CONVERGENCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTH SLAVONIC AND GREEK PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS

Vit Bubenik
Snezana Milovanovic
Memorial University of Newfoundland

ABSTRACT

Section 1 introduces one of the salient Balkanisms – the 'proleptic use of pronouns', called crossindexing of the direct and indirect objects / clitic doubling constructions – in the context of other Balkanisms. The necessary diachronic background for the present study, case syncretism and the emergence of the postpositive article in South Slavonic languages, is provided in 2 and 3. The development of the Bulgaro-Macedonian pronominal system from that of Old Church Slavonic is outlined in 4, and the parallel development of the Greek system in 5. The current controversy regarding the synchronic status of Modern Greek and Bulgaro-Macedonian clitics is addressed in 6. It is demonstrated that pronominal clitics of Modern Greek cannot be considered to be bound morphemes and that Macedonian clitics stand a better chance to qualify for the status of bound morphemes / affixes vis-à-vis those of Greek but also those of closely related Bulgarian.

Section 8 attempts to establish a causal nexus between the loss of case and the emergence of crossindexing of the recipient / beneficiary and the patient by means of clitic doubling constructions. Modern Greek went as far as Middle Bulgaro-Macedonian before the loss of case marking on the definite article; Macedonian, however, converged with Greek in favouring the strategy of proclisis vs. Bulgarian enclisis: ton=vlépo, ton=jó (Greek) and go=glédam sinot vs. glédam=go, sina (Bulgarian) 'I see the son'. Furthermore, only Macedonian demarked this construction in that the doubling is necessary outside pragmatic contexts. Morphological corollaries are the uninterruptibility of the clitic block recipient=patient and its immediate attachment to the verb in Macedonian (vs. Bulgarian). Some desiderata for further typological and functional research along the lines of the present study are outlined in 7 and 9.

1. BALKANISMS

The area of the Balkans is one of the most famous examples of a sprachbund, or linguistic convergence area. In this area are found four genetically quite distinct families of the Indo-European phylum: Slavonic (Bulgarian, Macedonian, and southeastern dialects of Serbo-Croat), Romance (Rumanian), Illyrian (Albanian), and Hellenic (Greek). It is generally assumed that the long period of widespread migrations of various
The generalization of the infinitive loss and the dominant finite complement stage is further attested in later stages of South Slavic. Infinitive loss characterizes not only Macedonian, Bulgarian, and the regional Serbian dialects, but also the standard Serbian dialect of Belgrade. The emergence of new periphrastic future constructions is subsequent to the loss of the infinitives. The modal compound is no longer formed by combining the volitional verb with the infinitive of the main verb (OCSI xošti MAIN VERB+INF) Ja ću raditi, but is replaced extensively by the construction consisting of the complementizer da plus the subjunctive ja (ho)ću da radim 'I will work'. This innovation spread to all Serbian dialects, while Croatian dialects, located to the north of the Sava-Ljublje line, still preserve the use of the infinitive.

2. CASE SYNCRETISM IN SOUTH SLAVONIC LANGUAGES

Another linguistic change that characterizes the South Slavonic languages is case-syncretism. Reduction of the complex six case system of the Old Church Slavonic is slightly less widespread than the complement finite constructions since it is still strongly resisted by standard Serbian variants and other Slavic languages except Bulgarian and Macedonian. There is a rich literature on the loss of case in other Balkan languages (especially Greek and Rumanian) and we may dwell for a while on regional Serbian dialects which currently exhibit various syncretisms. They share the process of case merger by which distinct case forms co-occurring with prepositions merge with the direct case: the accusative singular for some nominal stems (a-stems), and the nominative singular for other stems (e, o and consonantal stems). Mergers are not clearly confined to distinct stems in regional dialects even though broad generalizations can be drawn. This is a consequence of the accusative-nominative merger which seems to be presently taking place; there are variations involving either distinct or identical accusative-nominative forms across dialects; and different usages have been recorded even within the same dialect (Milovanovic 1986). The general case, a single nominative-accusative case, has been generalized in most plural stems. For these nominal stems the complex case system has been reduced to a single case form – the general case – used with prepositions in oblique functions and requiring help
of word order and semantics to distinguish between the subject (agent) and object (patient).

Among linguistic processes that condition case-syncretism that have been recognized by linguists are phonetic change, analogy, the use of prepositions and postpositions, word order phenomena and overlapping of usage. A unanimous position on which factors should be given priority has not been achieved.

Fairbanks (1977) maintains that the use of prepositions has very little influence on the process in question. It would seem that the use of prepositions does not affect the morphological make-up of most Slavic languages. According to Fairbanks, in all Slavic languages, other than Bulgarian and Macedonian, the introduction of prepositions created redundancies which did not cause the merger of cases. However, more subtle reasoning, paying attention to *sprachbund* convergencies, is in order. Bulgarian, Macedonian and the dialects of south-east Serbia which are geographically contingent exhibit the process of case merger only in prepositional cases. A significant contrast is observed between the standard dialect of Belgrade and regional dialects of south-east Serbia. The close examination of case-systems represented by various regional dialects reveals prepositional use to be important but not the most crucial factor of case merger. As far as the other potential factors are concerned, Beliè (1905) has claimed that phonetic processes play no role in this process, more specifically, that there is no evidence of final sound reduction or vowel coalescence in the cases that merge. Of the remaining factors, analogy (which spreads case merger from certain nominal stems to other nominal stems) and the use of prepositions play a major role. The latter phenomenon may be readily observed in the prepositional use of oblique cases. It is fairly well known that all Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects employ the preposition *na* with the direct case to express the notion of reception/benefit and possession. The geographically contiguous regional Serbian dialects share this feature with Macedonian and Bulgarian (the latter two initiated the development of this construction, as will be shown in the next section). Beliè (1905: 309) provides some examples of the prepositional use in combination with the accusative encoding the beneficiary / recipient:

(6)a. *Idi da kažeš na carsku cerku*  
*go + IMP that tell +2/SG on(to) emperor's + ACC daughter + ACC  
+2/SG*  
'Go to tell it to the emperor's daughter.'
b. Prati na Cara Lazara
   send + IMP on(to) Tsar + ACC Lazar + ACC
   ‘Send it to the Tsar Lazar.’

c. Kazala na momka onoga
told + FEM on(to) guy + ACC that + ACC
   ‘She told it to that guy.’

However, this prepositional use is not extended to all regional Serbian dialects. Those contiguous with the standard dialect do not employ the preposition na with the genitive or dative. The dative in these dialects often retains a distinct case form while the genitive is expressed either by the preposition od ‘from, of’ plus the direct case, the quantifier co-occurring with the direct case for the partitive functions or even the standard variant of the inflected oblique forms. This system is found in one of the Moravian dialects in the south-eastern area. The dialect of the village Jovac located 145 km south of Belgrade (investigated in 1986 by Milovanovic) undoubtedly shows the merger of the prepositional cases, genitive, locative and instrumental, with the direct or the oblique case. Geographical proximity to the Bulgarian and Macedonian border obviously represents a significant factor in the presence of the features that make up the sprachbund. Witness the extension of the previously mentioned prepositional use to the expressions of reception and possession in the dialect of Pirot and its vicinity:

(7)a. Kao na kuće su dali
   As on dog+NOM/ACC be+3/PL give+PP+M/PL
   ‘They gave as if to a dog.’

b. čudo na Karadžića su dali da priča
   Wonder on K+ACC be+3/PL give+PP+M/PL COMP speak+3/SC
   ‘It’s a wonder they permitted Karadžić to speak.’

c. Kako mu dadaš da govori
   How he+DAT give+AOR+3/PL COMP speak+3/SC
   ‘How did they permit him to speak?’

