEN.* ABR  
 saw.3SG 1PL.ACC.CL 3PL.ACC.Pron  
 ‘He saw US.’
- b. *Man isi ma(n) jekh kher.* ABR  
 1SG.ACC.Pron be.IMPERS 1SG.ACC.CL a house  
 ‘I have a house.’ (lit. ‘To me is a house.’)

### 3.3 Impersonal pronominal clitics

The dative and accusative personal clitics have corresponding impersonal/reflexive forms which are used for anaphoric reference, in impersonal clauses and as passive and middle markers. In Balkan Slavic, these pronominal clitics are used for anaphoric reference whenever co-referential with the subject. Thus, we have the following contrasts:

- (42) a<sub>1</sub> *Ti se mieš.* Ma/Bu  
 a<sub>2</sub> *Ti se umivaš.* SC  
 you.SG REFL.ACC.CL wash.2SG  
 ‘You are washing yourself.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Petko se mie.* Ma/Bu  
 b<sub>2</sub> *Petko se umiva.* SC  
 Petko REFL.ACC.CL wash.3SG  
 ‘Petko is washing himself.’
- c<sub>1</sub> *Petko go mie.* Ma/Bu  
 c<sub>2</sub> *Petko ga umiva.* SC  
 Petko 1SG.ACC.CL wash.3SG  
 ‘Petko is washing him.’

In Balkan Romance, the reflexive/impersonal pronominal clitics are used only for anaphoric reference to third persons:

- (43) a<sub>1</sub> *Ion s-a ras.* Ro  
 Ion REFL.ACC.CL-has.CL shaved.M.SG.PART  
 ‘Ion shaved himself.’
- a<sub>2</sub> *Iani si briciaști.* MR  
 Iani REFL.ACC.CL shave.3SG
- a<sub>3</sub> *Iane s-sursi.* Ar  
 Iane IMPERS.ACC.CL-shave.3SG  
 ‘Iani/Iane is shaving himself.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Ion își cântă.* Ro  
 Ion REFL.DAT.CL sing.3SG
- b<sub>2</sub> *Ianiăș contă.* MR  
 Iani REFL.DAT.CL sing.3SG
- b<sub>3</sub> *Iane sh-cântă.* Ar  
 Iane IMPERS.DAT.CL-sing.3SG  
 ‘Ion/Iani/Iane is singing to himself.’

In Arli Balkan Romani, there is only one impersonal/reflexive pronominal clitic, which is used for anaphoric reference to third person pronouns:

- (44) *Thovelape.* ABR  
 wash.3SG+REFL.ACC.CL  
 ‘(S)he washes himself/herself.’

In Albanian, there is also only one accusative impersonal/reflexive clitic. Moreover, this clitic is used for anaphoric reference only to nouns denoted by the subject of the clause, and only when the verb is in a past tense.<sup>41</sup>

- (45) a. *Unë u rrova.* Al  
 I REFL.CL shave.1SG.AOR  
 ‘I shaved myself.’
- b. *Pjetri u rrua.* Al  
 Pjetri REFL.CL shave.3SG.AOR  
 ‘Pjetri shaved himself.’

In Modern Greek, there are no impersonal clitics.<sup>42</sup>

The impersonal, passive and middle clauses with impersonal clitics (as well as the Albanian and Modern Greek verbs with medio-passive morphology) often include dative personal pronominal clitics and/or lexical dative phrases. According to Rivero (this volume) there are two types of impersonal/passive constructions with datives. The first construction is the so-called involuntary state or “feel like” construction, which occurs in Albanian and the South Slavic languages, but not in Romanian and Modern Greek.

