

Zuzanna Topolinjska
Skopje

**On grammatical categoral markers
(Analytical language — what does it mean?)**

Most often a grammatical category can be seen as a grammaticalized segment core of a semantic category, with grammaticalization understood as the regularization of exponents of some quantum of information from the semantic field of a (partially) grammaticalized semantic category. In other words: grammaticalized information is regularly transferred by means of some class of morpho-syntactic (i.e. morphological and/or syntactic) constructions with predictable grammatical markers. Only marginally does grammaticalization lead to a (partially) semantic bleaching of the respective markers.

Grammaticalized information means information with predictable, transparent grammatical exponents. The said exponents should be easily identified; they should stand out in the discursive chain and thus be easily perceived by addressees.

It would be expected (and linguistic research confirms the expectation) that the grammaticalized information is of particular importance for the successful realization of communication.

I should like to discuss here linguistic means chosen to serve as exponents of grammaticalized information, but before starting that discussion, there is one more terminological problem that should be clarified.

My discussion will be founded mainly on the language which in the course of the last decades presents the central object of my research: the Macedonian language. Macedonian is one of the Slavic members of the so-called Balkan Sprachbund. In the professional literature it is often designated as an **analytical** language. It is not clear for me what the adjectives „analytical” or „synthetical” mean when attributed to a language or when associated with the name of a language. From what I could infer by analysing a sample of contexts where such attributes

are used, it seems that grammatical constructions are labeled as analytical when their categorial markers take the form of „graphically autonomous” words. No comment is needed as to the linguistic validity of such a questionable definition. In the subsequent text I shall try to present and analyse grammatical categorial markers functioning in contemporary Macedonian and — at the same time — I shall try to find if and how analytism can be defined as a linguistic concept.

I consider it necessary to begin the discussion on the formal exponents of particular grammatical categories (i.e. partially grammaticalized semantic categories) from an attempt to define their respective semantic fields, since the direction and the dynamics of the formal evolution — more often than not — is semantically motivated.

The canonical inventory of the semantic, partially grammaticalized categories of Macedonian includes aspect, mode, tense/taxis, distance, person, degree of intensity, definiteness, case, number, and gender. I do not divide them into verbal and/or nominal, nor into sentential and/or categories of the noun phrase, since there is no clear-cut border neither at the semantic nor at the formal grammatical plane.

Let us see how the grammaticalized segments of the corresponding semantic fields and their respective categorial markers have evolved in the frame of the Macedonian diasystem from the hypothetical Common Slavic starting point up to now. As we shall see, besides the inherited morphological affixes and morphophonemic alternations in the course of time numerous new categorial exponents appeared. They usually stand in the two marked positions, that is to say: at the beginning and/or at the end of the respective morpho-syntactic unit; on the prosodic plane they usually behave as clitics and — depending on some local orthographic conventions — they are treated as autonomous “words” (a treatment typical of markers in preposition) or as new affixes (which is typical of markers in postposition). One of the important sources of new categorial markers are auxiliary and/or synsemantic verbs transformed in the course of time into uninflected adverbial particles. The dynamics of these processes makes it often difficult to discern between periphrastic constructions on the one hand and the so called analytical constructions on the other. Since Macedonian linguistic territory is relatively differentiated and Standard Macedonian was definitely codified only in 1944, the usual morpho-syntactic norm shows considerable regional variation. Thus, I shall discuss here not only constructions sanctioned by the prescriptive norm, but also some dialectal and/or regional evolutionary tendencies.

My understanding of the category of ASPECT derives from works of F. Antinucci, L. Gebert (1975–76), and S. Karolak, M. Mirkulovska (2000). Accordingly to the theory of F. Antinucci and L. Gebert, the aspectual opposition is privative in character, namely its marked member, i.e. the perfective aspect, signals a

change of action / of the state of affairs. In Karolak's theory that critical moment of change becomes the base of a temporal opposition between the momentous (= perfective) and continuous (i.e. imperfective) aspect. I would say that aspect means the internal temporal organization of the event.