The issue of the reduction of the case system will be reexamined in the following section in the context of the emergence of the postpositive article in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

---

1The data in (7) were provided by Slavinka Madić, *1920, in the village Velika
in which is non-existent now. Velika Lukanja is located 12 km from
both Pirot and Velika Lukanja are approximately 36 km from the
Bulgarian border.
3. THE EMERGENCE OF THE POSTPOSITIVE ARTICLE AND THE REDUCTION OF THE CASE SYSTEM

The source of the postpositive article - found in Rumanian, Albanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian - is uncertain (cf. Mladenov 1929: 248, regarding the existence of the postpositive article in the North Russian dialects). The Greek article is prepositive and is usually ruled out as a potential source (but even the Greek pattern with an article repeated with an attribute could provide a model: (ho) anér ho=kalōs > ándras o kalōs; cf. Rumanian prieten=ul sincer < Latin (ille) amicus ille sincerus). According to Stöltling (1970), the Bulgarian-Macedonian article was influenced in its formation and placement by the Rumanian and partly by the Albanian system during its formative period between the 6th & 10th centuries. It is fairly well-known that Old Church Slavonic, as a conservative literary dialect with six synthetic cases, did not develop (or rather, had no need to develop) the article. Rare OCSI instances of an 'article' - such as (8) - are to be interpreted as cliticized demonstrative pronouns:

(8) člověk=to
    man=that

'that man'

[Mark xiv.21; Mar]

This usage, however, was on the increase in the progressive Bulgaro-Macedonian dialects during the 11th - 13th centuries. Ultimately, the demonstrative pronoun lost its deictic meaning and was recategorized as a definite article. This process may be followed in the Bulgaro-Macedonian literary documents composed during the 11th - 13/14th centuries. (Codex Suprasliensis [11th c.]; the writings of Exarch Johannes, Praxapostolus ochridensis [12th c.]; Narodno žitje Ivana Rilskago [12th c.]; Dobrejšovo-Evangelium [13th c.]; narrations of Michail Voin [14th c.]).

It is important to realize that the period of the emergence of the postpositive article in South Slavonic languages is in causal nexus with the reduction of the system of synthetic cases. The rich system of six cases, as known to us from Old Church Slavonic, was reduced to three by the loss of the locative, instrumental, and genitive. Thus in Old Bulgarian the notions of location and instrumentality started being expressed by prepositional phrases. As far as the notion of possession was concerned, in OCSI the nominal and pronominal possessorS were expressed by the genitive case. In Middle Bulgarian (after the 14th c.) the nominal and pronominal possessor started being expressed by the dative, which was later on replaced by the prepositional phrase na plus the noun (in the accusative). Mladenov
(1929: 228) gives the following Middle Bulgarian example of the dative, and its Modern Bulgarian equivalent na Noun+ACC:

(9)a. doidošo do vratb gradu (Middle Bulgarian)
reach+AOR+3/PL to gate+GEN/PL town+DAT
'They came to the gate of the town'

b. doidoxa do vratata na grada (Modern Bulgarian)
reach+AOR+3/PL to gate+ART to town+ACC

Similarly, the pronominal possessor which used to be expressed by the genitive in OCSi and Old Bulgarian started being expressed by the clitic pronominal form in the dative. Old and Modern Bulgarian constructions are given in (10):

(10) syn'b jego (OBg) sin=mu (MnBg)
son he+GEN son=he+DAT
'his son'

In the Modern Macedonian dialect of Dihovo (Groen 1977:81) the clitic dative forms are used only with kinship terms (= inalienable possession):

(11)a. sin=mi 'my son' b. sinój=mu 'his/her sons'
sin=I+DAT sons=he/she+DAT
zena=mi
wife=I+DAT
'My wife'

To put emphasis on the possessor (and to avoid ambiguity in the 3rd PERS) the pronominal possessive adjectives (or the prepositional phrase in the 3rd PERS) have to be used:

(12) m6ja žéna vs. žéna=mi
my wife (i.e., mea uxor) wife=I+DAT
'My wife'

sín=mu négo/s na toj sín=mu
son+he+DAT his/ to him son=he/she+DAT
'HIS son'

sín=mu néžin/na taja sín=mu
son=she+DAT hers/to her son=she+he+DAT
'HER son'

With the genitive Bulgaro-Macedonian dialects lost also the accusative case (the suffix -a used to express both the genitive and accusative with masculine nouns). Middle Bulgarian presents an intermediate state of affairs when the old ACC/GEN suffix -a may be used after the preposition na:
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(13) | Old       | Middle     | Modern Bulgarian |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM Stojan</td>
<td>Stojan</td>
<td>Stojan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC Stojana</td>
<td>Stojana</td>
<td>Stojan(a)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT Stojanu</td>
<td>na Stojana</td>
<td>na Stojan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A complete loss of the morphological distinction between the subject and object (expressed originally by -1 > -Ø vs. -a) resulted in the cross-indexing of the object in the verbal complex. Macedonian examples are given in (14):

(14)a. čovekot jade
    man=ART eat+AOR+3/SG
    'The man ate'

On the Greek side, the system of four cases was reduced to three during the early Byzantine period. The notion of reception which used to be morphologized by the dative in Hellenistic Greek started being expressed by either the genitive (Southern dialects) or the accusative (Northern and Asia Minor dialects).

The common denominator of this morphological merger in both Slavic and Hellenic was the semantic closeness of the notions of possession and benefit/reception. Ultimately, in both Bulgaro-Macedonian and Greek the semantic functions of possessor and beneficiary/recipient ended up being expressed by the same construction/case. The following examples show the Bulgarian prepositional phrase with na, and the Greek genitive in both functions:

(15) | Possessor  | Recipient/Beneficiary |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'the house of the old man'</td>
<td>'he said to the old man'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>kъštata na starikъt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house=ART to old=ART</td>
<td>mu=reče na starikъt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>to=spiti tu=geronta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART=house ART+GEN=old+OBL</td>
<td>to=ipe tu=geronta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART+GEN=old+OBL +3/SG</td>
<td>ART+GEN=old+OBL +3/SG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In earlier Hellenistic Greek the distinction between possession and reception was weakened or blurred in contexts where Wackerngel's Law

²The suffix -a is used only with anthroponyms (and also with common masculine nouns). If determined by the article, only one form in -ъt functions as both the subject and object (cf. Mladenov 1929: 226).
moved the pronominal clitics into S-2 position as in the following New Testament (NT) examples in (16) and (17):

(16) sy=mou nipteis touς podas [John XIII.6]
you=I+GEN wash+2/SG ART+ACC/PL feet+ACC

‘You are washing feet (un)to me?’

The Vulgate shows the unambiguous dative form tu mihi lavas pedes. However, one could claim that Wackernagel’s Law lifted the clitic from its postnominal position ... podas=mou ‘my feet’, as tacitly assumed by the New English Bible, which translates the above passage ‘You, Lord, washing my feet?’.

Both versions are available in John XI.21 and 32, where Martha said:

(17) Kyrie, ei es hode, ouk an apethanen ho adelphos=mou,

but Mary said: Kyrie, ei es hode, ouk an=mou apethanen ho adelphos.

Strictly speaking, Martha said unambiguously: ‘Lord, if you were here, my brother would not have died’, whereas Mary’s statement can be translated either ‘the brother would not have died unto me’ (with mou expressing Beneficiary ‘unto me’), or ‘my brother would not have died’ (assuming that the clitic mou was placed by Wackernagel’s Law in S-2 position).

4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH SLAVONIC PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS

To facilitate our further discussion we will be referring to Chart 1, which shows the pronominal system of Old Church Slavonic.

