BEITRÄGE

Explaining compelling similarities
in Macedonian and Montenegrin dialects:
Perfects and adjectival participles[1]

Matthew C. Curtis (Columbus)

0. Introduction

In a brief article, Robert Greenberg (2000) discusses similarities between Macedonian and Montenegrin dialects that are uncommon from the perspective of other Slavic languages, giving two possible explanations: they are either "random linguistic parallels" or evidence of a convergence area outside of the most commonly-accepted boundaries of the Balkan Sprachbund. While Greenberg satisfactorily shows that random occurrence is not a sufficient explanation, he focuses on the evidence from Slavic dialects for an "uninterrupted Slavic speech continuum from Montenegro through … Western Macedonia" to the exclusion of evidence from other languages in the region, most notably Albanian.

This current paper aims to provide some provisional answers to the question, underlying Greenberg's article: "Why are there structural similarities in Western Macedonian and Southwestern Montenegrin that are strikingly different from other Slavic speaking communities?" Ultimately Greenberg concludes that the similarities are evidence of a Slavic language continuum that historically included both Slavic communities, but he also suggests that Albanian dialects in contact with these Slavic languages should be studied to identify their possible influences. Although both aspects of language contact are not necessarily irreconcilable, I will argue that these similarities presented by Greenberg, when taken together with other structural convergences presented below, are such that intimate contact with Albanian must be considered

---

part of the explanation; that is, an uninterrupted dialect continuum is not a sufficient explanation, and contact with Albanian provides a more complete answer. In this paper I cite the linguistic evidence provided by Greenberg, compare it to the situation in neighboring Albanian dialects, and expand the analysis for one particular structural similarity, the formation of perfect tenses. This sample case of perfect constructions is a piece of a far larger project, but in and of itself also contains information relevant to the types of language change encountered in Slavic-Albanian contact situations.

1. Sprachbünde and the Processes of Language Contact-Induced Change

As Albanian and Macedonian are central members of the Balkan Sprachbund structural similarities and mutual influence between the languages are expected. Structural similarities are not rigidly constrained within the conventional Sprachbund boundaries, as HAMP (1989), SAWICKA (1997), and GREENBERG (2000) and others illustrate; these authors specifically show that dialects of Southeastern Montenegro also have linguistic similarities that may have arisen from language contact with other languages of the Balkans. As is well known, mere similarities do not make a sufficient basis for a claim of linguistic convergence; as CAMPBELL et al. (1986) argue, a historical and comparative perspective is necessary to show that linguistic similarities are not the result of chance, universality, or common descent. Thus, in addition to comparing the peculiarities to other related dialects, in this paper I will also provide a brief historical as background to the speech communities, compare the given phenomena with those in other dialects in the individual language families, and refer to typological frequency to show that these similarities are not the result of chance or historical descent.

While it is common knowledge among linguists that "Balkanisms" – common elements (particularly *morphosyntactic* elements) among Balkan languages – have arisen from language contact in the Balkans, often the exact historical developments are obscure. Perhaps the main task for researchers of Balkan linguistics is to explain the historical processes behind these convergences as much as possible. While there are many frameworks detailing the processes of contact-induced change (including WEINREICH 1953; THOMASON/KAUFMAN 1988; MYERS-SCOTTON 2002), here I will analyze the similarities based on Frans VAN COETSEM's (1988/2000) framework of contact-induced change, focusing on his concept of imposition. His framework has the advantage of focusing on the speaker's individual linguistic competencies, and it provides clear-cut expectations for results from the processes that he outlines[2].

In VAN COETSEM's framework, two processes regularly occur in language contact situations: *borrowing* and *imposition*[3]. Borrowing happens when a very speaker of one

---

2   VAN COETSEM's framework has been recommended most highly by WINFORD (2005) in his critique of the frameworks explaining language contact.

3   VAN COETSEM also includes a third process in the 2000 version of the book – *neutralization*. Neutralization occurs when neither of the languages is linguistically dominant for the speaker. Unlike the processes of imposition and borrowing, it is not possible to predict the level or area of language that the results of neutralization will affect. It is very possible that

language takes a form from another language and uses it in his/her own language. The form is imitated and then adapted to that speaker's linguistic system. Van Coetsem calls this process "recipient language agentivity", because the speaker adapts words from another language (the source language). An example of borrowing is an English speaker using French words, like *déjà vu* in an English sentence, which very well may not occur with the same French articulation [ü]. Borrowing, for van Coetsem, is largely limited to the lexical sphere of language; structure, perhaps, is seldom or never borrowed directly, but usually only indirectly through lexical items and phrases[4]. Over time the borrowings may become indistinguishable from "native" words for individuals and communities.

In contrast, imposition (similar to historical linguistics' *substrate* (or *adstratum*) *influence* and second language acquisition's *transfer*) involves source-language agentivity, in which a speaker imposes his/her own linguistic structure on the recipient language. Van Coetsem gives the example of imposition of a French speaker speaking English, and pronouncing 'pit' with an unaspirated *p*. In the process of acquiring another language, imposition is responsible for the development of "foreign accents" and atypical grammatical structures in the second language. The main result of imposition is the appearance of forms from the speaker's dominant language (the source language) in the recipient language; thus imposition yields converging structures between the source language and the recipient language, where borrowing does not necessarily do so. Prolonged contact in an imposition situation often leads to a simplification of structures learned in the non-dominant language, while preserving structures common to both languages.

Borrowing and imposition should not be seen as contradictory but rather as complementary; they may occur simultaneously but yield opposite results. For instance, an English speaker saying *déjà vu* imposes her own phonology on the borrowed word[5]. In both processes, the determining factor is the speaker's competence in the language: if the recipient language is dominant, then the speaker imposes her structure on her use of the source language; if the source language is dominant, then the speaker incorporates borrowed material into her dominant language. A speaker's language dominance or fluency may change over the course of a lifetime, so that the recipient and the source languages may be reversed, thus imposing non-native structures from the linguistically dominant second language into the native, but now less-

---

neutralization is the process whereby some of the changes discussed below may have come about, but, because there is no *a priori* expectation of the results of neutralization, it is quite difficult, if not impossible, to identify as the process by which these similarities may have resulted.

4   This is a major difference between van Coetsem's framework and the others mentioned. Thomason/Kaufman (1988) claim that structure can be borrowed in very intense situations, while van Coetsem deals with "typical" language contact situations, thus treating it as rare.

5   For instance, in the case of the English speaker saying *déjà vu* given above, he imposes his own phonology on the borrowed word; thus both processes occur simultaneously. In van Coetsem's framework the language proficiency determines what system of structure will be imposed and what can be considered "borrowing".

proficient language. This process seems to potentially explain many structural changes in the Balkan languages. It is singled out by JOSEPH and FRIEDMAN in their book on the Balkan Languages (to appear), who call this influence of a second language on the first *reverse interference*.

The historical evidence for positing imposition as the mechanism of linguistic convergence in Albanian contact with Slavic comes from both the social setting in which the languages have interacted for the past millennium and a half and linguistic details of bordering dialects — a broad range of structural similarities between languages that are not "genetically" related. While imposition explains many structural convergences in the dialects of Montenegro and Macedonia, it does not explain all their differences from other surrounding Slavic dialects. Still, this formulation of imposition is a good basis for researching the structural outcomes of several generations of bilingualism in the region.

To investigate the processes of linguistic convergence that has occurred in the Western Balkans, I first turn to anthropological evidence and diachronic linguistic developments of the languages involved, and then to specific structural similarities between Albanian and its neighboring languages. I next consider one of these structural similarities cited by GREENBERG (2000) in more detail — perfect constructions. I show that imposition of Albanian in Montenegro is more likely, whereas the case for Albanian imposition on Macedonian dialects is somewhat less compelling, although still informative.

2. Language histories and relatedness

The earliest records from Western European anthropologists and folklorists in the Western Balkans date only to the mid-late Nineteenth Century and are heavily influenced by Romantic conceptions about nation and identity. However, in spite of the late attestation and description of the sociolinguistic situation, specialists have been able to reconstruct some of the history of Montenegrins and northern Albanians before the Ottoman conquest of the Balkans with the help of the oral records of the tribes (which can date back some 13 or 14 generations) (DURHAM 1928). Subsequent anthropological and dialectal work has revealed that there has existed for quite some time a close interaction between Montenegrin and Albanian tribes, and that many of the tribes trace their origins back into the other ethnic group. Intermarriage between tribes was especially influential in facilitating bilingualism; because the tribes regarded incest and endogamy as tremendous social taboos, marriages were often contracted with tribes who were believed not to be related (SOBOLEV 2007; DURHAM 1928). This resulted in many marriages between tribes that identified with the other ethnic group, necessitating functional bilingualism for a significant section of the population (DURHAM 1928). Certainly there was tremendous social intercourse among the tribes that necessitated bilingualism and made imposition of linguistic structures possible from one language to the other. The situation of Albanian and Slavic contact in Macedonia is different in that intermarriage was less common than in Montenegro, however it is certain that both languages have been in continual contact for the past several centuries (MURATI 2000). Albanian-Slavic bilingualism is higher for Albanians than for Slavs, and a similar situation can thus be assumed for

the past. Although not the focus of this particular article, the presence and multilingualism of the Arumanians in both areas add to the complexity of both the historical sociolinguistic setting and the historical development of the dialects.