In Common Slavic the verbal aspect was a derivational, and not an inflectional category. The morphological exponents of the perfective and imperfective aspect respectively (following Moszyński 1984: 258–259) were:

- a) suppletive roots, as in **proiti* vs. **proxoditi*;
- b) root apophony, as in **prinesti* vs. **prinositi*;
- c) prefixes with the categorial aspectual function, as in **xvaliti* vs. **poxvaliti*, **pisati* vs. **napisati*, **dělati* vs. **sъdělati*, **l'ubiti* vs. **vъzl'ubiti*;
- d) prefixes with the status of additional semantic predicates; different prefixes of this type can be added to the same root; they not only change the aspect from imperfective to perfective, but also modify the meaning of the root; in consequence — to assure the aspect balance — new imperfective verbs, founded on apophonic alternations, are derived, after the pattern: **nesti* > **pri-nesti* > **pri-nositi*; **nesti* > **za-nesti* > **za-nositi*, etc.
- e) change of the so-called thematic morphemes, as in **dvig-a-ti* vs. **dvig-nō-ti*, **sěd-a-ti* vs. **sěd-0-ti* > **sěsti*.

In course of time, Macedonian diasystem has virtually eliminated patterns b) and d); in the basic Slavic lexicon there is also no prefix with the function of perfectivization alone, but as of late the prefix *iz-* with the borrowed *-ira-* verbs spreads just as a means of perfectivization (cf. Marković 2010). Instead of the eliminated patterns b) and d) the reversed mechanism has been introduced — the suffixal sequence *-uv-a-* (continuing the older form *-ov-a-*) serves as a universal means of imperfectivization and/or as a marker of the imperfective aspect, cf. secondary imperfectives as: *pro-čit-a* (pf) ~ *pro-čit-uv-a* (ipf), *do-nes-e* (pf) ~ *do-nes-uv-a* (ipf), *za-mol-i* (pf) ~ *za-mol-uv-a* (ipf), etc.; cf. also numerous restructured primary imperfectives as *sed-n-uv-a*, *leg-n-uv-a*, *piš-uv-a*, etc. (cf. Humphries 1997a, 1997b; cf. also Vidoeski 1997 on the situation in the dialects of the Macedonian language).

In the result of the above mentioned processes, today in Macedonian affixes and sequences of affixes alone serve as aspect markers, which seems to confirm the perception of aspect as derivational category. Yet there are some other specific processes that compel us to qualify this evaluation.

In the light of our current knowledge, in Common Indo-European the verbal tense paradigms were bearers of the aspectual difference. This situation changed in the Common Slavic period and thus the Common Slavic aorist and imperfect could be derived both from perfective and/or from imperfective verbs (cf. Moszyński, *ibid.*). In the course of Macedonian historical evolution the picture

was changed once more. In modern Macedonian the imperfect forms derived from perfective verbs are bound forms, components of some marked members of the category of verbal mood (cf. below), while the imperfective aorist has very low frequency and is also lexically restricted and at the semantic plane signals only that the given action/relation holds no more and says nothing about its momentous and/or continuous character. Macedonian — under the Romance influence — has also developed the system of periphrastic resultative verbal paradigmes with the auxiliary *ima* ‘habere’ whose semantic load includes an „aspectual component” almost identical with that of the aorist from imperfective verbs: it signalizes the termination of a past event without information about its momentous and/or continuous character¹.

Finally, one more series of constructions expressing particular aspectual configurations should be mentioned. These are periphrastic constructions organized usually after the pattern: synsemantic verb + *da*-subjunctive of the conjugated verb and/or synsemantic verb + verbal substantive of the conjugated verb, cf. e.g. *X počna / fati / zede... da pišuva...*; *X završi / prekina so pišuвање*, etc. As illustrated, most typical are constructions expressing the inchoative configuration (cf. Topolińska 1984, 1985; Mirkulovska 2000). Constructions of this type introduce into our discussion the problem of the changeable border-line between the periphrastic categorial series on the one hand and categorial series with uninflected analytical exponents on the other, one of the central problems in this discussion.

Summarizing:

- the course of Macedonian evolution confirms and strengthens the derivational character of the grammatical category of aspect;
- Macedonian has virtually eliminated the „hidden” morpho-phonemic aspectual markers and introduced new morphological markers, among others *-UV-A-* as virtually universal signal of the imperfective (unmarked?) aspect;
- Macedonian has partially restored the aspectual function of the aorist as marker of the perfective aspect;
- the new Macedonian *ima*-resultative also has a marginal aspectual function of signalling the termination of a past event,
- finally: in Macedonian — as in other Slavic languages — there are serial periphrastic constructions expressing aspectual semantics.