---

**Chart 1: The Pronominal System of Old Church Slavonic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>she</th>
<th>we (dual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>azu</td>
<td>ty</td>
<td>ona</td>
<td>vće</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>minē, mi3</td>
<td>tebē, ti</td>
<td>onomu / onemu, emu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC / GEN</td>
<td>mene, mē</td>
<td>te ēē</td>
<td>onu / oni, j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Forms following a comma and printed in *italics* are reduced or clitic forms of the corresponding full pronominal form. Forms following the slash symbol (/) are alternative forms.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ye (dual)</th>
<th>we</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>they (m)</th>
<th>they (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>my</td>
<td>vy</td>
<td>oni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>vama, va</td>
<td>namu, ny</td>
<td>vamu, vy</td>
<td>oněmu / onimu, emu / imu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC / GEN</td>
<td>vaju, va</td>
<td>nasu, ny</td>
<td>vasu, vy</td>
<td>ony / oně</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike in the full forms of the 1st and 2nd PERS, there was no morphological contrast between DAT and ACC/GEN in dual and plural in the clitic forms. In the 3rd person plural the contrast in gender was neutralized in oblique forms, as in ony/oně 'them' (M/F). But the contrast between the full and clitic form was here available (at least in the dative): oněmu/onimu 'to THEM' vs. emu/imu 'to them'.

To judge by our written documents, the usage of the clitics was not well established; in many instances when we expect a clitic form the full form appears. There are even instances of parallel sentences, one with a full form and another one with a clitic form; an example from The Our Father in the Codex Zogrophensis [Matthew vi. 13] is given in (18):

(18) i ne vüvedi nasu vu napastu
    and not lead+IMP we+ACC into temptation
    nu izbavi ny ota nepriězni
    but deliver+IMP we+ACC from evil+GEN
    ‘and lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil’

Another example from the same codex is in (19):

(19) da ne předastu tebe sōpiri sōdii
    that not hand+3/SG YOU+ACC enemy judge+DAT
    i sōdii tě předastu sludzě i vu
    and judge=you+ACC hand + 3/SG constable+DAT and in
    temnico vuvružeta tě
    jail+ACC put+3/SG=you + ACC
    ‘otherwise the enemy may hand you over to the judge, and the judge
to the constable, and he will put you in jail’ [Matthew v. 25; Zogr]

Pronominal clitics expressing the patient and beneficiary/recipient occur typically in post-verbal position (20), but they may also be placed in S-2 position by Wackernagel’s Law (21).
Postverbal clitics:

(20) i sutvorjō vy čkomu lovica
    and make+1/SG=ye people+DAT fishermen
‘and I will make you fishermen of people’ [Matthew iv. 19; Zogr]

S-2 clitics:

(21) da i ubijōtu
    that=him kill+3/PL
‘that they may kill him’ [Mark xiv. 55; Mar]

...zirēašete kade i polagāxō
look+IMPF+2/DU where=him lay+IMPF+3/PL
‘they (2) were looking where they laid him down’4 [Mark xv. 47; Mar]

Examples in (21) show typical phonological hosts, such as the subordinating conjunction da ‘that’ and the relative adverb kāde ‘where’. More rarely, however, even the coordinating conjunction i ‘and’ may host pronominal clitics, as shown in (22), where the reflective pronoun se is attached to it:

(22) i se lice jego obrazy izmēnjaše
    and=REFL face his form+ACC/PL change+IMPF+3/SG
‘and his face changed itself’5 [Supr; Auty 1968: 79]

4Russian Old Church Slavonic does not possess the clitic i ‘him, it’. Contrast OCSI:

    da i obrēzōt
    that him circumcize+3/PL
‘that they (may) circumcize him’ [Lk 2,21; Mladenov 1929:293]
(cf. Bulgarian da go obrēžat)

with Russian OCSI

    da obrēžut ego
    that circumcize+3/PL him
‘that they (may) circumcise him’ [Mladenov 1929:293]

5This usage survived in Modern Bulgarian dialects, but not in Macedonian. Mladenov (1929: 293) compares OCSI John 11, 28:

    učitelѣ se estѣ i zovetѣ tѣ
    teacher here is and calls you
‘the teacher is here and calls you’ [J 11, 28]

with Modern Bulgarian

    učitelѣt e tūk i te vika
    teacher=ART is here and you calls
Further research into the matters of synenclisis involving the forms of the auxiliary (*lu-participle plus verb 'to be'), and various particles and conjunctions (such as the interrogative particle *li; conjunction/particle *že 'and; but') is a desideratum. Broadly speaking the pronominal clitics are placed before the auxiliary, as shown in (23) and (24):

(23) a malo mi jesi dalu
    and a little I+DAT are give+PP
    'and you gave me a little' [Supr; Auty 1968:78]

(24) i togda bo gospod'i mē bē posulalu
    and then for lord I+ACC was send+PP
    'And for then the Lord sent me' [Supr; Auty 1968:80]

Modern Bulgarian preserved the sequence W=PRO=AUX; thus, (24) would be translated:

(25) gospød me bē pratil
    lord me be+AOR+3/SG send+PP
    'the Lord sent me' [Mladenov 1929:293]

Modern Macedonian, however, places the pronominal clitics after the auxiliary in the block of proclitics AUX=PRO=V:

(26) jas sum go pr6dal
    I be+1/SG him/it sell+PP
    'I have sold him/it' [Groen 1977:212]

The interrogative particle *li is placed in S-2 position by Wackemagel's Law (27); similarly, the conjunction/particle *že 'and; but' (which translates the Greek particle dē) is placed in S-2 position and the pronominal clitics follow, as shown in (27):

(27) ne bēxu li ti reklu
    not was+AOR+1/SG =Q =you say+PP
    'Didn't I tell you?' / 'Hadn't I told you?' [Supr; Auty 1968:79]

De Bray (1980:130) exemplifies *'and' and *no 'but', as hosting clitics:

Običaj rođinata si i i služi vjárho
    'Love your country and serve it faithfully'

Diren e i u tjax, no go ne namérili
    'He was sought (i.e., they looked for him) in their house, but they did not find him.'
(28) iegda že i postavišč patriarxa... [Supr; Auty 1968: 79]
when=and=him appoint+ADOR+3/PL patriarch+ACC

‘And when they appointed him patriarch’

blazaženji že to slyšavšč uboia sę [Supr; Auty 1968: 80]
blessed=and=it hear+PART/PERF be-frightened+ADOR+3/Sg REFL

‘Having heard it, the blessed was frightened’

And finally, there are rare instances which anticipate the later Bulgaro-Macedonian cross-indexing of objects by pronominal clitics in the verbal complex:

(29) i edini iunoša etera po and one youth one after
nemi ide ... i iēšē i iunošē he+LOC go+ADOR+3/SP and grab+ADOR+3/PL=him youth+ACC

‘and one youth went after him ... and they grabbed him’ [Mark xiv. 51; Mar]
(literally ‘and they grabbed=him the youth’)

Here we may speculate that the translator was influenced by spoken Macedonian, since i iēšē=i should suffice in literary style (the Greek original has only kai kratoūsin autón ‘and they grab him’, i.e., not *kai kra-
toūsin autôn tòn neanían).
ne, vi vs. ve); and the distinction of gender (OCSI oni ‘they’ (M) vs. ony (F)) was given up in favour of unmarked tie ‘they’.

Non-standard dialects introduced even more far-reaching innovations. The dialect of Dihovo (a western dialect spoken in a village lying about 8 kms to the west of Bitola, described by Groen 1977) gave up the OCSI distinction of DAT vs. ACC in all persons in both numbers; in the plural both full forms (DAT and ACC) are available but either of them can be used to express either the beneficiary or the patient. In addition, the distinction of gender and number on the clitic forms expressing the recipient/beneficiary was lost (Dihovo mu ‘to him/her/them’ vs. Standard Macedonian mu ‘to him’, i ‘to her’, im ‘to them’. The Dihovo system is presented in Chart 3.