- (46) a. *Ne mu se raboteše vo* Ma  
 not 3SG.F.DAT.CL IMPERS.ACC.CL work.3SG.IMPERF.PAST in  
*nivata.*  
 field+the.F.SG  
 ‘He didn’t feel like working in the field.’
- b. *I u punua këtu.* Al  
 3SG.DAT IMPERS.CL work.3SG.IMPERF here  
 ‘(S)he felt like working here.’
- c. *I se lucra în fabrică.* Ro  
 3SG.DAT.CL IMPERS.ACC.CL work.3SG.IMPERF in factory  
 1. ‘One/people worked in the factory on his/her behalf.’  
 2. ‘One/people worked in his/her factory.’  
 Not: ‘(S)he felt like working in the factory.’

The second construction, which consists of an anticausative core, coupled with a dative, is found in all Balkan languages along parallel lines:

- (47) a. *Mu se skrši prozorecot.* Ma  
 b. *I- u thye dritarja.* Al  
 c. *I se sparse ferestrea.* Ro  
 3SG.DAT.CL IMPERS.CL break.3SG.AOR window+the  
 1. ‘His window got broken.’  
 2. ‘He involuntarily caused the big vase to break.’

Rivero (this volume) argues that involuntary state constructions contain a passive or impersonal core. This core contains an argument, which is implicit or existentially closed due to Argument Saturation. The dative discloses and binds

this implicit argument via a formal semantic procedure called Dative Disclosure. Anticausative datives, on the other hand, are interpreted by an inferential procedure called Ethical Strategy, which differs from Dative Disclosure, because it cannot operate on formally present arguments. Dative Disclosure cannot apply in anticausatives, since they lack the appropriate suppressed argument.

### 3.4 Possessive pronominal clitics

In all the Balkan languages, possessive relationships can be expressed in the DP, as well as in the CP – in both cases through the same morphological device, genitive pronominal clitics in Modern Greek, and dative pronominal clitics elsewhere. In Bulgarian, both possessive clitics in the DP and possessively interpreted dative clausal clitics are widely used and can refer to either animate or inanimate nouns. Examples:

- (48) a<sub>1</sub> *Razbole se deteto* Bu  
 get sick.3SG.PERF.PAST IMPERS.ACC.CL child+the.NEUT.SG  
*mi.*  
 1 SG.DAT.CL
- a<sub>2</sub> *Rasbole mi se* Bu  
 get sick.3SG.PERF.PAST 1 SG.DAT.CL ACC.IMPERS.CL  
*deteto.*  
 child+the.NEUT.SG  
 ‘My child got sick.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Interesni sa vāprosite im.* Bu  
 interesting.PL are.3PL questions+the.PL 3PL.DAT.CL
- b<sub>2</sub> *Interesni sa im vāprosite.* Bu  
 interesting.PL are.3PL 3PL.DAT.CL questions+the.PL  
 ‘Their questions are interesting.’

In Macedonian, the DP possessive clitics can refer only to nouns denoting family relationships. Thus, we have the following acceptability judgements:

- (49) a<sub>1</sub> \**Se razbole deteto* Ma  
 IMPERS.ACC.CL get sick.3SG.PERF.PAST child+the.NEUT.SG  
*mi.*  
 1 SG.DAT.CL
- a<sub>2</sub> *Mi se rasbole* Ma  
 1 SG.DAT.CL IMPERS.ACC.CL get sick.3SG.PERF.PAST  
*deteto.*  
 child+the.NEUT.SG  
 ‘My child got sick.’



- (52) *Erdhi nga e ëma.* Al  
 come.3SG.AOR from F.SG.AGR.CL mother+the.F.SG  
 ‘(S)he came from his/her mother’s.’

In Arli Balkan Romani, dative pronominal clitics are very selectively used and never express possessive relationships. There are, however, possessive pronominal clitics related to full (lexical) possessive pronouns/determiners, which refer to singular nouns denoting close family relationships:

- (53) a. *So šuži stadik pletingja ti daj!* ABR  
 what beautiful.F.SG hat knit.3SG.PAST your.2SG.CL mother  
 ‘What a beautiful hat has your mother knitted for you!’  
 b. *Kergja lafi te dadea.* ABR  
 make.3SG.PAST talk your.2SG.OBL.CL father.INSTR  
 ‘(S)he talked to your father.’