¹ In some SouthWestern Macedonian dialects - as a result of the intensive Macedonian-Aromanian linguistic interference - an interesting new aspectual opposition has developed. The conjugated verb is represented by the old *participium praeteriti passivi* which has lost its [+pass] characteristic, became diathetically unmarked and can be derived both from transitive and intransitive verbs; as categorial aspectual markers serve auxiliaries, respectively *sum* ‘esse’ as a positive signal for perfective aspect, and *ima* ‘habere’ as the unmarked member of the opposition as described above. All this situation is presented in detail in Marković 2007.

As a result of all these changes, present-day aspectual markers in Macedonian texts are more transparent and more predictable than those ascribed to Common Slavic.

In the discussion of the grammatical aspect markers one more specific aspectual configuration should be mentioned — the iterative aspect. As a means of expressing a repetitive series of events it is primarily of durative, thus: imperfective character; nonetheless, keeping in mind that these events can be presented both from the perspective of their duration and/or from the perspective of the critical ‘moment of change’, an iterative series can be formalized with the means of imperfective and/or perfective verbs. What is interesting is that an iterative imperfective series expresses usually a real series of past events, while an iterative perfective series serves as a means of expressing a virtual series of events. Consequently, we shall come back to the problem of iterativity and its markers when speaking about a modal opposition: real vs. virtual.

The semantic category of MODALITY has as its grammatical exponents the so-called verbal moods. At the semantic plane modality is usually understood as the expression of the speaker’s subjective attitude in relation to his message; the information transferred by grammatical moods usually expresses (a) the speaker’s wish to provoke some action (deontic modality) and/or (b) his evaluation of the truth value of the message (epistemic modality). Generally speaking, I would qualify as [+ modal] every utterance speaking about a virtual situation / event or about a situation / event whose factive status is doubtful from the speaker’s perspective. Thus, the qualification [+ modal] is valid — among others — for all the utterances speaking of future events (cf. below). Finally, that qualification is valid also for utterances with strengthened „positive” modality, e.g. for resultative constructions.

Our actual reconstruction of the Common Slavic verbal system among the inherited Indo-European moods — besides the unmarked assertive (indicative) mood — shows only the presence of the imperative mood; the conditional mood, founded on the old optative of the verb **byti* is a Common Slavic innovation (cf. Moszyński 1984: 260–270).

Present-day Macedonian indicative mood includes verbal paradigms of the „absolute” tenses, which means the present tense (from imperfective verbs only), the aorist and the imperfect (from imperfective verbs only). On the usage of bound forms such as „present” and/or „imperfect” forms from perfective verbs cf. below. Formative markers of the mentioned indicative categories — as inherited from Common Slavic — are of strictly morphological character; these are (a) the so-called stem-vowels and (b) the corresponding series of personal endings.

The imperative mood has also morphological markers, partially inherited, partially redistributed depending on the phonological structure of the stem (cf. Koneski

1982: 416). The imperative has inflected forms for the second-person singular and plural alone. The forms of the first and third-person are built after the pattern: the adverbial particle *da*, for the third person also the adverbial particle *neka* + corresponding forms of the *praesens* from the conjugated verb. Occasionally the imperative forms are strengthened by the preposed imperative of the verb *dava*: *daj!* *dajte!* The strengthened form of the prohibitive is formed after the pattern: *nemoj / nemojte da + praesens* from the conjugated verb, with the forms *nemoj(te)* derived from the old prohibitive of **mogti* ‘posse’.

Present-day Macedonian verbal system includes also two extended series of periphrastic paradigms with the auxiliaries *sum* ‘esse’ and *ima* ‘habere’, whose many contextual and/or constitutional variants are marked for the epistemic and/or deontic modality, among others admirative, evidential, etc. The first examples of the so-called *sum*-perfect can be found in the oldest Church Slavic texts. The *ima*-series appears later, under the Romance influence.

Common Slavic lost the Proto-Indo-European conjunctive and formed a new conjunctive mood after the pattern: old *participim perfecti activi secundum* + the auxiliary *bimь* which continues the optative from **byti* (cf. Moszyński 1984: 270). In present-day Macedonian it functions as *potentialis* with a relatively low frequency; the former auxiliary paradigm is reduced to the petrified uninflected particle *bi*.