Chart 3: Non-standard Macedonian Pronominal System
(dialect of Dihovo) [Groen 1977]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>she</th>
<th>we</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>they</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>jás (ka)</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>toj</td>
<td>tá(j)a</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>vie</td>
<td>tie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>mène,</td>
<td>tebe,</td>
<td>négo/ toj,</td>
<td>néze/ tája,</td>
<td>nas/ nam,</td>
<td>vas/ vam,</td>
<td>ním(i),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>méne,</td>
<td>tebe,</td>
<td>négo/ toj,</td>
<td>néze/ tája,</td>
<td>nas/ nam,</td>
<td>vas/ vam,</td>
<td>tie,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>ve</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some examples of Standard and Dihovo usage are given in (30):

(30)a. toj mène me víde (Both Standard & Dihovo)

‘He saw me’

b. toj nas ne víde (Standard)

‘He saw us’

toj nas/nam ne víde (Dihovo)

‘He saw us’

c. toj nam ni go dáde (Standard)

‘He gave it to us’

toj nam/nas ni go dáde (Dihovo)

‘He gave it to us’
Macedonian personal pronouns are the only class of words which distinguish case. They have special forms when they have a subject function (direct form), and other object (oblique) forms to express functions of the beneficiary/recipient and the goal/patient (in terms of morphology, the dative and the accusative case). The object (oblique) forms distinguish full and clitic forms; the full forms do not distinguish between the dative and accusative (with the difference between standard and non-standard speech as described above) and they have to be used together with the clitic forms which possess this contrast (except when they occur after preposition):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{SUBJECT} & \text{OBJECT} & \text{FULL} \\
\text{(Direct)} & \text{(Oblique)} & \text{CLITIC} \\
jaš & mene & mi \\
\text{DATIVE} & \text{ACCUSATIVE} & me
\end{array}
\]

The nominal beneficiary/recipient (=indirect object) is marked by the preposition na 'to' and crossindexed by the clitic form in the verbal complex:

(31) mu go dáof
he+DAT=it+ACC=gave+1/SG na brát mi (Dihovo)
to brother=I+DAT
'I gave it to my brother'

It should be observed that objective clitics mu (he+DAT) and go (it+ACC) are proclitics whereas the possessive mi (I+DAT) is an enclitic: mu=go=dáof na=brát=mi.

The pronominal beneficiary/recipient may be marked by the same preposition na (na toj 'to him', na tája 'to her') or expressed by the oblique form (négo ‘him’, néze ‘her’); in either case, it has to be crossindexed by the clitic mu which is marked for case (Dative) but not for gender (in Dihovo). The nominal categories of number, gender and case are thus divided between full and clitic forms in that the former ones are marked overtly for number and gender, and the latter ones for number and case.

Examples in (32) show the male recipient (case indicated by mu 3/SG+DAT, and gender indicated by the oblique form with or without preposition na toj/négo) and the female (33) the female recipient (case indicated by mu 3/SG+DAT, and gender by the oblique form with or without preposition na tája/néze).
(32) Pronominal male recipient:

a. mu  go  dáof  na  toj  
3/SG+DAT  it+ACC  gave+1/SG  to  he+DIR

'I gave it to him'

b. mu  go  dáof  négo
3/SG+DAT  it+ACC  gave+1/SG  he+OBL

'I gave it to him'

(33) Pronominal female recipient:

a. mu  go  dáof  na  tája
3/SG+DAT  it+ACC  gave+1/SG  to  she+DIR

'I gave it to her'

b. mu  go  dáof  néze
3/SG+DAT  it+ACC  gave+1/SG  she+OBL

'I gave it to her'

In (32)a. and (33)a. the recipient is marked by the clitic form mu, without the distinction of gender, and crossindexed by the prepositional phrase na toj (M) vs. na tája (F), with the distinction of gender; in (32)b. and (33)b., as above, the recipient is marked by the clitic form mu, and crossindexed by the oblique form négo (M) vs. néze (F), with the distinction of gender.

The nominal patient (direct object) is not marked by any preposition but then it has to be crossindexed – if it is definite – by the pronominal clitic (go 'him', je 'her', i 'them') in the verbal complex; examples are provided in (34):

(34) otvoréte je vráta ta
open+2/PL=her door=ART

'open the door'

otko ímame kóla...
since have+1/PL car

'since we have had a car, …'

go gledam  čoekot
him=watch+1/SG  man=ART

'I am watching the man'

gledam  čoek  nadvor
watch+1/SG  man  outside

'I am watching a man outside'

The pronominal patient is definite and has to be crossindexed by the pronominal clitic, as shown in (30). The sequence: OBL CL V (oblique form –
clitic form – verb) is the marked one, i.e., if the patient or recipient are assigned the pragmatic function of focus (in the sense of Functional Grammar, cf. Dik 1989: 277-88) the oblique form is placed in preverbal position, as was shown in (30) (partially reproduced below). The unmarked counterparts are listed in (35):

(30) a. toj méné me víde
    he I+OBL I+ACC=see+AOR+3/SG
    ‘he saw ME’

c. toj nam ni go dáde
    he we+DAT we+DAT it+ACC give+AOR+3/SG
    ‘he gave it to US’

(35) a. toj me víde méné
    he I+ACC=see+AOR+3/SG I+OBL
    ‘he saw me’

toj ni go dáde nám
    he we+DAT it+ACC give+AOR+3/SG we+DAT
    ‘He gave it to us’

5. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GREEK PRONOMINAL SYSTEM

The Ancient Greek pronominal system is shown in Chart 4 and its Late Medieval/Early Modern C descendant in Chart 5. The latter system – represented e.g. by Erotokritos (17th c.) – is essentially identical with that of Modern Greek.

**Chart 4: The Pronominal System of Ancient Greek**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I (ego)</th>
<th>you (sý)</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>she</th>
<th>we (dual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>emoú, mou</td>
<td>soú, sou</td>
<td>autoú</td>
<td>autéis</td>
<td>nóin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>emé, me</td>
<td>sé, se</td>
<td>autón</td>
<td>autén</td>
<td>nó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ye (dual)</th>
<th>we</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>they (m)</th>
<th>they (f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOM</strong></td>
<td>sphó</td>
<td>ἡμεῖς</td>
<td>ἡμεῖς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>sphóin</td>
<td>ἡμῶν</td>
<td>ἡμῶν</td>
<td>autón</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAT</strong></td>
<td>sphóin</td>
<td>ἡμῖν</td>
<td>ἡμῖν</td>
<td>autoîs</td>
<td>autoîs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACC</strong></td>
<td>sphó</td>
<td>ἡμᾶς</td>
<td>ἡμᾶς</td>
<td>autoús</td>
<td>autás</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 5: The Pronominal System of Early Modern Greek**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>she</th>
<th>we</th>
<th>ye</th>
<th>they (M)</th>
<th>they (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOM</strong></td>
<td>egó</td>
<td>esi</td>
<td>aftós</td>
<td>afti</td>
<td>ēmis</td>
<td>sis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEN</strong></td>
<td>emé(na)/ ménα, μυ</td>
<td>esé(na)/ sénα, su</td>
<td>tóne, (n)tu</td>
<td>tine, (n)τίς</td>
<td>emás/ máse</td>
<td>esás, tóse, (n)τοσ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACC</strong></td>
<td>emé(na)/ ménα, με</td>
<td>esé(na)/ sénα, se</td>
<td>tóne, tine, τίν</td>
<td>emás/ máse</td>
<td>esás, tóse, (n)τοσ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of several phonological changes which took place during the Hellenistic and Roman periods (loss of length, unrounding of [y] > [i], and raising of the front mid ɛ > ɪ) the Early Medieval system lost a number of morphological contrasts. In the second person singular, the contrast between the nominative (σύ > σί) and the dative (σοί > σύ > σί) was lost; in the plural the contrast between all the forms of the 1st person vs. those of the 2nd person was lost (the resulting forms would sound as follows: *imís, *imón, *imín, *imás). There were no clitic forms in the plural sub-paradigm, and in the singular only the 1st person displayed opposition between the full (emú, emé) and the clitic form (mu, me).