In Modern Greek, genitive clitics can express possessive relationships within the nominal phrase, as well as possessive relationships within the clause:<sup>46</sup>

- (54) a. *O Jorghos idhe tin kori su.* MG  
 the.M.SG Jorghos see.1SG.AOR the.F.SG.ACC daughter 2SG.GEN.CL  
 ‘Jorgo saw your daughter.’  
 b. *Tu pandrevete i kori.* MG  
 3SG.M.GEN.CL marry.3SG.M-P the.F.SG daughter  
 ‘His daughter is getting married.’

Pancheva (this volume) argues that Modern Greek possessive clitics receive abstract genitive case and are thus formally distinct from clausal indirect object clitics, which are valued as dative. The identity between the two types of clitics in this language results from dative/genitive syncretism in the morpho-phonological expression of distinct abstract syntactic features. In Bulgarian, Macedonian, Romanian, and Serbo-Croatian, on the other hand, possessive clitics have dative case features in syntax, and are the same entities as clausal indirect object clitics; the identity of the morpho-phonological form of the two types of clitics is due to identity of formal features and not to case syncretism. There are further distinctions within this latter group of languages: Bulgarian and Macedonian DPs have syntactic mechanisms to value dative case on possessive arguments, Serbo-Croatian DPs have completely lost the dative-case valuation mechanisms, while Romanian DPs have almost lost them. This parametric difference is responsible for the availability of DP-internal possessive clitics in Bulgarian and Macedonian, their lack in Serbo-Croatian, and their non-productivity in Romanian.

Pancheva bases her conclusions on comparative data from the contemporary languages, as well as on historical data. She gives evidence that in the history of South Slavic genitive clitics were never available.

There have been arguments in the generative literature that the Balkan clausal clitics with possessive interpretation originate in and are raised from DPs (cf. Avram & Coene 2000; Stateva 2002; Moskovsky this volume). While Avram and Coene (2000) maintain that the movement is triggered by a topic feature, and Stateva (2002) believes that it is case-driven, Moskovsky (this volume), who works within Binding theory (Chomsky 1981, 1986; Chomsky & Lasnik 1992) argues that the DP to CP clitic movement in Bulgarian strictly respects normal constraints on movement – it is an optional movement allowed only out of complements of the verb, i.e. out of maximal projections which are L-marked. Moskovsky presents evidence that locality constraints on binding in Bulgarian apply within narrower boundaries than generally assumed (e.g., under a “governing category” formulation).

#### 4. Subjunctives

The most perspicuous and most widely spread and discussed property of the Balkan Sprachbund languages is the loss of the infinitive and its replacement by structurally comparable subjunctive constructions. In Macedonian and Tosk Albanian the loss of the infinitive is complete and in Aromanian, Modern Greek, Bulgarian and the southeastern Serbian dialects it is almost complete; in Megleno-Romanian the infinitive shows up in a limited number of expressions; whereas in Geg<sup>47</sup> Albanian, Romanian, Standard Serbian and Standard Croatian it shares many of its functions with subjunctive constructions with finite verbs.

##### 4.1 Subjunctives as complements of modal and intentional verbs

Typically, subjunctive constructions are used in complement positions of modal and intentional verbs. The verb of the subjunctive construction can, but need not agree in person and number with the verb of the main clause. Whenever such an agreement occurs, there is “equi” deletion and only one subject surfaces – in unmarked sentences, to the left of the main verb. Pronominal subjects are dropped, unless emphatic.