As a result of the Balkan linguistic interference two new moods have appeared: conditional and subjunctive.

The conditional appears today in the two canonical variants: as *realis (conditionalis praesentis)* and *irrealis (conditionalis praeteriti)*. Its formant is the preposed petrified verbal particle *k’e* deriving from **xǝtǝti*. *Conditionalis praesentis* is formed after the pattern: *k’e + praesens* from the conjugated verb, and *conditionalis praeteriti* — after the pattern: *k’e + imperfectum* from the conjugated verb. In some peripheral dialects there are still residua of the inflected paradigm of **xǝtǝti* in its primary and/or in its secondary (auxiliary) function.

Also the subjunctive appears in the two variants, as *subiunctivus praesentis* and *subiunctivus praeteriti*; its formant is the adverbial particle *da* preposed respectively to the *praesens* and/or to the *imperfectum* of the conjugated verb.

Finally, in present-day Macedonian there exists also (as postulated by Čašule 1989) an interesting subsystem of modal verbs. They share several semantic and formal characteristics, but what is most noticeable from the point of view of our discussion here is their oscillation between the status of a full (auxiliary / synsemantic) verb and an uninflected verbal particle controlling subjunctive constructions. Two of them, *ima*₂² expressing internal and/or external obligation (as in ‘have to’, ‘ought to’) and *mora* ‘must’, appear in both syntactical variants in constructions

² Labelled as *ima*₂ in opposition to *ima*₁ - predicate of possession.

whose second component is *subiunctivus praesentis* of the conjugated verb, cf. a) *imam da odam / čitam / učam...* ~ b) *ima da odam / čitam / učam...* Another one, *može*, appears in both variants with the meaning ‘(be) able to’, ‘know how’ and also in the variant b) with the meaning ‘may’. Finally, the last two, *smee* ‘may’, ‘be permitted to’, and *biduva* ‘should’ appear in the variant a) alone.

Summarizing:

– in relation to Common Slavic, Macedonian, due primarily to the Balkan (Romance) interference, has substantially increased the number of grammaticalized modal constructions;

– numerous otherwise indicative constructions acquired secondary, contextual and/or consituational variants marked for (epistemic and/or deontic) modality;

– but certainly the most characteristic trait of the Macedonian „modality grammar” is the gradual transformation of some auxiliary and/or synsemantic verbs into uninflected preposed adverbial particles functioning as formants of particular moods.

The semantic categories of TENSE and TAXIS organize information concerning the place of the narrated event on the axis of time. The category of TENSE is responsible for the (absolute) location in relation to the speech-event, while the category of TAXIS expresses the relative location, i.e. informs about the relative succession (anteriority and/or posteriority) of events.

The category of TENSE covers two temporal zones known respectively as ‘present’ and ‘past’, while the events projected into the future are perceived as positively marked for modality and expressed with the aid of corresponding moods. In other words: in the semantic categorial hierarchy modality is assigned a higher position than tense.

The ‘present’-zone differs from the ‘past’-zone only in that it includes the moment of the speech act.

We assume that there were three morphological tense paradigms in Common Slavic: present, aorist and imperfect. Their categorial markers were (a) specialized morphemes defining the structure of the stem, and (b) corresponding specialized series of endings for person and number. (Concerning the aspectual semantics of the past tenses, see above). In the course of time Macedonian has restricted the tense function of the imperfect to imperfective verbs only; on the other hand, the aorist today — as mentioned above — is practically derived from the perfective stems alone. The strictly morphological character of the categorial markers has been retained, but their inventory was simplified with the elimination of morphophonemic alternations and the reduction of morphonological stem variation (cf. Vidoeski 1997).

The grammatical means for expressing differences in TAXIS in Common Slavic were relatively few and with low frequency; solely periphrastic paradigms with the auxiliary *sum* ‘esse’ (past and present) appear in that function; they are known respectively as Slavic perfect and plusquamperfect. This is also the situation found in the oldest Church Slavic texts of Macedonian provenience. Only later, under the Romance influence, „the second perfect” appeared, with the auxiliary *ima* ‘habere’. Today there is a considerable regional variation in the frequency of use as also in the semantic load of the particular „perfective” paradigms, but they still represent typical periphrastic constructions³. Parallel to the developments in other Slavic languages, the auxiliary *sum* is lost in the 3rd person of the perfect paradigm. On the specific markers for gender and number in the *sum*-perfect cf. below.