Without going into intermediate medieval systems, we want to make some general typological observations from the point of view of one of the Early Modern Greek descendants (Erótokritos, 17th c.). Most notably, the above mentioned contrast full-clitic form in the 1st SG (emé vs. me) supplied a model for all the other persons: 2nd SG esé vs. se, 1st PL emás vs. mas, 2nd PL esás vs. sas. The affix e could be added also at the end of clitic forms to create new full forms: tóne vs. ton, máse vs. mas, sáse vs. sas, and
tôse vs. tos. In the 1st and 2nd person these forms are not found in Modern Greek which possesses only one oblique form in the plural:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Modern Greek</th>
<th>Modern Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'we'</td>
<td>'we'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>emís</td>
<td>emís</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique Full</td>
<td>emás ~ máse</td>
<td>emás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>mas</td>
<td>mas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 3rd person the full forms with -e (tône, tîne, tôse) are found today only as variants of the clitic forms (ton, tin); they were replaced by the accusative forms of the demonstrative pronoun aftós (aftón, aftín, aftús, aftés). The contemporary forms tône and tîne could be a recreation of Modern Greek and need not continue the earlier full forms tône and tîne.⁶

In the full forms the Ancient Greek distinction of the genitive vs. accusative was given up in favour of a single oblique form which continues the old accusative (AGr emé > EMnGr emé(na) ~ ména, AGr hêmás > EMnGr emás).

However, as in Bulgaro-Macedonian, the clitic forms preserve the morphological contrast between the genitive vs. accusative (dative vs. accusative in Bulgaro-Macedonian), which is crucial for the grammaticalization of the semantic functions of the possessor, beneficiary/recipient and patient. Unlike Bulgaro-Macedonian, Greek possesses only one plural clitic form in the 1st and 2nd Person (emás vs. mas, esás vs sas). The Modern Greek case system is thus somewhat anomalous in displaying more nominal (NOM, GEN, ACC) than pronominal (full) forms (NOM and OBLIQUE); languages typically display the opposite ratio (e.g., English), or, they preserve case distinctions with pronouns while they lose them with nouns (e.g. Bulgaro-Macedonian).

The nominal beneficiary/recipient (=indirect object) may be marked by the preposition s(e) ‘to’ (cf. Bulgaro-Macedonian preposition na ‘to’):

(36) díno to=vivlío sto=Jâni
give+1SG ART=book to+ART=John
'I (am) giv(ing) ... a book to John'

⁶ We owe this observation to Brian Joseph (personal communication).
If the pragmatic function of tail⁷ (called more commonly right dislocand) is assigned to this constituent, it has to be crossindexed by the pronominal clitic in the verbal complex (proclitic if the verb is finite):

(37) **tu=to=díno to=vivlió, sto=Jáni**

him=it=give+1/SG ART=book, to+ART=John

'I (am) giv(ing) the book to him, to JOHN’

It should be observed that in (37) the recipient is outside the nuclear predication (Dik 1989: 183ff.). Prosodically, the tail constituent is separated from the nuclear predication by the intonation (expressed orthographically by the comma) which is not present in (36) where the recipient is inside the nuclear predication.

Similarly, the pronominal recipient – if assigned the function of tail – will appear after the intonation break:

(38) **aftós mu=to=édose,**

he I+GEN=it=give+AOR+3/SG,

(s)eména (to)=I+OBL

‘He gave it to ME’

The preposition se is obligatory in cases of double contrastive focus, as shown in (39):

(39) **s=eména édose to=vivlió óxi s=eséna**

to+I+OBL give+AOR+3/SG ART=book not to=you+OBL

‘He gave the book to ME, not to YOU’

The oblique full form may also appear in the position of theme, or, functionally speaking, the beneficiary or patient may be assigned the function of theme,⁸ as shown in (40):

(40)a. **eména θa=mu=filísis to=xéri**

I+OBL FUT=I+GEN=kiss+FUT+2/SG ART=hand

‘To me you will kiss the hand?’ – ‘Will you kiss the hand to me?’

[Kazantzákis, O Χριστός κσανασταύρωνετε]

b. **eména afíste=me**

I+OBL let+AOR+IMP/PL=I+ACC

‘(As far as I am concerned), let me go!’

---

⁷ In Functional Grammar (Dik 1989: 135, Siewierska 1991: 150) ‘the Tail is characterized as an ‘after-thought’ to the predication, i.e., as information meant to clarify or modify some constituent in the predication’.

⁸ In Functional Grammar (Dik 1978:130, Siewierska 1991:150) ‘the Theme is defined as specifying the universe of discourse with respect to which the subsequent predication is presented as relevant’.
Early Modern Greek examples of coreferential theme and tail constituents (from Erotokritos, 17th c.) are given in (41):

(41)a. na=mu=ta=pís eména
that=I+GEN=those=say+AOR+2/Sg I+OBL
‘That you (may) tell those to me’

b. Ke=xáno=se k=eséna
and=lose+I/SG=you+ACC and=you+OBL
‘And I (will) lose you’

c. ma emé=pote de=mú=rese
but I+OBL=ever not=I+GEN=please+AOR+3/SG
‘But (as far as I am concerned) it never pleased me’

The use of the coreferential theme and tail constituents is common in Modern Colloquial Greek, especially in dialects. (42) is an example from the Northern (Macedonian) variety:

(42)a. ki=šéna i=mra š=éduki mia=fúnda maraméni
and=you+OBL ART=fate you+ACC= one=flower withering
give+AOR+3/SG
‘And as far as you are concerned, the fate gave you a withering flower’ [Adamopoulos 1988:39]

6. MACEDONIAN PRONOMINAL CLINICS AS ‘BOUND’ MORPHEMES

Currently, the synchronic status of Modern Greek and Macedonian clitics is a matter of controversy. Spencer (1991: 358 ff.) argues that the clitic doubling phenomenon in Macedonian is similar to object agreement in a language like Chukchee. Similar clitic doubling constructions are also known from Hebrew and Latin-American Spanish (the type lo=vimos à Juan ‘We saw Juan’). According to Spencer (1991: 362), the Greek clitic system also bears much resemblance to that of Macedonian, but he did not elaborate on this point.

Prinz (1991) went into detail and suggested that pronominal clitics of Modern Greek are bound morphemes affixed syntactically to the hosting lexical item. One of his arguments for the affix status of Modern Greek object clitics (p. 170-184) draws on the parallel working of the three-syllable rule. As well-known, this rule moves the accent in inflected forms if an extra syllable is added, e.g., ónoma ‘name’ -> onómatos (Gen), and seemingly also in the clitic group, e.g., káne=to ‘do it!’ -> káne mú=to ‘do it for me!’. However, the parallel is incomplete since one would expect *kané=mu=to by the three-syllable rule. Also, it is not clear to us in which
sense the elision of the stressed vowel of the phonological host after the special clitic (e.g., *ta=exo > tá=xo 'I have them') proves the affix status of Modern Greek special clitics. It is true that the accent in Greek finite forms is assigned by the three-syllable rule, e.g., the active imperfect *édina (1SG), edíname (1PL) 'dress', but there are also affixes which are accented inherently (i.e., the finite forms in which they occur cannot be said to be accented by the three-syllable rule), e.g., the mediopassive imperfect edínómun (1/SG) or the passive future *thá diáðo. On the Macedonian side, however, the three-syllable stress rule treats as a word any content word together with its enclitics, e.g. žénata wife=ART 'the wife', ženáta=ti wife=ART=you+DAT 'your wife', dâjte=mi ‘give me!', dajt€=mi=go ‘give me it’.

But more importantly, as shown above (section 4), the special clitics of Greek do not exclude the full NPs, or, put differently, they do not obligatorily crossindex the recipient/beneficiary and the patient. In this respect, they are different from the special clitics of Macedonian which are obligatory with definite object NPs (including full forms of pronouns).

To argue more convincingly for this point, let us re-examine the Greek examples in (36) and (37), summarized in (43), and their Macedonian equivalents in (44):

(i) gives the nuclear predication without crossindexing the recipient and patient;
(ii) crossindexes the recipient;
(iii) crossindexes the patient;
(iv) crossindexes both the recipient and the patient.