Modal verbs are very often impersonal. When personal, however, they have to agree in person and number with the verb in the subjunctive construction.<sup>48</sup>

- (55) a. *Ne možam da go vidam/\*vidiš.* Ma  
 not can.1SG SUBJ.MARK 3SG.M/NEUT.ACC.CL see.1/2SG.PERF.PRES  
 ‘I cannot see him/it.’
- b. *Poř s-ti/\*il duř/\*duca.* MR  
 can/may.2SG SUBJ.MARK-2/3SG.ACC.CL go.2/3SG  
 ‘You can/may go.’
- c. *Dy prej tyre mundën (që) të shpëtonin.* Al  
 two from they.DAT can.3PL.AOR that SUBJ.MARK save.3PL.M-P  
 ‘Two of them could be saved.’
- d. *Boro na figo/\*figis.* MG  
 can/may.1SG SUBJ.MARK leave.1/2SG  
 ‘I can/may leave.’

Intentional verbs fall into three classes with respect to agreement with the person/number features of their subjunctive complements. Verbs of the “intend” type have same reference as the subjects of their subjunctive complements; the reference of verbs of the “order” type differs from the reference of the subjects of their subjunctive complements (disjoint reference verbs); while verbs of the “want” type may agree or disagree with the person/number features of their subjunctive complements.

- (56) a. *Namerava da patuva/\*patuvaš.* Ma  
 intend.3SG SUBJ.MARK travel.3/2SG  
 ‘(S)he intends to travel.’
- b. *Intenționează să meargă/\*meargi la Paris.* R  
 intend.3SG SUBJ.MARK go.3/2SG.SUBJ to Paris  
 ‘(S)he intends to go to Paris.’
- c. *Tentoi (që) të vijë/\*vij.* Al  
 intend.3SG.AOR that SUBJ.MARK come.3/1SG.SUBJ  
 ‘(S)he intended to come.’
- d. *Skopevo na ertho/\*erthis.* MG  
 intend.1SG SUBJ.MARK come.1/2SG.PERF.PRES  
 ‘I intend to come.’
- e. *Nietinela te dromarel/\*dromarela.* ABR  
 intend.3SG SUBJ.MARK travel.3/1SG  
 ‘(S)he intends to travel.’
- (57) a. *Zapoveda Marija da dojde* Ma  
 ordered.3SG.PERF.PAST Marija SUBJ.MARK come.3SG.PERF.PRES  
*vednaš.*  
 immediately  
 ‘(S)he gave an order for Marija to come immediately.’

- b. *A ordonat ca Maria să vină* Ro  
 has ordered.PART SUBJ.MARK Maria SUBJ.MARK come3SG.SUBJ  
*numaidecât.*  
 immediately.  
 ‘(S)he gave an order for Maria to come immediately.’
- c. *Urdhëroi Drita (që) të vish menjëherë.* Al  
 order.3SG.AOR Drita that SUBJ.MARK come.2SG.SUBJ immediately  
 ‘(S)he gave an order for Drita to come immediately.’
- d. *Dietakse ti Maria na* MG  
 order.3SG.AOR the.F.SG.ACC Maria SUBJ.MARK  
*erthi amesos.*  
 come.3SG.PERF.PRES immediately  
 ‘(S)he gave an order for Maria to come immediately.’
- e. *Naredingja i Nafija te avel*  
 ordered.3SG.PAST the.F.SG Nafija SUBJ.MARK come.3SG  
*akana.* ABR  
 now  
 ‘(S)he gave an order for Nafija to come immediately.’
- (58) a<sub>1</sub> *Sakam da mu go* Ma  
 want.1SG SUBJ.MARK 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL  
*dadam.*  
 give.1SG.PERF.PRES  
 ‘I want to give it to him.’
- a<sub>2</sub> *Sakam da mu go* Ma  
 want.1SG SUBJ.MARK 3SG.M.DAT.CL 3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL  
*dadat.*  
 give.3PL.PERF.PRES  
 ‘I want them to give it to him.’
- b<sub>1</sub> *Vrea să pleci la București.* Ro  
 want.3SG SUBJ.MARK leave.2SG to Bucharest  
 ‘(S)he wants you to leave for Bucharest.’
- b<sub>2</sub> *Vrea să plece la București.* Ro  
 want.3SG SUBJ.MARK leave.3SG to Bucharest  
 ‘(S)he wants him/her to leave for Bucharest.’
- c<sub>1</sub> *Duan (që) t’ia japin.* Al  
 want.3PL that SUBJ.MARK-3SG.DAT.CL+3SG.ACC.CL give.3PL.SUBJ  
 ‘They want to give it to him/her.’
- c<sub>2</sub> *Duan (që) t’ia jape.* Al  
 want.3PL that SUBJ.MARK-3SG.DAT.CL+3SG.ACC.CL give.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘They want him/her to give it to him/her.’