The category of DEGREE — characteristic of the predicates formalized as adjectives and/or adverbs and informing on the degree of intensity of the feature ascribed to the respective actions and/or protagonists of the action — in Common Slavic had morphemic, suffixal markers which implied several morpho-phonemic alternations. In the course of time Macedonian — under the influence of the neighboring Balkan languages — has exchanged these suffixes for prefixes: *po-* for the comparative and *naj-* for the superlative degree (cf. e.g. *kratok* ‘short’, *pokratorok* ‘shorter’, *najkratok* ‘the shortest’, etc.). The prefixes are more transparent as markers and do not entail morphological complications. Of course, besides morphological ones, there were always periphrastic constructions (with adverbs like *poveke* for comparative, *mnogu* or *mošne* for superlative) expressing degrees of intensity, but the introduction of prefixal markers allowed a noticeable spread of the morphologically, regularly expressed gradation. As a result, where other Slavic languages resort to periphrastic solutions, Macedonian (and Bulgarian) have „regular” degree forms both for the so-called relational (= deadjectival, deverbal) adjectives and/or adverbials as *pomalečok*, *povodenikav*, *ponapreden...*; *ponagore*, *ponadesno*, *najnadolu*, and the like.

The category of PERSON is usually understood as a paradigmatic category of the verb. It carries information about the active and passive participants in the speech event and also about the spoken event under discussion. Its grammatical categorial markers are the so-called verbal endings for person and number; they could be interpreted as postpositive clitic variants of the personal pronouns.

³ Blaže Koneski in his grammar of Macedonian (Koneski 1982: 485-6) notes that the form *beše* (3rd ps sg ipf. from *sum*) can appear in the function of a particle emphasizing the reference to the past as expressed by the *sum*-perfect of the constitutive predicate of the sentence in question (cf. *beše si došle*, and the like; it seems that present-day Macedonian standard has marginalized this type of use.

Macedonian, *mutatis mutandis*, continues Common Slavic endings for all the verbal paradigms. It is not unusual for the information covered by the endings to be strengthened by the presence of the full forms of the personal pronouns, cf. e.g. *Jas mislam deka... Vie sami ne možete...*, and the like. In constructions with the constitutive predicate in aorist, where the forms for the 2nd and 3rd person singular are identical, and/or in the 3rd person singular of the *sum*-perfect with the auxiliary zeroed, personal pronouns and/or other nominative NPs alone function as categorial markers for person.

There is, however, another possibility to interpret the category of person. We could speak about PERSON *sensu largo*, i.e. cover all the grammatical functions of the personal (and possessive) pronouns⁴. In other words: we could speak of the category of PERSONALITY (in some contexts: the category of ANIMACY), which is often coded with the aid of special grammatical markers performing several categorial functions. Such a treatment seems particularly well justified in the analysis and description of Balkan languages, as will be seen in our discussion of the categories of CASE and DEFINITENESS.

The grammatical category of CASE offers information about the number and the primary hierarchy of the arguments implied by particular predicates and defines referents of these arguments in terms of basic oppositions such as [+/- abstract], [+/- animate], [+/- human], etc.; moreover, it suggests prototypical functions of the arguments based on their relation to the predicate, as in the nominative argument referring to the subject / agens / initiator of the action, the accusative argument — the object of the action / patiens, the dative argument — the addressee / beneficiens / target of the action, the instrumental argument — the means of the action / accompanying factor, the local / spatial argument — localizer of the action...

In Common Slavic, cases were expressed with morphological nominal forms marked with corresponding declensional endings; there were several series of declensional types, defined by the inventories of endings and inventories of morphological alternations implied by these endings; besides nominative, accusative, dative, instrumental and locative, also vocative — expressing a direct relation between the author of the message and its addressee, i.e. marked for the semantic category of APPEAL — is traditionally included in the inventory of case forms. Additional semantic distinctions: spatial, temporal, causal... were expressed by two-component constructions: preposition + morphological case-form or — by way of exception — morphological case-form + postposition. Even in the oldest Slavic texts some

⁴ I understand possessive pronouns as genitive forms of personal pronouns, cf. below.

case-forms appear more often with prepositions than not; such is the case with locative and also — in some regionally marked texts — with instrumental.