The Slavic dialects in Montenegro and Macedonia are very similar to other South Slavic dialects. At the same time, however, the dialects sharing the same territory as Albanian speech communities have many structural features similar to each another, yet different from almost all other Slavic languages. These structural differences appear in three basic areas of linguistic structure: phonology, morphology, and syntax. While it is theoretically conceivable that common features in peripheral Montenegrin and Macedonian dialects are the result of a dialect continuum that branched away from the other South Slavic languages, as Greenberg suggests, it is traditionally assumed that from a (genetic) historical perspective Macedonian belongs to the eastern branch of South Slavic languages with Bulgarian, while Montenegrin dialects belong with the Western South Slavic languages, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Slovenian. Furthermore, anthropological accounts and linguistic evidence from Albanian argue against this type of dialect-continuum description. Moreover, the groups are not necessarily contiguous as they are divided from one another by Albanian communities[6].

Albanian is universally acknowledged as an Indo-European language, but it is not generally grouped together with a lower-level language unit like Slavic, Germanic or Romance. Albanian is divided into two main dialect areas, Geg in the north, and Tosk in the south. These are further divided into subdialects. Of importance for this study are the Northeastern Geg dialect near and in Northwestern Macedonia, the Northern Tosk dialect in Southwestern Macedonia, and the Northwestern Geg dialect in and around Montenegro. Although Albanian shows many influences from Slavic (mainly in the form of lexical borrowings), Slavic and Albanian are not related by common descent outside of their common Indo-European heritage[7]. Thus the similarities in phonemic systems between Albanian and its neighboring Slavic languages, Macedonian and Montenegrin (and Serbian) are less likely to be the result of common historical development or chance than the result of imposition of Albanian bilingualism on the Slavic dialects.

---

6   Because the selection of literary languages among dialects depends on a number of factors not directly related with the features of the dialects (that is, the selection is usually based on political expediency more than the structures of dialects), evidence for imposition must be taken from dialects next to or overlapping with Albanian dialects and not from the standard languages.

7   There are some historical developments dating from the end of Proto-Indo-European and for sometime thereafter that Slavic, Baltic, and Albanian (and perhaps Germanic) may have been more closely related than other IE languages, as they experienced common changes, such as the merger of PIE *o and *a, the merger of voiced aspirate stops and voiced unaspirated stops, the composition of numbers 6–10 with a suffix of *-ti, and others, see CIMOCHOWSKI (1961) and HAMP (1966 and 1992).

3. Contemporary synchronic linguistic evidence of imposition

In addition to the anthropological findings that show flexible relationships between the Slavic and Albanian tribes (as well as other ethnic groups in the Balkans), synchronic linguistic evidence shows strong evidence for intimate contact among the groups. Because of the number of languages involved in the Sprachbund convergences in the Balkans, it is often impossible to specify which languages are responsible for the spread of which features. As such, conclusions reached by looking at only a couple of languages may be valid only for a small region – and may still be very tenuous at that. With that precaution in mind, I believe that we can see convergences in the structures of Slavic dialects in areas surrounding Albanian-speaking regions as exhibiting the structural convergence predicted in van Coetsem's framework for imposition; this is especially true in Montenegro, but also to a lesser extent in Macedonian dialects. In particular, evidence from the dialects of Western Montenegro and Southwestern Montenegrin shows convergences with Albanian dialects in phonology, morphology, and syntax, beyond general "Balkan" features.

If imposition had been the mechanism for these changes in the Slavic dialects, we would expect across-the-board changes in the dialects that would have the most contact with Albanian and the greatest number of Albanian-dominant bilinguals; that is, many levels of linguistic structure, such as phonology, morphology, and syntax in the recipient language (here Slavic) would be likely to show characteristics of the donor and linguistically dominant language. The following data on the relevant Slavic dialects provided by Greenberg (2000), when compared to Albanian equivalences given below, indicates that structural similarities do, in fact, exist in phonology, morphology, and syntax (3.1., 3.2., and 3.3. respectively). This discussion is not meant as an exhaustive treatment of the contact-induced changes in the languages, just as a follow-up to the evidence given by Greenberg (2000). Indeed as the work done by Stanišić (1995) shows, such examples could be multiplied several-fold. Section 4 will present a more detailed account of one of these features, perfect constructions, and will suggest how these selected features might be analyzed to determine whether or not these "across-the-board" convergences should be attributed to Albanian imposition, language-internal developments, or other source languages.

3.1. Phonology

The first correspondence in (1) is the phonological distinction of laterals. Albanian and Macedonian dialects have a distinction between a "clear *l*" (alveolar lateral) and a "dark *l*" (velarized alveolar lateral) as opposed to the distinction between an alveolar lateral <л> and a palatal lateral <љ> found in other dialects of Macedonian. Greenberg (2000) records that, in dialects that have come into contact with Albanian, many non-standard pronunciations of *l* are found: "The clear *l* is often interpreted in the Slavic dialects as a combination of *l* + *j* or a palatal *lj* [as shown in 1b]. Otherwise, the Slavic dialects lose palatal *lj*, replacing it with a dark *l* [(1a)]".

1a)   Western Macedonian l' > l
    – ključ > kluč 'key'
    – prijatelj > prijatel 'friend'

 – košulja > košula 'shirt'
(GREENBERG 2000: 298)

1b) Southeast Montenegrin
  i.   mislit > misljit 'to think'
  ii. cipele > cipelje 'shoes'
  iii. moliš > mol'iš 'you pray'
  (GREENBERG 2000: 298)

1c) Albanian laterals
  i.   vëllai (velarized *l*) 'brother'
  ii. lule (alveolar *l*)   'flower'

The examples in (1) suggest that the distinction has been imposed, as laterals that were not etymologically palatal have been velarized. This very well may be the result of the Albanian phonological system being imposed; that is, speakers dominant in Albanian interpreting these similar phonological structures through the Albanian phonological system. Serbian dialectologist Pavle Ivić (1994) further notes that Montenegrin dialects with the most contact with Albanian have a common alternation with *j* and *ll*, that is common in Albanian phonology as in Albanian *pyll ~ pyj* 'forest' (singular and plural). Eric HAMP (2004) also has suggested that speakers of Albanian helped to shape the rich system of lateral distinctions and alternations in Serbian. In a similar vein, I would argue that the distinctions in the laterals in Macedonian and Montenegrin dialects have been remade according to the Albanian system, with contrasts of clear versus dark *l* rather than palatal and alveolar, and that their outcomes can be explained by imposition of Albanian phonology on the Slavic languages. Indeed, STANIŠIĆ confirms that the Albanian-type distinction of laterals holds throughout Slavic dialects of Kosovo and Southeast Montenegro (1995: 50).

Further evidence for imposition on the phonological level is the development of the voiced dental affricate [dz] (othographically marked as <s> in Macedonian and the Montenegrin orthography proposed by NIKČEVIĆ (2001) and <x> in Albanian). For the Slavic dialects, this is a remnant of Common Slavic velar palatalizations; in Albanian, it occurs quite infrequently in the standard language, mainly in onomatopoeic or expressive speech. However its use is more widespread in dialectal speech. Furthermore, because its phonemization in Albanian is quite recent (at the earliest from the Middle Ages (TOPALLI 2003), it may be that the influence between the languages is mutually reinforcing for this feature.

2a) preservation and expansion of voiced dental affricate in Macedonian
  i.   zvezda > **dz**vezda 'star'
  ii. nodze > no**dz**e (preserved) 'legs/feet'
  (GREENBERG 2000: 298)

2b) The rise of the phoneme [dz] in Montenegrin[8]
  i.   zeleno > **dz**eleno 'green'

---

8   GREENBERG suggests that the emergence of [dz] may be the result of Aromanian influence, although he does not expand on this idea.

    ii. zubi > **dz**ubi 'teeth'
    iii. jezero > je**dz**ero 'lake'
    iv. bronzin > bron**dz**in 'bronze'
    (GREENBERG 2000: 298)

2c)   Albanian presence of voiced dental affricate \<x> [dz]
    i. **xix**ë [dzidzə] 'spark'
    ii. **xec** [dzets] 'tar, pitch'

The distribution of [dz] argues in favor of Albanian imposition, because it is present in all of the Western Macedonian dialects, except for the dialects which also do not have the voiced alveolar palatal affricate (VIDOESKI 2005: 25) and are in less contact with Albanian than the other the Western dialects. Likewise, Ivić also notes that this sound occurs in the southernmost dialects of Montenegro, again those with the most contact with Albanian, while most dialects of Serbian maintain a [z] in these positions. Although Albanian also has a fricative [z] and an affricate [dz] (graphically \<x>), the [dz] may be more salient, because of its greater frequency and its treatment not as a cluster, but as a single phoneme. Moreover, because a change from a voiced sibilant fricative to a voiced sibilant affricate, is typologically more unusual (ZYGIS 2007), the explanation of language contact is even more compelling[9].