In Greek (43) single and double crossindexing (ii-iv) is available but it is not obligatory. (ii) or (iv) (crossindexing the recipient) is used when the recipient is assigned the pragmatic function of tail in which case there must be an intonation break between the sentence and this constituent. As shown in (iii) and (iv), the patient may be crossindexed only if it is definite.9

On the other hand, the Macedonian counterparts in (44) reveal that:

9 Indefinite patients may be cross-indexed in Modern Greek and Albanian if they are specified (cf. Kazazis and Pentheroudakis 1976); in functional terminology, if they are thematic or contrastive: e.g. ‘speaking of a sweater’ or ‘as for a sweater’ su to plékó éna pulóver, lit. you it knit+1/SG one sweater ‘I’ll knit you one’). For Macedonian, our informant, Ms. Žaklina Beleva (*1964 in Bitola), refused the cross-indexing of indefinite patients in the above contexts as ungrammatical (*ke ti go ispletam eden). This matter should be further investigated (we are grateful to Brian Joseph for drawing our attention to it).
(i) without the recipient and the patient crossindexed the sentence is ungrammatical;
(ii) unlike in Greek – the definite patient has to be crossindexed by the clitic;
(iii) it is not enough to crossindex the definite patient if the recipient is expressed in the sentence.

(43) (i) díno \{ to \} vivlío sto=Jáni
(ii) tu=díno \{ to \} vivlío, sto=Jáni
(iii) to=díno to vivlío sto=Jáni
*to=díno ena
(iv) tu=to=díno to vivlío, sto=Jáni
*tu=to=díno ena

(44) (i) **dávam \{ knígata \} \{ edna kníga \} na=Ivana
(ii) **mu=dávam knígata na=Ivana
    mu=dávam édna kníga na=Ivana
(iii) *ja=dávam knígata na=Ivana
    **ja=dávam édna kníga na=Ivana
(iv) mu=ja=dávam knígata na=Ivana
    *mu=ja=dávam édna kníga na=Ivana

As shown above in (34), in Macedonian the patient is crossindexed only if it is definite. The beneficiary/recipient, however, has to be crossindexed no matter whether it is definite or indefinite:

(45)a. i=dávam na=žénata
    she+DAT=give+1/SG to=woman=ART
    I give [it] to the woman

---

10 We are grateful to Ms. Žaklina Beleva for judging the degree of grammaticality of sentences in (44). A double asterisk (**) indicates a totally unacceptable construction, a single asterisk (*) an unacceptable one. With ditransitive verbs, such as ‘give’ not to cross-index at least one of the beneficiary or the definite patient is totally unacceptable. It is less serious to be unacceptable – not to cross-index the beneficiary than the patient (if the other participant is cross-indexed).
b. i=dávam na(=édna) žéna
    she+DAT=give+1/SG to(=one) woman
    ‘I give [it] to a woman’

Some dialects of Macedonian may crossindex even the indefinite patient provided it is animate:

(46) kači=se gore, da go=gledaš eden čo’ek umren
    get=REFL upstairs that he+ACC=see+2/SG one man dead
    ‘Climb upstairs that you may see a dead man’ [Sandfeld 1930:193]

The data in (45) and (46) indicate that the determining factor for the crossindexing of objects in Macedonian is animacy rather than definiteness.

7. THE TYPOLOGY OF BALKAN PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS

In this section we want to alert the reader to the fact that all the other languages of the Balkan sprachbund use the same strategy of crossindexing of the beneficiary and patient by the pronominal clitics. (Limitations of space will not allow us to comment on the situation in Rumanian).

The Albanian system resembles that of Macedonian. Its clitics behave like ‘affixes’ in that they are obligatory, and their coreferential beneficiary and patient are not separated from the sentence by an intonation break. Appropriate examples are given in (47):

(47)a. Dja-li mori librin e ia dha sè moťrēs
    boy took book+ACC and s/he+DAT gave PRT sister+DAT
    =s/he+ACC
    ‘The boy took the book and gave it to his sister’ [Camaj 1984:265]

b. Ep-ia djalit bukēn
    give=s/he+DAT=s/he+ACC boy+DAT bread+ACC
    ‘Give the boy the bread!’ [Camaj 1984:265]

The whole system of full and clitic forms is displayed in Chart 6.

In the plural subparadigm the Albanian pronominal system grammaticalizes the distinction between recipient / beneficiary vs. patient by full forms (neve DAT vs. ne ACC) whereas Macedonian does it by clitic forms (ni DAT vs. ne ACC). In the singular subparadigm (the 1st and 2nd Person) there is only one oblique full vs. clitic form, respectively (mue/a vs. mē) as in the Greek plural subparadigm. In the 3rd person the morphological contrast between the dative and accusative is observed in both full and clitic forms.
One of the interesting features of the Albanian system is the existence of contracted forms of the sequences of pronominal clitics expressing the beneficiary/recipient and patient. For instance, *ia* in (47) consists of *i* 'him/her' (Dat) and *e* 'him/her' (Acc).

**Chart 6: The Albanian pronominal system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>you</th>
<th>he</th>
<th>she</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOM</strong></td>
<td>unë</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ajë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAT</strong></td>
<td>mue/ a, më</td>
<td>ty, të</td>
<td>(a)tëj, i</td>
<td>(a)saj, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACC</strong></td>
<td>mue/ a, më</td>
<td>ty, të</td>
<td>(a)të, e</td>
<td>(a)të, e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We you they (M) they (F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOM</strong></td>
<td>na/ e</td>
<td>neve, na</td>
<td>ne, na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAT</strong></td>
<td>ju, ju</td>
<td>(a)tyn/re, u</td>
<td>(a)tyn/re, u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACC</strong></td>
<td>(a)të, i</td>
<td>(a)të, i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contracted sequences of the beneficiary/recipient and patient (in the 3rd person) are shown in Chart 7.

**Chart 7: Pronominal beneficiary/recipient and patient in Albanian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary/Recipient</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Underlying Form</th>
<th>Contracted Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>më =e</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>të = e</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>i = e</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>na = e</td>
<td>na e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ju = e</td>
<td>jua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>u = e</td>
<td>ua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>më = i</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>të = i</td>
<td>ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>i = i</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>na = i</td>
<td>na i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ju = i</td>
<td>jua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>u = i</td>
<td>ua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The system neutralizes the distinction in number of the patient (3rd person) after the beneficiary/recipient (in the 3rd person, and the 2nd person.

11 In the chart, 1 denotes 1/SG, 11 denotes 1/PL, 2 denotes 2/SG, etc.
plural), i.e., *ia* is both 'him -it/them', *ua* 'them - it/them', and *jua* 'to ye -it/them'. The number distinction of the patient is shown on the coreferential noun, as shown in (48):

(48)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ia} & \quad \text{'him - it'} & (i^e) & \quad \text{he gave him the book'} \\
\text{ia} & \quad \text{dha} & \quad \text{librin} & \quad \text{gave} & \quad \text{book+ACC} \\
3/SG=3 & & & \text{ia} & \quad \text{'him - them'} & (i^i) & \quad \text{he gave him the books'} \\
\text{ia} & \quad \text{dha} & \quad \text{librat} & \quad \text{gave} & \quad \text{books}
\end{align*}
\]

Put differently, the number contrast with the beneficiary/recipient (*ia* 'him -it/ them' vs. *ua* 'them - it/them') is more important than the contrast with the patient. The former contrast is double-marked, the latter only single-marked.