d <sub>1</sub>	<i>Thelo na pao eki.</i>	MG
	want.1SG SUBJ.MARK go.1SG there	
	‘I want to go there.’	
d <sub>2</sub>	<i>Thelo na pai eki.</i>	MG
	want.1SG SUBJ.MARK go.3SG there	
	‘I want him/her to go there.’	
e <sub>1</sub>	<i>Na mangela te ovel tlo/klo izmekjari.</i>	ABR
	not want.3SG SUBJ.MARK be.3SG your servant	
	‘(S)he doesn’t want to be your servant.’	
e <sub>2</sub>	<i>Na mangela te ovav tlo/klo izmekjari.</i>	ABR
	not want.3SG SUBJ.MARK be.1SG your servant	
	‘(S)he doesn’t want me to be your servant.’	

In Serbo-Croatian, intentional verbs can take either subjunctive or infinitive complements. The usage of infinitive and subjunctive complements with individual types of intentional verbs in (standard) Serbian is, however, different from their usage in (standard) Croatian. When the intentional verb and its complement have disjoint reference, in both (standard) Serbian and (standard) Croatian we have subjunctive complements. In the case of joint reference, however, intentional verbs in (standard) Croatian take only infinitives, while in (standard) Serbian both infinitive and subjunctive complements are accepted, though the latter are preferred.

Stojanović and Marelj (this volume) examine child and adult strategies in interpreting empty subjects in Serbian and Croatian subjunctive and infinitival complements of intentional verbs. Fifteen four-and-five year old speakers of Serbian, and 25 three-to-five year old speakers of Croatian, as well as 16 Serbian and Croatian speaking adults were tested in an act-out experiment. The results demonstrate that the rules for interpreting null subjects in infinitive complements in both Serbian and Croatian are in place by the age of five. Although neither child nor adult subjects showed any problems with interpreting null subjects in subjunctive-like complements, only the Croatian-speaking children adopted the external reference for empty subjects in “want” type subjunctive complements.

#### 4.2 Subjunctive constructions as modifiers

In all the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund, subjunctive constructions can function as adjectival or adverbial modifiers. The border between subjunctive constructions functioning as adjectival or adverbial modifiers is actually very weak. Thus, clauses in which the subjunctive construction is introduced by a “wh” relativizer clearly function as adjectival modifiers:<sup>49</sup>

- (59) a. *Tărsja žena kojato da* Bu  
 look for.1SG woman who.F.SG+the.NEUT.SG SUBJ.MARK  
*mi gleda decata.*  
 1SG.DAT.CL look after.3SG children+the.PL  
 ‘I am looking for a woman to look after my children.’
- b. *Caut o fată care să știe* Ro  
 look for.1SG a.F girl which SUBJ.MARK know.3SG.SUBJ  
*englezește.*  
 English  
 ‘I am looking for a girl that knows English.’
- c. *Ubides capelă cari s-mi* MR  
 look for.1SG hat which SUBJ.MARK-1SG.ACC.CL  
*veagljă di soare.*  
 protect.3SG.SUBJ from sun.  
 ‘I am looking for a hat that would protect me from the sun.’
- d. *Aflai tu sone una fustane cai/tsi* Ar  
 find.1SG.AOR at end a dress which/what  
*s-mi arisească.*  
 SUBJ.MARK-1SG.ACC.CL please.3SG.SUBJ  
 ‘I finally found a dress which should please me.’