In the South-Eastern diasystems, Macedonian and Bulgarian, early on there appears a tendency to simplify the system of expressing case-relationships: (a) by eliminating morphological alternations; (b) by reducing the inventory of case-endings; (c) by transferring the focus point from simple morphological case-forms to prepositional constructions. In present-day Macedonian we have some regional nominal systems where there is a morphological distinction between nominative and vocative form alone, and even this only in the singular. Analysing the current means of expressing case-relationships we have to make distinctions (a) between the [+ definite] and [– definite] noun-phrases and (b) — as a corollary — between noun phrases constituted by substantives and those constituted by personal pronouns; the pronominal morpho-syntax remains still more complicated than iso-functional substantival constructions.

Personal pronouns in expressively unmarked constructions appear as clitics; their full forms appear in the position of contrast (under rhetorical stress) and/or when controlled by prepositions. Thus, in the pronominal sub-system:

- in expressively unmarked position, the nominative case relationship is expressed by the enclitic personal endings of the verb; in the position of contrast the nominative NP is morphologically marked, can even have a suppletive stem;

- the accusative NP is morphologically marked; in the position of contrast it is redoubled by the corresponding clitic.

NB with prepositions only the „full” accusative form appears; marginally, in some regional systems, it appears in the function of *casus generalis obliquus*;

- the dative NP is morphologically marked; in the position of contrast it is redoubled by the corresponding clitic; marginally, regionally, the *na*-construction appears;

NB in colloquial standard some speakers mix up the „full” accusative and dative forms,

- the instrumental NP is expressed by the tandem: the preposition *so* + *casus generalis*;

- the locative NP — according to the interpretation we accept in this text — is marked by one of the rich inventory of spatial and/or temporal prepositions;

- according to the prescriptive norm there is no genitive NP, i.e. no genitive NP constituted formally by a pronominal form; the genitive case relationship is expressed by possessive pronouns.

In the substantival sub-system:

- the nominative NP is marked by its linearization (as preposed to the verb in expressively unmarked constructions), by the absence of prepositions; more often than not it is marked also as [+ definite];

– the accusative NP is marked by its linearization (as postposed in relation to the verb in expressively unmarked constructions) and by the absence of prepositions, albeit in some dialect it is accompanied by the preposition *na* (cf. Koneski 1986); if [+ definite], it is marked with the preposed pronominal clitic (see below). In some Western dialects there are residua of old accusative forms with some masculine proper names, kinship terms and professional names;

– the dative NP is marked by the preposition *na*; more often than not it is also [+ definite] and if so, it is additionally marked with the preposed pronominal clitic (see below); in some Western dialects there are residual dative forms of proper names, both masculine and feminine;

– the instrumental NP is marked by the preposition *so*;

– the locative NP — as it is understood in this text — is accompanied by one of the rich inventory of the spatial and/or temporal prepositions;

– the genitive NP is marked by its adnominal (and not adverbial) position and by the preposition *na*; there exists also a class of adjectival possessive derivatives from proper names, term of kinship, professional names... expressing the genitive case relationship, but they are today in retreat.

On the primary semantic motivation of cases cf. Topolińska 1996, 2010.

The grammatical category of NUMBER represents the grammaticalized segment of the semantic category of QUANTITATIVE EVALUATION of the spoken of events and of protagonists of these events.

In Common Slavic the grammatical category of number had three regular members: singular, dual and plural, all with morphological markers in the form of corresponding endings appearing in the declension of substantives, adjectives and pronouns; there were also some shorter series of suffixal derivatives with the meaning of collectively (and not distributively as in the case of „regular” plural) perceived sets of denotates of a given concept.

In present-day Macedonian we have singular and plural case-paradigms with the difference in number signalled by inflectional endings. There is also a lexically-restricted series of masculine bound forms with the old dual ending *-a*; this series is known as the counting plural and appears only when accompanied by cardinal numbers.