On the other hand, as shown above in Chart 3, the Macedonian dialect of Dihovo neutralizes the distinction in number of the beneficiary/recipient in the 3rd PERS of clitic forms. The full pronominal form or the nominal form, of course, disambiguates the sequence *mu=go* as either 'him it' or 'them it'; this is shown in (49):

(49)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec=Pat Rec</th>
<th>Rec=Pat Rec</th>
<th>Rec=Pat Rec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mu=go</em></td>
<td><em>négo/na toj</em></td>
<td><em>mu=go ...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lim(i)/</em></td>
<td><em>na tī</em></td>
<td><em>tō them</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him=it...</td>
<td>to him</td>
<td>him=it...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mu=i</em></td>
<td><em>négo/na toj</em></td>
<td><em>mu=i</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lim(i)/</em></td>
<td><em>na tī</em></td>
<td><em>nā tī</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>him=them</td>
<td>to him</td>
<td>him=them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the nonstandard Macedonian dialect of Dihovo, the Albanian, Standard Macedonian and Bulgarian systems possess more full than the clitic forms in the plural subparadigm. In semantic terms, Albanian and Bulgaro-Macedonian grammaticalize the distinction between the beneficiary/recipient vs. the patient by means of the full forms whereas non-Standard Macedonian does it by clitic forms. In Bulgarian, both the nominal and pronominal beneficiary/recipient is marked by the preposition *na* 'to' (*na stārīkst* 'to the old man', *na nas* 'to us'); the archaic (OCSI) full pronominal form *nam* 'to us' survives in some dialects (Mladenov 1929: 240); and the clitic form *ni* is used in both functions of beneficiary/recipient and patient '(to) us'. It is the other way round in non-Standard
Macedonian: the old full forms nam and nas are used indiscriminately for both the beneficiary/recipient and patient, and the distinction is expressed by the clitic form ni (DAT) vs. ne (ACC) in the plural subparadigms. Chart 8 captures this important difference.

Chart 8:
Marking for participants in discourse (in plural) in Bulgarian and Macedonian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Standard Macedonian</th>
<th>Non-standard Macedonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'we'</td>
<td>Full form</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>nie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>na nas</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(archaic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>nas</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>nas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'ye'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>vie</td>
<td>vie</td>
<td>vie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>na vas</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(archaic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>vas</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>vas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant examples are given in (50):

(50) toj nas vide 'He saw us' (Bulgarian)
    toj na nas go dade 'He gave it to us'
    toj nas ne vide 'He saw us' (Standard Macedonian)
    toj nam ni go dade 'He gave it to us'
    toj nam/nas ne vide 'He saw us' (Dihovo)
    toj nam/nas ni go dade 'He gave it to us'

8. CONVERGENCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS OF MACEDONIAN AND GREEK

At this point we may try to establish the causal nexus between the loss of synthetic (morphological) case and the emergence of crossindexing (double-marking) of the recipient / beneficiary and patient by means of the pronominal clitics. On the South-Slavonic side, we may start at the stage of synthetic case represented by OCSI viždo syn+a 'I see the son' and da-doxu go syn+ovi/u 'I gave it to the son' (the patient is marked by the suf-
fix-a and the recipient by the suffix -ovi/u). After the formation of the definite article, early Middle Bulgarian descendants of these two constructions can be reconstructed as shown in (51):

\[(51) \text{glédám } \text{sin+a=togo} \quad \text{‘I see the son’} \]
\[\text{dadox } \text{go sin+u=tomu} \quad \text{‘I gave it to the son’} \]

During the Early New Bulgarian period (as represented by the so-called Damaskins) both forms sinutomu (double-marked for dative) and sinotomu (only tomu is marked for dative) are documented (cf. Mladenov 1929: 248, and Stölting 1970: 184-7 for actually documented examples such as gospodárutomu ‘to the housekeeper’ vs. ángelotomu ‘to the angel’). In our survey of the the literature, the form *sinotogo is not documented, whereas the double-marked sinatógo is common. To assign the pragmatic function of focus to the patient or recipient the strategy of crossindexing (double-marking) by the pronominal clitics was developed. The same effect, of course, could be achieved by intonation:

\[(52) \text{glédám}=\text{go} (\text{go}=\text{glédám}) \text{ sina=togo} \quad \text{‘I see the SON} \quad \text{(i.e., not someone else’)} \]
\[\text{dádox}=\text{mu}=\text{go} (\text{mu}=\text{go}=\text{dádox}) \text{ sinu=tomu} \quad \text{‘I give it to the SON} \quad \text{(i.e., not to someone else’)} \]

In subsequent development, the case marking on the postpositive article (=demonstrative pronoun) was lost and we reach the modern Bulgarian (53) and Macedonian (54) stage:

\[(53) \text{glédam}=\text{go} \text{ sina} \quad \text{‘I see the SON’} \quad \text{(Bulgarian)} \]
\[\text{dádox}=\text{mu}=\text{go} \text{ na=sina} \quad \text{‘I gave it to the SON’} \]
\[(54) \text{go}=\text{glédam} \text{ sinot} \quad \text{‘I see the son’} \quad \text{(Macedonian)} \]
\[\text{mu}=\text{go}=\text{dádov} \text{ na=sinot} \quad \text{‘I gave it to the son’} \]

There are two important differences in the outcome of this historical process. In Macedonian – but not in Bulgarian – the strategy of crossindexing the focal patient and the recipient / beneficiary was demarked. The Bulgarian equivalents of the Macedonian sentences do not display the coreferential pronominal clitics:

\[(55) \text{glédam sina} \quad \text{‘I see the son’} \quad \text{(Bulgarian)} \]
\[\text{dádox}=\text{go na sina} \quad \text{‘I gave it to the son’} \]

The other difference concerns the direction of clisis. In Bulgarian the clitics are attached to the finite verb forms by Wackernagel’s Law in S-2
position as enclitics, whereas in Macedonian the clitics are attached to the finite verb form as proclitics (with the exception of the imperative).

Modern Greek went as far as Middle Bulgarian before the loss of case marking on the definite articles; with the exception of the article being postpositive in Bulgaro-Macedonian but prepositive in Greek, the sentences in (52) have exact parallels in Early Modern Greek texts:

\[
(56) \quad \text{vlépo=ton} \quad (\text{ton=vlépo}) \quad \text{ton=jó(n)} \\
\text{see}+1/\text{SG}=\text{him} \quad (\text{him=see}+1/\text{SG}) \quad \text{ART=}\text{son} \\
\text{‘I see the son’} \\
\text{édosa}=\text{tu}=\text{to} \quad (\text{tu}=\text{to}=\text{édosa}) \quad \text{ston=jó(n)} \\
\text{gave}+1/\text{SG}=\text{you}=\text{it} \quad (\text{you}=\text{it}=\text{gave}+1/\text{SG}) \quad \text{to=}\text{ART=}\text{son} \\
\text{‘I gave it to the son’}
\]

That is, the article is marked for case \((\text{ton=}\text{ACC}, \text{ston=}\text{DAT})\) while the noun does not have to be marked by \(-n\) for the oblique case (ACC or DAT); cf. Bulgaro-Macedonian after the loss of case marking on nouns: \(\text{da}=\text{dox}=\text{mu}=\text{go} \text{ sinotomu}\) (earlier \(\text{sinutomu}\)). In its later development Modern Greek concurred with Macedonian in favoring the strategy of proclisis with finite verb forms\(^{12}\) (but enclisis is used widely in non-standard epicthoric dialects), cf. Greek and Macedonian vs. Bulgarian:

\[
(57) \quad \text{ton=vlépo, ton=jó} \quad (\text{Greek}) \quad \text{proclisis} \\
\text{go}=\text{glédam sinot} \quad (\text{Macedonian}) \quad \text{proclisis} \\
\text{vs.} \quad \text{glédam}=\text{go, sínà} \quad (\text{Bulgarian}) \quad \text{enclisis} \\
\text{tu}=\text{to}=\text{édosa, ston=jó} \quad (\text{Greek}) \quad \text{proclisis} \\
\text{mu}=\text{go}=\text{dádov na=sínot} \quad (\text{Macedonian}) \quad \text{proclisis} \\
\text{dádox}=\text{mu}=\text{go, na=sínà} \quad (\text{Bulgarian}) \quad \text{enclisis}
\]

\(^{12}\)As far as we can tell, the observation that the divergence between Macedonian and other Slavic languages is due to Greek influence was first made by Joseph (1983: 239).
participle the auxiliary may precede or follow the block of clitics, while the interrogative particle *i* separates them from the main verb (PP=*li=*AUX=*mu*=go or PP=*li=*mu*=go=AUX); in Macedonian, the auxiliary is placed at the beginning of the block of proclitics – with the pronominal clitics attached immediately to the verb – while the interrogative particle *i* is placed by Wackernagel's Law after the main verb (AUX=*mu*=go=PP=*li*).