3.2. Morphology

As compared to other Slavic languages, Macedonian has a much less elaborate case system, where the maximal distinction is for three different cases, nominative/vocative/oblique. These distinctions, moreover, exist only in masculine names and kinship terms (FRIEDMAN 2002). Against this background of Macedonian dialects in general, the preservation of case declension in W. Macedonia (3a) may be an instance of convergence with Albanian. This, however, would not be an innovation, but rather the preservation of a structure common to both language systems involved, a process in language contact that is not completely explained by VAN COETSEM's framework, but which seems to be at work in several of the similarities between Albanian and neighboring Slavic dialects.

3a)   Preservation of proper noun and kinship term declensions in W. Mac.
    i. Mu   rekov   Mark**otu** / Mark**ovi**
        3SG.DAT.CLITIC   say.1SG.AOR   Mark.DAT
        "I told Marko."

    ii. Mu   rekov   tetk**i** / tetk**e**
        3SG.DAT.CLITIC   say.1SG.AOR   aunt.DAT
        "I told the aunt."
        (VIDOESKI 2005: 20)

---

9   One further piece of evidence for imposition is in the change of [x] > [f] which is in all of the areas considered, but because this is also typologically common, it should be considered only ancillary evidence (FRIEDMAN 1979 *inter alia*).

3b) Albanian oblique case declensions (also valid in Northwestern Geg)

    i.   I   thashë   Mark**ut**

        3SG.DAT.CLITIC   say.1SG.AOR   Mark.DAT

        "I told Marko."

    ii. I   thashë   tez**ës**

        3SG.DAT.CLITIC   say.1SG.AOR   aunt.DAT

        "I told the aunt."

In Montenegrin and Albanian, however, declension of the nouns for dative and other cases is obligatory, so evidence from those languages does not show any overt structural convergence.

The data in (3) also show two other important converging features between Albanian and Western Macedonian dialects. The first is the possible positioning of clitics as the first element in a sentence. Elsewhere in the Slavic languages, clitics are ordinarily placed as a second element (either phonological or syntactic) in a clause, as in Serbian, or else positioned relative to the verb, as in Bulgarian. While it is possible that the sentence initial clitics in Macedonian may be due to a localized contact with Albanian (where it is also found immediately preceding the verb) this construction also occurs elsewhere in Balkan languages, namely Arumanian and Greek; hence, in principle, first-position clitics is not necessarily a localized phenomena, but rather a shared linguistic feature of many dialects in the Western Balkans.

The second morphological similarity between Albanian and Macedonian dialects is the use of a single clitic for all genders in third person singular shown in (4). As linguistic systems in contact are often reduced in the number of distinctions, this reduction of three genders to one for the Bitola dialects may be an example of the reduction of linguistic systems that often accompanies imposition. Yet, as this dialect is strongly influenced by Arumanian, it should not be presumed that Albanian alone is the source of this syncretism[10].

4a) Macedonian third person clitic *mu* used for all genders and numbers

    i.   **Mu**   reče   na ženata / deteto / čovekot

        3.DAT.CLTC   say.3SG.AOR   DAT woman / child / man

        "[S/he] told the woman / child / man."

    ii. **Mu**   reče   na ženite / decata / mažite

        3.DAT.CLTC   say.3SG.AOR   DAT women / children / men

        "[S/he] told the women / children / men."

        (VIDOESKI 2005: 16)

4b) Albanian third person clitic in phrase initial position

    i.   **I**   thashë   gruas / fëmijës / burrit

        3SG.DAT.CLTC   say.3SG.AOR   woman.DAT/ child.DAT/ man.DAT

        "[s/he] told the woman / child / man."

---

	ii.	**U**	thashë	grave / fëmijëve / burrave
		3PL.DAT.CLTC	say.3SG.AOR	women.DAT/ children.DAT/ men.DAT

"[s/he] told the women / children / men."

On the surface, the data from morphology may not appear as good evidence for building a case for imposition as compared to the convergence in phonological structures. However, the differences in (3) and (4) from other Macedonian dialects along with their similarities with Albanian may perhaps be indicative of convergence. It is plausible that the Albanian system of proclitics was carried over into Macedonian in bilingualism, as it conforms closely to the Albanian system shown in (3). The extension of (4) to include all plurals is a plausible extension of the system once it had been incorporated into the Macedonian dialects. Also, although I have not presented morphological examples for Montenegrin, morphology does figure into example (5) in the section on syntax.

3.3. Syntax

Once again, similarities with Montenegrin dialects are fewer than with Macedonian, but in one specific instance, the Montenegrin pronoun system has a direct parallel to the Western Macedonian and Albanian dialects: the reduplication of personal pronouns, particularly for emphasis.

5a) Macedonian pronoun reduplication
Bil   kaj nimi, ama   **nego**   **go**   ne našl
be.PRF   at them but   3SG.MSC.OBL.LNG 3SG.MSC.OBL.CLTC not find.
"He's been to their place, but he didn't find him."

5b) Montenegrin pronoun reduplication
Ujak **mi**   e **mene**   Bešir
uncle 1SG.OBL.CLTC   is 1SG.OBL.LNG   Bešir
"My uncle is Bešir."

5c) Albanian pronoun reduplication
E   pashë **atë**   në shtëpinë e tyre
3SG.MSC.ACC.CLTC   see.AOR 3SG.MSC.ACC.LNG at house PART their
"I saw him at their house."

Because pronoun reduplication is found in other Balkan languages, such as Greek, Romanian, Bulgarian, and (standard) Macedonian, and is commonly cited as a typical "Balkanism", it would be imprudent to consider it an Albanian imposition across the board. However, within Serbian and Montenegrin dialects, pronoun reduplication is much more limited, thus we should not rule out Albanian influence in one form or another for these dialects.

Two other parallel convergences of syntactic structures are found in these dialects as well as in Albanian, but not to the same extent as in other Slavic speech communities. The first is the preservation of non-perfect preterits (both the aorist and imperfect (6)), which is unusual for the other dialects of these languages and is commonly found in only a couple of contemporary Slavic languages, Bulgarian, dialects of Serbian, and Sorbian. Montenegrin also preserves non-perfect preterits, especially the

Aorist (Ivić 1994). Yet while these forms have been lost in most Slavic languages, they have been preserved quite robustly, not just in Albanian and Macedonian and Montenegrin, but in most of the Balkan languages, including Greek and Arumanian[11].

6a) (3a) Macedonian preservation of non-perfect preterits (Aorist, Imperfect)
      Mu   **rekov**   Markotu / Markovi
      3SG.DAT.CLTC   say.1SG.AOR   Mark.DAT
      "I told Marko."

6b) (3b) Albanian non-prefect preterits (Aorist, Imperfect)
      I   **thashë**   Markut
      3SG.DAT.CLTC   say.1SG.AOR   Mark.DAT
      "I told Marko."

The second syntactic convergence in the verb system is the formation of a perfect tense from *imam* 'to have' or *sum* 'to be' plus the past passive participle (7), as detailed §4 below.

7a) Macedonian perfect from the past passive participle
      i.   Ovde   sum   dojden
           here   am.1SG   come. N/T-PART.MASC.SG
           "I've come here."

      ii. Imat   zboreno
           have.3PL.   said. N/T-PART.NEUT.SG
           "They have said."

7b) Montenegrin perfect from the past passive participle
      Kuća-mu-je   izgorela   / izgoreta
      house-3SG.MSC.DAT-is.3SG   burned.L-PART.FEM.SG / N/T-PART.FEM.SG
      "His house has burned down."
      (GREENBERG 2000: 299)

Before considering the perfect in greater detail, let me sum up the evidence presented so far. The western Macedonian dialects overlap considerably with Albanian-speaking communities, and most of the inhabitants of these regions are bilingual (VIDOESKI 2005: 10). As predicted by Van Coetsem's framework for imposition, these dialects show a number of structural convergences with Albanian (examples 1–7). Furthermore, Southeastern dialects of Montenegrin, as described by GREENBERG (2000) and Ivić (1994), show many of the same converging features, and a couple of other features possibly related to Albanian (examples. 1–2, 5 and 7). Although imposition from Albanian may not be responsible for all of the "intriguing" similarities in Slavic dialects of the Western Balkans, there are across-the-board changes in the dialects that are closest to Albanian, that argue the possibility of imposition from Albanian.

---

11 Once again thanks to Eleni BUŽAROVSKA p.c., for pointing out the wider (Balkan) scope of this and other morphological forms discussed in this section.

4. Perfect and adjectival participial constructions

While thus far the evidence seems to indicate that Macedonian dialects may have experienced more influence from Albanian than Montenegrin dialects, the topic of this section, the system of periphrastic perfects, indicates a stronger influence of Albanian on Montenegrin than Macedonian in this feature, as well as some apparent Serbian influence on some Northeast Geg dialects of Albanian. In this section I present a closer comparison of syntactic and semantic properties of the periphrastic formation of the perfect with a non-referential past passive particle in relevant Albanian and Slavic dialects.