On the other hand, subjunctive constructions preceded by equivalents of the preposition *for* clearly function as adverbial modifiers of purpose:

- (60) a. *Npravivme pauza za da gi* Ma  
 make.1PL.PERF.PAST pause for SUBJ.MARK 3PL.ACC.CL  
*čue me vestite.*  
 hear.1PL.PERF.PRES news+the.PL  
 ‘We paused in order to hear the news.’
- b. *Dojdoh za da vi săobșta* Bu  
 come.1SG.AOR for SUBJ.MARK 2PL.ACC.CL inform.1SG.PERF.PRES  
*če si otivam.*  
 that IMPERS.DAT.CL leave.1SG  
 ‘I came to inform you that I am leaving.’
- c. *Ion e prea periculos pentru ca* Ro  
 Ion is too dangerous for that.MOD  
*să-l angajăm.*  
 SUBJ.MARK+3SG.M.ACC.CL hire.1PL  
 ‘Ion is too dangerous for us to hire him.’
- d. *Irtha ja na se voithiso.* MG  
 come.1SG.AOR for SUBJ.MARK 2SG.ACC.CL help.1SG.PERF.PRES  
 ‘I came to help you.’

Nevertheless, the relativizer and the preposition can be left out, and in some languages do not occur at all, and then the clause is open to ambiguities. Bužarovska (this volume) examines the syntactic environments that favor the realization of an isofunctional syntactic pattern, which occurs in the mixed domain of purpose and modification in Macedonian, Aromanian, Albanian and Modern Greek. She shows that these languages share a limited set of ditransitive verbs that allow “purpose-like” modification of their direct object due to dual case assignment and argues that the weakening of control at the expense of benefactive meaning is responsible for gradual shift from purpose to modification.

Related to subjunctive constructions functioning as adjectival modifiers are subjunctive constructions with “wh”-words as subjects, objects or adjuncts, which can be reinterpreted as structures in which subjunctive constructions modify “wh”-words. The main verbs of the sentences in which these subjunctive constructions appear express (a) assertion or denial of existence or (b) coming into being, view or availability or causation of one of these. In (61) we have examples of subjunctive constructions with “wh” arguments or adjuncts in complement positions of equivalents of the existential verb “have” – a verb that typically expresses assertion or denial of existence:

- (61) a. *Ima koj da mi pomogne.* Ma  
 have.IMPERS who SUBJ.MARK 1SG.DAT.CL help.3SG.PERF.PR  
 ‘There is someone who can help me.’
- b. *Njama kakvo da kupiš.* Bu  
 not+have.IMPERS what SUBJ.MARK buy.2SG.PERF  
 ‘There is nothing to buy.’
- c. *Nemaš kako da pošalješ paket.* SC  
 not+have.2SG how SUBJ.MARK send.2PL.PERF.PR parcel  
 ‘You have no way to send a/the parcel.’
- d. *Nu am cu cine sã vin.* Ro  
 not have.1SG with who SUBJ.MARK come.1SG  
 ‘I have nobody with whom I can come.’
- e. *Nu ari di ři si cařã.* MR  
 not have.IMPERS from what SUBJ.MARK catch.3SG/PL.SUBJ  
 ‘There is nothing (s)he/they can hold onto.’
- f. *Am cu cai (tã) s-yin.* Ar  
 have.1SG with whom that.MOD SUBJ.MARK-COME.1SG  
 ‘I have somebody with whom I can come.’
- g. *S’ka (që) ř-të bëhet.* Al  
 not-have.IMPERS that what-SUBJ.MARK DO.IMPERS.M-P  
 ‘There is nothing one can do.’