In Bulgarian, the negative particle may host the clitic block *mu*=go (attached by Wackernagel's Law) with the interrogative particle *i* attached to the main verb or intervening between the clitics (NEG=*mu*=Q=go); or, the negative particle may host the auxiliary and the interrogative particle (NEG=AUX=Q) with the clitic block *mu*=go attached to the past participle (*mu*=go=PP). On the other hand, the only option of Macedonian is to place the auxiliary before and the interrogative particle after the block of pronominal proclitics plus the finite verb form: AUX=(mu=go=PP)=Q. The following data exemplify all the above options:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(58)</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Dáli=li=mu=go=e?</td>
<td>Mu=go=dál=li?</td>
<td>'Did he give it to him?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>Dáli=li=si=mu=go?</td>
<td>Si=mu=go=dál=li?</td>
<td>'Did you give it to him?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Dáli=li=mu=go=si?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii</td>
<td>Né=mu=go.dái=li</td>
<td>Ne=mu=gó=dál=li?</td>
<td>'Didn’t he give it to him?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Né=mu=li=go=e dáí?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Né=si=li mu=go=dál?</td>
<td>Ne=si=mu=gó=dál=li?</td>
<td>'Didn’t you give it to him?'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Macedonian state of affairs may be described insightfully by assuming the existence of the block of pronominal proclitics (*mu*=go) plus the finite verb form (past participle in 50 (i-iv)). The negative particle *ne* and the finitizing auxiliary are added as proclitics to this block, while the interrogative particle *i* is attached by Wackernagel’s Law as an enclitic to this block. Summarily: NEG=AUX=(mu=go=PP)=Q. The interrogative particle may also be cliticized to the negative particle (e.g. né=li mi=ja=dónese knígata ‘Didn’t he bring the book to me?’) or to the auxiliary (né=bév=li ti=ja=dónel knígata ‘Hadn’t he bring the book to you?’), cf. Kubes (1988: 288). In either case the block of pronominal proclitics appears immediately before the finite verb form or PP.

The Bulgarian state of affairs is more complicated as a consequence of its free accent and a larger scope of the application of Wackernagel’s Law. As 58 (i) and (ii) show, the past participle may host not only the sentential...
interrogative particle *li* but also the auxiliary and the block of pronominal clitics *mu=go*; and the order auxiliary and the block of pronominal clitics appears to be interchangable: PP=Q=AUX=(mu=go) or PP=Q=(mu=go) =AUX13.

If the predicate is negated, the negative particle may host the block of pronominal clitics *mu=go* with the interrogative particle attached to the main verb or intervening between the clitics; (iii) or, the negative particle may host the auxiliary with the interrogative particle attached by Wackernagel's Law and the block of pronominal clitics appearing before the past participle, (iv). In other words, the block of pronominal clitics in Bulgarian is not so closely knit as in Macedonian since the interrogative particle may intervene between the dative and the accusative clitic: NEG=m=mu=go = Q=go.

Given the internal word-like stability of the block *mu=go=PP* in Macedonian – unlike in Bulgarian the block of clitics *mu=go* is never interrupted by the interrogative particle (cf. iii and iv), and it cannot be separated from its PP by this particle (cf. i and ii) and the auxiliary (cf. ii and iv) – it might be argued that the morpheme boundary + would capture more adequately the affix-like status of *mu* and *go*: #mu+go+dal#.

9. CONCLUSIONS

As argued in section 6, the Macedonian special clitics stand a better chance to qualify for the status of ‘bound’ morphemes than those of Modern Greek; in section 8 it was demonstrated that for different reasons the Macedonian clitics are better candidates for the status of ‘bound’ morphemes than those of closely related Bulgarian. More work remains to be done on the clitics of Albanian: in section 7, we highlighted their typological similarity with those of Macedonian. In Albanian the block of clitics Beneficiary /Recipient=Patient (Chart 7) exhibits similar word-like stability in that it cannot be interrupted by any other element. However, in both Albanian and Macedonian these clitics (or the block of clitics) keep the limited freedom of movement (typical of clitics) in that they attach as enclitics to the non-finite forms (and imperatives) but as proclitics to the finite verb forms and *l*-participles in Macedonian; contrast *dark=mu=ja knigata na=nego* ‘give the book to me’ with *tój mu=ja=dál knigata na=nego* ‘he

13According to Englund (1977: 110). However, both Mr. Valeri Stančev (*1955 in Sophia) and Dr. Svillen Stančev (*1957 in V. Turnovo) judged 58 (ii) *dál=li=mu=go=sì* to be ungrammatical. They also refused NEG=m=mu=go=Q AUX=PP or NEG=m=mu=Q=go AUX=PP given by Englund (1977: 114).
gave the book to him' (cf. the Albanian example in (47)). Even the fact that in verbal morphology the inflectional prefixes are apparently less common than the suffixes (but we are not aware of any statistics) might be an argument against their recognition as bound morphemes. Another counter-argument is the fact that – at least in Indo-European languages – one is used to think of agreement markers in terms of subject agreement markers. In other words, more convincing examples for the affix-like status of clitics crossindexing the object would be furnished by languages where the clitic crossindexing the subject might also crossindex the object. Within the Indo-European family of languages several Iranian ergative languages exhibit this phenomenon (cf. Bubenik 1989 for details). For instance, in Pashto the same morpheme \textit{am} expresses the 1st PERS subject in the present (suffix +\textit{am}) and the 1st PERS object in the past (clitic =\textit{am}):

\begin{align*}
(59) & \quad \text{za yam} \\
& \quad \text{I+DIR be+1/SG} \\
& \quad \text{I am'} \\
& \quad \text{tā za wālid=am} \\
& \quad \text{you+OBL I+DIR see+PP=1/SG} \\
& \quad \text{you saw me'}
\end{align*}

Kurdish data (dialect of Suleimaniye, Bynon 1979) are similarly complicated:

\begin{align*}
(60)a. & \quad \text{min ēwa=m bīnī} \quad \text{b. bīnī+m+in} \\
& \quad \text{I ye=1/SG see+P} \quad \text{see+P+1/SG+2/PL} \\
& \quad \text{I saw ye'} \quad \text{I saw ye'} \\
(61)a. & \quad \text{ēwa min abin+in} \quad \text{b. a+m+bin+in} \\
& \quad \text{ye I see+1/PL} \quad \text{PREV+1/SG+see+2/PL} \\
& \quad \text{Ye see me'} \quad \text{Ye see me'}
\end{align*}

In Kurdish (Suleimaniye) the same morpheme \textit{m} encodes both the 1st PERS subject in the past and the 1st PERS object in the present. More specifically, in (60) a. =\textit{m} is attached phonologically to the object as a clitic expressing the 1st PERS subject; in (60) b. the same phonological entity \textit{m} may be considered as the suffix of the 1st SG, +\textit{m}, attached in the appropriate position after the verb by a morphological rule; in (61) b. \textit{m} encoding the 1st

\footnote{The situation is quite different in the Afro-Asiatic phylum. In Semitic languages the subject agreement markers in the imperfect are prefixes but those in the perfect suffixes (e.g. Classical Arabic \textit{hw}w\textit{u} y\textit{k}t\textit{u}b\textit{u} 'he will write' vs. \textit{hw}w\textit{a} k\textit{a}t\textit{a}b\textit{a} 'he wrote'). A major typological and diachronic cross-linguistic study of these matters is a desideratum (cf. Bubenik 1993).}
PERS object appears inserted between the preverb and the verbal root as the prefix \( m+ \).

With this typological note – which gives an indication of our ongoing research – we wish to conclude our study. It is needless to say that much more remains to be done on the Balkan data both synchronically and diachronically before evaluating them in a broader typological context of other I-E and non-I-E languages.
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