The Slavic dialects that I will take into account include the Mrkovićki dialect in Southwestern Montenegro, between Lake Skadar (Alb. Shkodër) on the east and the Adriatic city of Bar to the west, as described by Vujović (1969); the Sretečka Župa Serbian dialects in Southeastern Kosovo near the northwest Macedonian border, as reported in Pavlović (1939) and later analyzed by Belyavski-Frank (1983); and Southwestern dialects of Macedonian in the Ohrid-Struga area (Friedman 1976, Elliot 2001, Gołąb 1983). For the Albanian dialects, I will examine Northwestern Geg, represented by the Dushmani dialects outside of Shkodra (BCS Skadar), as reported by Cimochowski (1951), Northeastern Geg represented by the dialect of Deçani (BCS Dečani) as recorded by Mehmetaj (2006), and (Western) Central Geg represented by the Muhurr village near Dibër (Mac. Debar), as described by Ylli and Sobolev (2003).

After analyzing constructions in the dialects, I will propose possible accounts of the historical development of this construction in the Western Balkan dialects. In conjunction with this, I will also refine my previous argumentation on the causation of these similarities – namely, that while similarities in Montenegrin dialects to Albanian are most certainly the result of linguistic imposition from Albanian, the similarities in Macedonian are less likely to have come from Albanian alone; indeed, Albanian dialects in Kosovo and on the border of Macedonia may possibly have changed as the result of imposition from Slavic dialects.

4.1. Slavic and Albanian perfect systems in general

Modern Slavic languages all have traces of the inherited perfect system from Common Slavic, which had a auxiliary conjugated for person and number from the verb **byti* 'to be' in addition to a participle inflected for number and gender. This participle was originally from a past resultative participle of the verb and is commonly called an L-participle because of the occurrence of an *l* in all of the forms historically (Friedman 1977, Elliot 2001). This form has been mostly preserved in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS), as illustrated by example (8) below, although the functional category of the perfect does not exist for most varieties of the language (with Montenegrin being the major possible exception (Lindstedt 2000)).

8)   BCS perfect
      On/ona/ono   je   bio[12]/bila/bilo   kod kuće.
      He/she/it-NOM.SG   is-3SG   been.L-PART.MSC/FEM/NEU   at home
      "He/she/it has been at home. / He/she/it was at home"

In some Slavic languages, the auxiliary has been eliminated, either in the 3rd person only, as in Polish, Czech, Slovak, Macedonian, and colloquially in BCS, or for every person and number, as in Russian. In standard Macedonian (9, below), the inherited Common Slavic perfect form has taken on a range of meanings, including a simple past, with the chief contextual variant being nonaffirmativity (FRIEDMAN 1977: 95).

9)   Macedonian nonaffirmative past with *be* + L-PART
      Toj bil   vo Skopje.
      He was-L-PART-MASC.SG.   in Skopje.
      "He has been in Skopje." or "He is/was in Skopje (apparently) /
      (much to my surprise) / (supposedly)."
      (ELLIOT 2001: 19; see FRIEDMAN 1993: 272)

Meanwhile, other periphrastic constructions have emerged, composed of *imam* 'to have' plus a participle which historically derives from the passive (or non-active) participle and a historically-derived neuter singular adjective ending -*o* as a perfect (10)[13]. In addition, another periphrastic construction has emerged: a resultative construction from *sum* 'to be' plus passive participle (11), which is considered by some (including BELYAVSKI-FRANK 1983 and PAVLOVIĆ 1939) to be a perfect.

10)   *Ima* Macedonian perfect
      Gi   imam   kupeno   knigite
      them-CLIT.PL   have-1SG   bought-N/T-PART   books-the-PL.
      "I have bought the books."
      (ELLIOT 2001: 23)

11)   Macedonian resultative
      Knigata   e   skinata
      book-the-FEM.SG   is-3SG   torn-N/T-PART.FEM.SG
      "The book is torn."
      (TOMIĆ 2006: 348)

Thus, even within the Slavic standard languages of the Balkans, a variety of perfect constructions exist, as given in examples (8–11) above.

As with the perfects from the Slavic systems mentioned above, Albanian constructions of the perfect tense also involve an auxiliary plus an invariant participle. In

---

12 The masculine participle form no longer contains an -*l* because word final *l* > *o* in these standards.

13 Because the participle is not always a past passive participle, I demarcate it here with 'N/T-PART'. I disregard the grammatical function in notation because I indicate the grammatical function in other ways. As I am looking at this as an occurrence of language change, I am interested in showing previous morphological associations as well as the synchronic status.

the standard language, perfects formed from active verbs are formed with the auxiliary *kam* 'to have', as in (12), while all non-active verbs (middle, passive, reflexive, and reciprocal) form the perfect with the auxiliary *jam* 'to be' (NEWMARK et al. 1982: 31–35) as in (13) below. The Albanian participle, unlike the L-participle in Slavic, does not inflect for number or gender. However, when participles are used in adjectival constructions, they are preceded by a connecting particle that does inflect for number and gender, as shown in (14) below. As adjectives, participles may have either active or passive meaning; generally, those formed from transitive verbs are passive (NEWMARK et al. 1982: 92) as in (14).

12)   Albanian active perfect with *have* + Part.
      Ai/ajo ka   qenë   në shtëpi.
      He/she has-3SG   been-PART   at home-ACC.FEM.SG.INDEF.
      "He/She has been at home."

13)   Albanian non-active perfect with *be* + Part.
      Shtëpia   e tij   është   djegur.
      house-NOM.FEM.SG.   his   is-3SG   burn-PART.
      "His house has burned down."

14)   Albanian adjectival use of participle with connective particle
      Ajo ka   shtepinë   e djegur.
      She has-3SG house-ACC.FEM.SG.DEF.   ADJ.PARTICLE-FEM.SG PART
      "She has a burned-down house."

While these previous statements, based on the standard descriptions of the languages, do not describe the situation in the dialects precisely, they provide a starting point for discussing the types of constructions seen in the different varieties.

4.2. Perfect and Adjectival Resultative Constructions through the framework of Macedonian (and English)

In order to understand the semantics of perfect constructions, a couple of key distinctions need to be made. In establishing these definitions, I follow Elisabeth EL-LIOT's work (2001) on perfect constructions, because she sets up a framework for investigating perfect and resultative constructions cross-linguistically, and she analyzes Macedonian and Bulgarian perfects in this framework. Although I accept her definitions to this point, my analysis of the development of the perfects over time in these dialects is not in complete agreement with hers (see Section 4.3.1.).

While the usual definition of the perfect tense is something like COMRIE's statement that "the perfect indicates the continuing present relevance of a past situation" (1976: 52), MCCOARD (1978, cited in ELLIOT 2001) demonstrates that this so-called "current relevance" formulation is insufficient, inasmuch as it does not exclude the semantic range of preterites, and more specifically that "any notion of current relevance 'is not implied in the perfect tense form but derives from the meaning or character of the verb, or from the context, or from the statement as a whole'" (1978: 65, 2001: 8). MCCOARD (1978) offers a more suitable delineation of the perfect as the "extended now":

> All that remains invariant in the meaning of the present perfect is an identification of prior events with the "extended" now which is continuous with the moment of coding. The preterit contrasts in identifying prior events with "then"-time which is conceived as separate from the present, the "now" of speaking (McCOARD 1978: 19).

On the basis of McCOARD's work, ELLIOT accepts the following basic definition of the perfect, which I will also adopt for the present survey:

15) Definition of perfect:
     A past event expressed within a time span which is continuous with the present (2001: 9).

Perfects should also be distinguished semantically from resultative adjective constructions. Adjectival resultative constructions, in contrast, express the "present tense state of past action" (2001: 11).

16) Definition of resultative adjective:
     A present state that exists as a result of a past event.

This difference can be demonstrated by sentences such as (17–20) below from English, where (17) and (18) represent perfects, while (19) and (20) are corresponding adjectival resultatives (all from ELLIOT 2001, emphasis in original).

17) He **has written** a paper.
18) He **has gone**.
19) He **has a written** paper.
20) He **is gone**.

Syntactically, perfects differ from resultative adjective constructions, being complex verb phrases, while resultative adjectives are modifiers to a noun phrase as schematized in (21) and (22) below:[14]

21) (17) [He$_{DP}$[has written]$_{VP}$ [a paper]$_{NP}$] (perfect)
22) (19) [He$_{DP}$ [has]$_{VP}$ [a written paper]$_{NP}$] (adjectival resultative)

Resultative adjectives of subjects are usually formed from the past passive participle of intransitive verbs, whereas object resultative adjectives are usually formed from transitive verbs. In some cases it is transparent that the participle modifies the noun, as indicated by overt marking for gender, number, and case agreement, as in examples (7) and (8); however, these constructions can also be ambiguous either because no such marking exists, as in the English example in (23), or because the forms of the

---

14 As Brian JOSEPH (p.c.) points out, yet a third type of construction (i) exists in English, typically analyzed as a 'small clause' as in (ii) below:
    i.   He has papers written.
    ii. [He [has [papers written]$_{IP}$]$_{VP}$]
         That is to say, the main verb *has* has as a complement to that main verb a 'small clause' (i.e. a subject and a predicate but without a verb, as in the 'complement-like' part of (iii):
    iii. I consider John smart.

verbal and adjectival form are identical, as in (24a) and (24b) from Macedonian, where the perfect participle form is the same as the adjectival neuter singular past passive participle.

23) The paper is written
       "The paper has been/is already written." (Perfect reading) or
       "The paper is in written form." (Adjectival resultative)

24a) Nitu eden fakultet nema dobieno pismo.
       not one department has-3SG-AUX received-INV.PART. letter-NEUT.
       "Not a single department has received a letter." (Perfect reading)

24b) Nitu eden fakultet nema dobieno pismo.
       not one department has-3SG received-NEUT.SG. letter-NEUT.
       "Not a single department has a received letter." (Adjectival resultative)
       (ELLIOT 2001: 37)

Fortunately, there are other criteria by which perfects may ordinarily be distinguished from adjectival resultatives. Primarily these ambiguities can be removed by reference to the discourse level, where either of the original sentences' meanings can be made clear from context. These may also be clarified by further questions such as "When was it written?" in response to (23) and „Kakvo pismoto imau" (What type of letter do they have?) in response to (24). FIELDER (1994) successfully analyzes differences between adjectival resultatives and perfects by looking at the discourse level, specifically looking at whether the constructions focus on the STATE (adjectival resultative) or the ACTION (perfect). Unfortunately, referring to the discourse level is not always possible, especially if the example in question is a citation in a grammar or a typical dialectological description.

4.3. Language Specifics

In this section, I consider the details of the individual languages and compare them to the definitions elaborated in Section 4.1 above. For each of the languages, perfects formed from active transitive and active intransitive verbs, as well as non-active verbs are presented, because these are the main semantic categories where the dialects show variation. Where it is relevant, examples are also given using the verb 'to be' and adjectival resultatives are cited.

4.3.1. Southwest Macedonian Dialects

The Macedonian perfect has been the subject of many insightful studies, with FRIEDMAN (1976, 1977, 1981), GOŁĄB (1984), FIELDER (1994), ELLIOT (2001), MITKOVSKA/ BUŽAROVSKA (2008) all making significant contributions. Within Macedonian, there are different realizations of the perfect; the greatest variety occurs in the extreme southwest. As TOMIĆ (2006) summarizes, there are two systems in Macedonian dialects that intersect in the central and most western dialects, but that function independently in the East and Southwest. The southwest dialects are marked by

(a) a simple past tense … passive participles, used exclusively to express evidentiality, (b) "have" present and past perfects with invariant past participles, which express resultativeness and experience, and (c) "be" perfects with inflecting passive participles used to express resultativeness (Tomić 2006: 336).

The "be" perfects in these extreme southwest dialects are shown by examples (25) and (26).

25) Active transitive verb with *be* + N/T-PART
| Pien | sum | tri | piva |
| drunk-N/T-PART.MASC.SG | am-1SG.AUX | three | beers |

"I have drunk three beers."

26) Active intransitive verb with *be* + N/T-PART
| Vlezen | sum vo | crkva. |
| entered-N/T-PART.MASC.SG | am-1SG.AUX in | church |

"I have entered into a church."
((25–26) (Markoviḱ 1995: 70–76, cited in Elliot 2001: 60)

Furthermore, Friedman (1976) writes that in the extreme southwestern Macedonian dialects the *ima*-constructions have been extended the farthest, including even the verbs *sum* 'be' and *imam* 'have', as illustrated by examples (27) and (28).

27) | Imam | bideno | tamo. |
| Have-1SG | been-INV.PART | there |

"I have been there."
(Friedman 1976: 98)

28) | Ima | imano |
| has-3SG | had-INV.PART |

"He/she has had."
(Friedman 1976: 98)

Examples (27–28), however, "would not be acceptable in regions to the north and east, e.g. Debar, Resen, and Bitola" (Friedman 1976: 98). Thus, in the extreme southwest Macedonian dialects, the perfect constructions differ significantly from what occurs elsewhere in Macedonian.

There are different accounts of how this system came about in the Macedonian dialects. Elliot (2001) offers the perspective of the gradual grammaticalization of 'have' resultative constructions, dating back to Old Church Slavonic into complex verbal forms, while Friedman (1994), Gołąb (1984), and Markoviḱ (2007) also point to interaction with Arumanian dialects in Southwestern Macedonia (and furthermore in Aegean Macedonia (Northeastern Greece)) as the motivation for a remodeling of the perfect system. While the grammaticalization account in Elliot (2001) can describe some of the progression, it does not necessarily explain how the language changed. On the other hand, the distribution of the *imam*-perfect definitely points to language-contact source for the change. Moreover, language contact offers possible motivations and mechanisms for the systemic changes in the perfect.

4.3.2. Southeastern Serbian (Sretačka Župa, Kosovo) Dialects

Just to the northwest of Macedonia, the transitional Serbian dialects of Sretačka Župa have standard Serbian type perfects (conjugated *biti* 'to be' + L-participle) as well as the two perfect formations from Southwestern Macedonia: *ima* + past passive participle and *biti* + past passive participle. The perfects formed with past passive participles are shown in (29–33).

29) Active transitive verb with *have* + N/T-PART
     Imam   žito   kupeno
     have-1SG   grain-NEUT.SG   bought-N/T-PART.NEUT.SG
     "I have bought grain."

30) Active intransitive verb with *have* + N/T-PART (pluperfect)
     U Drajčiću   sъᵃm   nemav
     to D.-FEM.ACC.SG   am-1SG.AUX   NOT-have-L-PART.MASC.SG

     stupnato
     march-N/T-PART.
     "I hadn't gone to Drajčića."

31) Active intransitive verb with *be* + N/T-PART, plural subject
     Od   Tetovsko   smo   dođeni.
     From   Tetovo   are-1PL   come-N/T-PART.MASC.PL
     "We have come from Tetovo."

32) Active intransitive verb with *be* + N/T-PART, feminine singular subject
     Moja   žena   je   sednata.
     My-FEM.SG wife   is-3SG   seated-N/T-PART.FEM.SG
     "My wife is seated/has been seated." («Moja žena je sela» as PAVLOVIĆ gives it.)

33) Active intransitive verb with *be* + N/T-PART, masculine singular subject
     Dup   je   padnat.
     oak-MASC.SG.   is-3SG-AUX   fallen-N/T-PART.MASC.SG
     "The oak has fallen (is fallen)." («Dub je pao – oboren.»)
     (29–33) (PAVLOVIĆ 1939: 216–218)

In (29) it is ambiguous whether this is a verbal or an adjectival construction because the object *žito* 'grain' is neuter singular, even though BELYAVSKI-FRANK (1983) points out that this, like the Macedonian participle, has a neuter singular ending. Because *kupeno* 'bought' is from a transitive verb, this could be an adjectival resultative construction from a possessive ('have') meaning. Likewise the subjects in (30–32) could be modified predicatively by the participles formed from intransitive verbs. In fact, PAVLOVIĆ glosses some of these forms as direct equivalents of Serbian *biti* plus L-participle perfects; for instance, in glossing (32), he gives "Moja žena je sela" ("My wife has sat down"), and he argues that "this construction has spread, particularly from verbs in *na* (historically with a back nasal) so that it has become the system in the Ohrid-Prespa dialect" (PAVLOVIĆ 1939: 218).

Although he analyzes these constructions as perfects in the Macedonian manner two of Pavlović's (1939) examples, (34) and (35) below, cannot be analyzed simply as adjectival resultative constructions.

34) Imaš   odeno   tamo.
    have-2SG. gone-N/T-PART.NEUT.SG   there
    "You have gone there."

35) Jovan   nema   progovoreno.
    Jovan   not.have-3.SG spoken-N/T-PART.NEUT.SG
    "Jovan has not spoken."

So, while Belyavski-Frank (1983) and Pavlović (1939) consider these and examples similar to (30–32) as perfect forms that have originated as adjectives, according to the criteria established in Section 3.1, most of these are more satisfactorily analyzed as adjectival resultatives because the passive participles agree with the object in transitive sentences and the subject in intransitive ones. Although not all of the examples are formally perfects, the handful of forms such as (34) and (35) shows some developments towards the system of perfect constructions found in southwest Macedonian. While her analysis focuses on the influence of other Slavic dialects, Belyavski-Frank, also states that, in addition to internal developments, these changes may have been influenced by Arumanian and Albanian (Belyavski-Frank 1983: 221).

4.3.3. Southwest Montenegrin (Mrkovićki) Dialects

Undoubtedly most perfect constructions throughout Montenegro are the same as those in Serbian, Bosnian, and Croatian, viz. with the auxiliary of *biti* 'to be' and the L-participle inflected for number and gender. Similarly, although dropping the auxiliary is rare, it occurs occasionally in Montenegrin dialects (Vujović 1969). Still, key differences in the verbal system can be found, most characteristically in that many of the dialects of Southwestern Montenegro have preserved the function of aorist and imperfect forms. The one dialect that Greenberg cites as possibly containing a perfect formed with N/T-PART is the Mrkovićki dialect zone near Bar. His example is given as (36) below (with my glosses):

36) (7) Kuća-mu-je   izgorela / izgoreta
        house-3SG.MSC.DAT-is.3SG burned.L-PART.FEM.SG / N/T-PART. FEM.SG
        „His house has burned down."
        (Vujović 1969: 266, cited in Greenberg 2000: 299)

In addition to the example that Greenberg cites from the Mrkovićki dialects, several additional examples are given in Vujović (1969) with the same verb, *izgoreti* 'to burn':

37) Kuće   izgorete
    houses-FEM.NOM.PL burned-N/T-PART.FEM.PL.
    'burnt houses'
    (Vujović 1969: 266)

38) Kome   -e   kuća   izgoreta?
     whom-DAT.SG.   is-3SG   house-FEM.NOM.SG. burnt-N/T-PART.FEM.SG
     "Whose is the burnt house?" / "Whose house is burnt?"
     (Vujović 1969: 266)

Furthermore, Vujović remarks that „izgoret = izgoreo" and „izgoreti = izgoreli",
presumably indicating that the passive participle formed with -t and the perfect parti-
ciple (L-participle) are performing the same function. But we could ask what func-
tion they are performing; it is possible that they are ambiguous, because both perfect
and adjectival resultative interpretations of "His house is burnt" are plausible. From
examples (36–38) it is obvious that the participle is **not** invariant. It consistently
inflects for number and gender, but so does the perfect L-participle in standard BCS
perfect constructions. These examples, if they are perfects, are all passive construc-
tions, such that the participle modifies the subject, as we would expect from the past
passive participle.

It is striking, however, that there is no morphological difference that would indi-
cate a passive perfect such as a non-active *se* particle, as in the Serbian paradigm, or
the use of a different verb such as *to be / to have* indicating active or passive, as seen
in Albanian. If the past passive participle and the L-participle truly are equivalent,
then a change has happened that is not found in the standard language, or in most
other dialects of Montenegro; that is, the passive participle has become syncretic with
the perfect participle. This is significant firstly, because it is evidence of a change not
found in surrounding Slavic dialects, and secondly, it is a change closer to the neigh-
boring Albanian dialects, where only one participle form is used for passive resulta-
tive and (active and passive) perfect constructions. It is worth noting, however, that
in these examples, the auxiliaries from the verb 'to be' continue the Slavic pattern,
and do not conform with the situation of Albanian perfect auxiliaries. The merger of
the two participles, whether for adjectival or verbal constructions, may be related to
another example that Vujović gives in his description of the perfect, shown in (39)
below.

39) *Imaš* – i *ća°to*   izbek
     have-2SG. OP sow-N/T-PART.NEUT   remaining(?)-NOM/ACC.MASC

     kokoroza?
     corn-MSC.GEN.
     „Have you sown the remaining corn?"[15]
     (Vujović 1969: 266)

Although the meaning of the sentence may be unclear, this is a definite case of a per-
fect construction using the past passive participle. The past passive participle does not
agree with the object *izbek*, which is masculine, nor, presumably, with the subject. In

---

15 While searching for the meaning of izbek, which I still don't know, I came across this
    citation on a NGO website for Mrkojeviči, which I am sure has a common reference: Imaš
    li šjato izbek kolomboća? – Jesi li posijao kukuruz? [Have you sown (ø/the/your) corn?]).
    http://www.mrkojevici.org/O_Mrkojevicima/Etnografija.html.

his analysis of the forms, Vujović himself says that this is a calque on the basis of the Albanian perfect formation.

One plausible theory to explain the alternation in (35) between *izgorela* and *izgoreta* is on the basis of the Albanian model, where the perfect participle here is used in non-transitive uses instead of the passive clitic *se* (as in standard languages and other BCS dialects), like Albanian, while the passive participle is used as an adjective for resultative constructions. Obviously there is no connective particle in the Slavic corresponding to the Albanian particle; instead, perhaps, the variant participles of the verb mark the same distinction. Although the developments could be the result of internal change advocated by Elliot (2001) and others from the perspective of grammaticalization, the participles and perfects of the coterritorial Albanian dialects offers a full explanation of the Slavic Mrkovićki dialects.

4.3.4. Geg Albanian Dialects
4.3.4.1. Northwest Geg Albanian (Dushmani) Dialects

In Albanian dialects in and near Montenegro, as well as in most other Albanian dialects, perfects of active verbs are constructed from the conjugated from of *kam* 'have' plus an invariant participle, while non-active verbs form perfects with the 'be' auxiliary *jam*. This is demonstrated with examples from the standard language (40–42) and Northwestern Geg dialects (43–44) below.

40) (12) Ai/ajo ka   qenë   në shtëpi.
          He/she has-3SG   been-PART   at home-ACC.FEM.SG.INDEF.
          "He/She has been at home."

41) (13) Albanian non-active perfect with *be* + Part.
          Shtëpia   e tij   është   djegur.
          house-NOM.FEM.SG.   his   is-3SG   burn-PART.
          "His house has burned down."

42) (14) Albanian adjectival use of participle with connective particle
          Ajo ka   shtepinë   e
          She has-3SG   house-ACC.FEM.SG.DEF.   ADJ.PARTICLE-FEM.SG

          djegur.
          burn-PART
          "She has a burned-down house."

43)   Kam ardh(un)[16]
          have-1.SG come-PART
          "I have come."
          (Cimochowski 1951: 115)

---

16 Both *ardhun* and *ardh* exist, and Cimochowski (1951) states that the shorter form is usually used in perfect and participial constructions, while the longer form is usually used in adjectival constructions.

44)   A   ke   mjellë   misrin?
        OP   have-2.SG   sown-PART   corn-MASC.ACC.SG
        "Have you sown the corn?"
        (Verbal forms composed from CIMOCHOWSKI 1951: 107, 115 and 135)

Viewing the examples considered up to now from Slavic, some parallel constructions emerge. Thus example (36), given again in (45) parallels Albanian adjectival resultative (46) and perfect (47) constructions.

45) (36) Kuća-mu-je   izgorela / izgoreta.
         house-3SG.MSC.DAT-is.3SG burned.L-PART.FEM.SG / N/T-PART.FEM.SG

46)   Shpja   e tij   asht   e djegun.
        house   his   is-3SG   burned-PART/ADJ.
        "His house is burnt."

47)   Shpja   e tij   asht   djeg(un).
        house   his   is-3SG   burned-PART.
        "His house has burned down."
        ((46–47) Verbal forms composed from CIMOCHOWSKI 1951: 134–135)

As stated earlier, the main difference between the Albanian adjectival resultatives and perfect in (46) and (47) is the presence or absence of the connective particle *e*, marking adjectival usage when present. In Northwestern Geg the adjectival form is different from the participle, while in the standard language it is usually the same (CIMOCHOWSKI 1951: 134, CAMAJ 1984).

For most verbs, the auxiliaries used for perfects in the Dushmani dialects are the same as that codified in the standard, *to be* for non-active, reciprocal, and reflexive verbs and *to have* for others. Two exceptions are the additional ways of expressing the perfect of the verb *to be* and non-active verbs (on which see §4.3.4.2., below). The perfect of the verb 'to be' where both 'to have' and 'to be' auxiliaries are possible, and in the village of Malagjia only the 'to be' auxiliary is used (CIMOCHOWSKI 1951 §125). Furthermore in the formation of the admirative, (which usually is made up of an inverted perfect) of 'to be', uses the 'to be' auxiliary instead of 'to have' (CIMOCHOWSKI 1951 §125). The use of the 'to be' auxiliary may be due to contact with Slavic, from internal developments, or perhaps even an archaism preserved in these dialects; there is too little evidence to be sure.

4.3.4.2. Northeast Geg Albanian Dialects

In general, Northeast Geg dialects differ further from the standard language in that both the verb *jam* 'to be' and active intransitive (verbs of motion) can form the perfect with either the 'to be' auxiliary as in (48–50) below, and "somewhat more rarely" (MEHMETAJ 2006: 94) with the 'to have' auxiliary shown in (51) below:

48)   Intransitive verbs of motion with *be* + PART.
        Jam   dal.
        am-1SG.   left-PART
        "I have left."

49) Ô   shkue
     is-3SG   gone-PART
     "He has gone."

50) *To be* with *be* + PART.
     Ish   kôn   puntuer.
     was-3SG   been-PART   worker-masc.
     "He has been a worker."
     ((48–50) GJINARI 1970: 84)[17]

51) Intransitive verb of motion with *have* + PART.
     Kemi a:rdh   me fje:t sônte
     have-1PL come-PART to sleep tonight
     "We have come to sleep tonight."
     (MEHMETAJ 2006: 94)

This unexpected construction where the verb 'to be' is used as the auxiliary for all intransitive verbs, in addition to the standard non-active verb, found in Northeastern Geg, brings the perfect system closer to that found in Slavic. Whether or not this is due to the influence of Slavic cannot be certain, but it is probably not coincidence that the Albanian dialects in closest contact with Slavic speakers with such a perfect system would make changes bringing it closer to their neighbor's language.

An additional fact about the perfect formation in Northeastern Geg, which is also found in some Northwestern Geg, that argues for the possible influence of Slavic bilingualism is the option of forming non-active perfects using a non-active particle *u* – which is also used in other non-active verb forms such as the aorist (ex. 52) and imperative (ex. 53). In this non-active participle formation – which exists side by side with the common Albanian formation of a 'to be' auxiliary plus participle – is formed by the non-active particle *u*, plus a 'to have' auxiliary plus participle (54–56).

52) non-active aorist using the particle *u*
     U   kthe-va
     non-active particle   return-AOR.1SG
     "I returned."
     (MEHMETAJ 2006: 93)

53) non-active imperative using the particle *u*
     Kthe-u!
     return-IMPERATIVE.2SG – U
     "Come back!"
     (MEHMETAJ 2006: 104)

54) non-active perfects using the particle *u* + 'to have' aux. + PART.
     M'   u   ka   çu: dhimta e kre:s
     me-DAT   U   has-3SG   start-PART   pain-NOM of head
     „My head has begun to hurt."

17 See also DESNICKAJA 1967: 85 and GJINARI/SHKURTAJ 2003: 231.

55) t'   u   ka   zbe: ftyra
    you-2SG.DAT U   has-3SG turn white-PART face-NOM
    "Your face has turned white."

56) m'   u   ka   pri:sh   puna
    me-DAT   U   has-3SG break-PART   work/business-NOM
    "My work has been fouled up."
    ((54–56) Mehmetaj 2006: 94)

Although this is not identical to the Slavic formation of non-active verbs, with the non active particle *se* plus *to be* auxiliary plus inflected particle, the use of a non-active particle in the perfect in this area suggests the possibility of Slavic influence[18]. However, since this construction is not found in the most extreme Northeast Geg dialects (in the area of Preševo (Presheva) and Bujanovac, Serbia) but is found in the southernmost dialects of Albanian (Çam), it is not likely an innovation due to contact with Slavic (Ajeti 1969, Ismajli 1971, Gjinari/Shkurtaj 2000: 240).

4.3.4.3. (Eastern) Central Geg (Muhurr) Dialects

In many ways the Central Geg Albanian dialects are more similar to the standard and Tosk Albanian dialects in terms of their perfect and participial constructions. Ylli and Sobolev report perfects with auxiliaries in *kam* 'have' for active perfects (57) and (58) below and in *jam* 'to be' for passive forms, as in (59) below.

57) Active transitive with *have* + Part.
    Un   sot   kam   mledh   k'ummla.
    I-NOM.SG   today   have-1sg   gathered-PART   plums-FEM.PL.ACC.INDEF.
    "I gathered plums today."

58) Active intransitive with *have* + Part.
    M'   ka   dek   b'urri m'oti,   ka
    CLIT-1SG   has-3SG died-PART   husband sister-GEN.FEM.SG has-3SG

    gjasht–shtat vjet.
    6–7 years
    "My sister's husband has died (on me); it's been six or seven years."

59) Non-active with *be* + Part.
    E   thken,   se   dor'i s'ô[19]   llô, …   mund
    CLIT-3SG.   return-3SG that hand   not is-3SG let-PART …   can

---

18 There are, to be sure, other interpretations of both the meaning and the origin of *u* in these formations. One possibility is that the *u* is actually the third personal plural dative clitic pronoun *u*, whose semantics could also be reconciled with the concept of the agent of the action – here an indefinite "them" expressed in an oblique form.

19 It may be of interest that this is the shorter of two forms that the verb *jam* can take in the 3sg. Both ô and ôsht can be used as auxiliaries for non-active verbs (Ylli/Sobolev 2003: 163).

ta   thkej
that+it-CLIT.   return-3SG-SUBJ.
"(S)he returns it, has not neglected it … (s)he can return it."
((49–51) YLLI/SOBOLEV 2003: 163–164)

So while the Albanian dialects in Northwestern Albania, Kosovo, and the far North of Macedonia show the use of 'to be' as an auxiliary not just for non-active verbs, but also active intransitive, including 'to be' and verbs of motion, those in contact with Western, and especially Southwestern Macedonian maintain the 'have' auxiliary for all active verbs.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, several important points can be taken from this survey of perfect and adjectival resultative constructions. Perhaps most importantly, we should recognize that many languages influence the spread of some Balkanisms. While the constructions tend towards convergence with neighboring and coterritorial languages, many languages could be responsible for the changes, and many language changes are possible. Thus, while GREENBERG (2000) and PEŠIKAN (1984) argue that parallel features in Macedonian and Montenegrin dialects are the result of an old Slavic dialect continuum connecting them together, and while I (2007) have argued for the influence of Albanian dialects in creating these similarities, neither explanation accounts for all of the facts. Although it is likely that Albanian has had considerable influence on the Montenegrin Mrkovićki dialects (cf. VUJOVIĆ's remark about the perfect construction as a calque on an Albanian model), it appears to have had a secondary or even tertiary influence (behind Arumanian) on the Southwestern Macedonian dialects (FRIEDMAN 1994). In addition, the Northeastern Geg information about the changes in the Albanian perfect constructions, in the adaptation of the 'to be' auxiliary to include intransitive active verbs illustrates that linguistic influence is not unidirectional, that the language promoting changes in one area may be the recipient of changes in another area. Finally, this survey also demonstrates the necessity of considering dialectal variation within languages, particularly dialects in closest contact with other languages, to explain changes from language contact rather than generalizing from standard language descriptions.

	active transitive	active intransitive	non-active	*to be*
Macedonian	*have* + N/T-PART	*have* + N/T-PART	*have* + N/T-PART	(*be*)+ L-PART
4.3.1. Ohrid-Prespa	*have* + N/T-PART *be* + N/T-PART	*be* + N/T-PART *have* + N/T-PART	be + N/T-PART have + N/T-PART	*be* + N/T-PART *have* + N/T-PART
BCS	*be* + L-	*be* + L-	(*be* +) se + L-	*be* + L-

	active transitive	active intransitive	non-active	*to be*
4.3.2. **Sretačka Župa**	*be* + L- *be* + N/T-PART	*be* + L- *have* + N/T-PART (?)	(*be* +) *se* + L- *be* + N/T-PART	*be* + L- (?)
4.3.3. **Mrkovićki**	*be* + L- *have* + N/T-PART	*be* + L-	*be* + L- *be* + N/T-PART	*be* + L-
4.3.4.1. **NW Geg Dushmani**	*have* + PART	*have* + PART	*be* + PART *u* + *have* + PART	*have* + PART *be* + PART
4.3.4.2. **NE Geg**	*have* + PART	*be* + PART (*have* + PART)	*be* + PART *u* + *have* + PART	*be* + PART
4.3.4.3. **Central Geg (Muhurr)**	*have* + PART	*have* + PART	*be* + PART	*have* + PART
Albanian	*have* + PART	*have* + PART	*be* + PART	*have* + PART

Table 1: Summary of perfect forms by verb type and dialect (underlined forms represent possible innovations.)

References

AJETI, I. (1969): „Rreth disa veçorive të të folmeve të shqiptarëve të rrethit të Preshevës dhe të Bujanovcit" [About some distinctive characteristics of the Albanian dialects in the areas of Presheva and Bujanovac]. *Gjurmime Albanologjike* nr. 2. 37–51.

ALEXANDER, R. (2008): "Major historical developments, and issues associated with them". *Lectures on South Slavic dialectology*. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University. May 2008.

BELYAVSKI-FRANK, M. (1983): "Morphological features in southern Serbian dialects". *Makedonski jazik* 34. 213–230.

CAMAJ, M. (1984): *Albanian grammar*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

CAMPBELL, L.; KAUFMANN, T.; SMITH-STARK, T. (1986): "Meso-America as a linguistic area". *Language* 62/3. 530–569.

CIMOCHOWKSI, W. (1951): *Le Dialecte de Dushmani: Description de l'un des parlers de l'Albanie du nord.* Poznań: Nakładem Poznańskiego towarzystwa przyjaciół nauk.

CIMOCHOWKSI, W. (1961): „Marrëdhëniet gjuhësore shqiptaro-sllave" [Albanian-Slavic Language Relations]. *Słownik starożytno ci słowianskich* 1/1. 16–19.

COMRIE, B. (1976): *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DESNICKAJA, A. V. (1967): *Albanskij jazik i ego dialekty* [The Albanian Language and its dialects]. Leningrad: Leningradskoe otdelenie izdatel'stva „Nauka".

DURHAM, M. E. (1928): *Some tribal origins, laws, and customs of the Balkans*. London: George Allen & Unwit Ltd.

ELLIOTT, E. (2004): "Imam ('have') plus past passive participle in the Bulgarian Erkec dialect". In: UCIAS (ed.): Volume 2 *Revitalizing Bulgarian dialectology*. University of California International and Area Studies Digital Collection.

ELLIOTT, E. (2001): *The* sum *('be') and* imam *('have') resultative constructions in Macedonian and Bulgarian within a typology of resultative constructions in Slavic.* PhD. dissertation, University of Toronto.

FIELDER, G. (1994): "The relationship between the ima ('have') perfect, the sum ('be') perfect and auxiliary loss in Macedonian and Bulgarian". In: Vera Veskoviḱ-Vangeli et al. (eds.): *Zbornik: Referati od Vtorata makedonsko-severnoamerikanska lavisticka konferencija za makedonistika.* Seminar za makedonski jazik, literatura i kultura, Oxrid 16–19 avgust 1994. 177–183.

FINE, J. V. A. (1983): *The early medieval Balkans: A critical survey from the sixth to the late twelfth century*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

FINE, J. V. A. (1987): *The late medieval Balkans: A critical survey from the late twelfth century to the Ottoman conquest.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

FRIEDMAN, V. (2004): *Studies on Albanian and Other Balkan Languages.* Peja: Dukagjini.

FRIEDMAN, V. (2002): *Macedonian.* Languages of the world/Materials 117. LinCom Europa.

FRIEDMAN, V. (1994): "Surprise! surprise! Arumanian has had an admirative!" *Indiana Slavic Studies* 7. 79–87.

FRIEDMAN, V. (1993): "Macedonian". In: B. Comrie, G. Corbett (eds.): *The Slavonic Languages*. London: Routledge. 249–305.

FRIEDMAN, V. (1981): "The pluperfect in Albanian and Macedonian". *Folia Slavica* 4/2–3. 273–82.

FRIEDMAN, V. (1979): "Influence vs. Convergence in Areal Phenomena". *SECOL Bulletin* 3/1. 1–8.

FRIEDMAN, V. (1977): *The grammatical categories of the Macedonian indicative.* Columbus, OH: Slavica.

FRIEDMAN, V. (1976): "Dialectal synchrony and diachronic syntax: The Macedonian perfect". In: S. Steever, C. Walker and S. Mufwene (eds.): *Papers from the Parasession on Diachronic Syntax*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.

GJINARI, J. (1970): *Dialektologjia shqiptare* [Albanian Dialectology]. Prishtina: Enti i teksteve dhe i mjeteve mësimore i krahinës socialiste autonome të Kosovës.

GJINARI, J.; SHKURTAJ, Gj. (2003): *Dialektologjia* [Dialectology]. Tiranë: Shtepia Botuese e Librit Universitar.

GOŁĄB, Z. (1983): „Konstrukcite so 'ima' i glagolska pridavka vo makedonskiot i vo vlaškot jazik" [Constructions with 'ima' + verbal participle in Macedonian and Vlah]. *II Naučna diskusija, Oxrid, 19–21 avgust 1975.* Seminar za makedonski jazik, literatura i kultura. Skopje: Univerzitet „Kiril i Metodij". 1–13.

GREENBERG, R. (2000): "The Dialects of Macedonia and Montenegro: Random Linguistic Parallels or Evidence of a Sprachbund?" *Južnoslovenski filolog* 56. 295–300.

HAMP, E. (2004): "On Serbo-Croatian's historic laterals". In: V. Friedman, D. Dyer (eds.): *Of all the Slavs my favorites: Studies in honor of Howard I. Aronson on the occasion of his 66th birthday*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana Slavic Studies. 243–250.

HAMP, E. (1989): "Yugoslavia – a crossroads of Sprachbünde". *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 25/1. 44–47.

HAMP, E. (1992): "Albanian". In: J. Gvozdanović (ed.): *Indo-European Numerals*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 835–921.

HAMP, E. (1966): "The Position of Albanian". In: H. Birnbaum, J. Puhvel (eds.): *Ancient Indo-European Dialects*. Berkeley: U. of California. 97–121.

ISMAJLI, R. (1971): „Vëretje mbi të folmen e Preshevës – Morfologji" [Observations on the dialect of Presheva – Morphology]. *Dituria* 1 (Prishtinë). 11–23.

IVIĆ, P. (1994): *Srpskohrvatski dijalekti* [Serbocroatian Dialects]. 3rd. ed. Novi Sad: Biblioteka Matice Srpske.

JOSEPH, B.; FRIEDMAN, V. (to appear): *The Balkan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LINDSTEDT, J. (2000): "The perfect – aspectual, temporal and evidential". In: Ö. Dahl (ed.): *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 366–383.

MARKOVIĶ, M. (1995): *Glagolskiot sistem vo makedonskiot i vo aromanskiot oxridski govor* [The verbal system in the Macedonian and Aromanian dialects of Ohrid]. Magisterska rabota. Skopje.

MARKOVIĶ, M. (2007): *Aromanskiot i makedonskiot govor od oxridsko-struškiot region* [The Aromanian and Macedonian dialects from the Ohrid-Struga region]. Skopje: Krste Misirkov.

McCOARD, R. (1978): *The English perfect: Tense-choice and pragmatic inferences.* North-Holland linguistic series 38. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

MEHMETAJ, B. (2006): *E Folmja e Deçanit me rrethinë: Morfologjia dhe fjalëformimi* [The dialect of Decani and its environs: Morphology and word formation]. Prishtinë: Instituti Albanologjik i Prishtinës.

MITKOVSKA, L.; BUŽAROVSKA, E. (2008): "On the use of *habere*-perfect in journalistic and administrative style". *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 61/2. 128–138.

MURATI, Q. (2000): *Bashkëmarrëdhëniet gjuhësore shqiptare-maqedonase – Меѓусебни албанско-македонски јазични влијанија – Albanian-Macedonian Language Interrelations.* Tetovo: State University of Tetovo.

MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (2002): *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes.* Oxford: Oxford.

NEIKIRK SCHULER, J. (1996): *From adaptation to nativization: a synchronic analysis of the category of aspect in borrowed verbs in Russian, Bulgarian and Macedonian.* Ph. D. Dissertation, Columbus: The Ohio State University Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures.

NEWMARK, L.; HUBBARD, P., PRIFTI, P. (1982): *Standard Albanian: A reference grammar for students.* Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

NIKČEVIĆ, V. (2001): *Crnogorski jezik.* [The Montenegrin Language]. Cetinje, Montenegro: Matica Crnogorska.

PAVLOVIĆ, M. (1939): „Govor Sretečke Župe" [The dialect of Sretečka Župa]. *Srpski dijalektološki zbornik* 8. 1–353.

PEŠIKAN, M. (1984): „Neke zetske dijalekatske paralele pojava u makedonskom glagolskom sistemu" [Some Zeta dialect parallels of features in the Macedonian verbal system]. *Makedonski jazik* 35. 117–121.

SAWICKA, I. (1997): *The Balkan Sprachbund in the light of phonetic features.* Studia humanitatis 2, Irena Sawicka and Wacław M. Osadnik, eds. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Energia.

SOBOLEV, A. (2007): Lectures on Albanian dialectology. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University. February–March 2007.

STANIŠIĆ, V. (1995): *Srpsko-Albanski jezični odnosi* [Serbian-Albanian language relations]. Belgrade: Srpska Akademija NiU.

THOMASON, S.; KAUFMAN, T. (1988): *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California.

TOMIĆ, O. (2006): *Balkan Sprachbund morphosyntactic features* (= Studies in natural language and linguistic theory 67). Dordecht, Netherlands: Springer.

TOPALLI, K. (2003): *Fërkimoret e afrikatet e gjuhës shqipe* [The fricatives and affricates of the Albanian language]. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave e Shqipërisë.

VAN COETSEM, F. (1988/2000): *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact,* Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

VIDOESKI, B. (2005): *Dialects of Macedonian.* P. Foster, Jr. trans. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.

VUJOVIĆ, L. (1969*)*: „Mrkovićki dijalekat" [The Mrkovićki dialect]. *Srpski dijalektološki zbor-nik* 18. 73–400.

WEINREICH, U. (1953): *Languages in contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

WINFORD, D. (2003): *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

WINFORD, D. (2005): "Contact-induced changes**:** Classification and processes". *Diachronica* 22/2. 373–427.

YLLI, Xh.; SOBOLEV, A. (2004): *Albanskij gegskij govor sela Muxurr (Kraina Dibyr): Sintaksis, leksika, etnolingvistika, teksty* [The Geg Albanian dialect of Muhurr village (In the region of Diber): Syntax, lexicon, ethnolinguistics, texts]. Materialien zum Südosteuropasprachatlas 3. Munich: Biblion Verlag.

ZYGIS, M. (2007): "Contrast Voicing in Slavic Languages". Presentation at the *Second Annual Meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society.* Berlin, August 22–25, 2007.