Concerning the quantitative evaluation of events as expressed in the frame of the verbal system cf. above in the fragment devoted to the category of verbal aspect.

Concerning the dynamics and idiosyncrasies of the present-day Macedonian quantitative constructions see E. Petroska (2008).

The category of GENDER is of a strictly grammatical character. There is no correlation between the morphological means (roots, stems) transferring information

on biological gender of the referents of NPs and morphological means (suffixes, inflectional endings) defining the grammatical gender of corresponding NPs.

DEFINITENESS is a pragmatic category partially grammaticalized at the NP level; it transfers information on whether the referent of a given NP is identified and/or individualized (specified) for the author of the message. The information is carried by the lexical markers known as pronouns; these are grammaticalized at the syntactic level — in the expressively unmarked NPs they open, by definition, the nominal string. Such is the situation in the majority of Slavic languages, the situation as inherited from Common Slavic.

The Balkan Slavic languages — under the Greek and/or Romance influence — have extended the grammatical segment of the category of definiteness — a whole series of new markers: pronominal clitics, appeared.

In present-day Macedonian the basic markers are enclitic forms of demonstrative pronouns. The enclitics based on the root **t-* function as definite articles — they are treated as suffixes and glued to the first component of the nominal string. The enclitics based on the stems **ov-* and **on-* carry additional information on the proximity / emotional closeness, or on the (spatial, emotional...) distance of the referent of the given NP respectively in relation to the speaker.

Also the clitic forms of personal pronouns function in some contexts as markers of definiteness, as demonstrated above in the analysis of the category of case. In the oblique case system (i.e. in A, D, and marginally also G) they are obligatory constituents of the [+ definite] case paradigm. Taking account of the „graphical status” of the marker this last series alone can be qualified as „analytical”.

In some functions of the indefinite article the lexeme *eden* appears, a semantic derivative of the cardinal number *eden* ‘one’.

As can be seen from the above description, in the Macedonian diasystem the inherited Slavic nominal inflectional system experienced complete revolution. In the substantival subsystem all the inflectional endings for oblique cases were eliminated, and in the pronominal subsystem their inventory was drastically reduced; this implies, of course, the elimination of all the morpho-phonemic alternations implied by these endings. The semantic opposition: singular ~ plural alone, and the purely grammatical oppositions of gender are still morphologically marked.

Basic markers of the case relationships are prepositions and — in the [+ definite] case paradigm — pronominal clitics. The corresponding prepositions by definition behave as proclitics, while the pronominal clitics can appear both in pre- and post-position. All these markers are „graphically autonomous words”. In some equivocal contexts also the linearization of the sentence as a whole and/or some lexical markers for topicalization help to identify the case relationship.

CONCLUSION:

– in the course of time the Macedonian diasystem has eliminated numerous morphological and/or morpho-phonemic categorical markers;

– numerous new markers appeared a) in order to replace the old inherited markers and/or b) in order to cover the need for new markers for new grammaticalized segments of the corresponding semantic fields;

– of the two marked positions: at the beginning and/or at the end of the verbal or of the nominal string, the majority of the new markers occupy the initial position and — understandably — in the written text they function as autonomous words; the new postposed markers are glued to corresponding elements of the string and treated as suffixes. Does it make Macedonian an analytical language? I would say that the same line of evolution is characteristic of all Slavic languages; it is only the pace of the evolution that is much quicker for languages experiencing lasting interferences from the neighbouring linguistic systems, as is the case for the members of the Balkan Sprachbund. In linguistic terms analytism can be defined as a tendency to shift the grammatical categorical markers from the purely morphological to the morphosyntactic level.

References

- Antinucci F., Gebert L., 1975–1976, *L'aspetto verbale in polacco*, „Ricerche Slavistiche”, vol. 22–23.
- Čašule 1989: Чашуле И., *Модалните глаголи во македонскиот јазик*, „Прилози = Contributions”, Македонска академија на науките и уметностите. Одделение за лингвистика и литературна наука, кн. 14/2.
- Humphries D. J., 1997a, *Concrete accomplishment in Macedonian imperfectives*, „Journal of Slavic Linguistics”, Vol. 5, No. 2.
- Humphries D. J., 1997b, *The morphology and semantics of doublet derived imperfective verbs in modern standard Macedonian*, Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services, (Chicago Univ. diss.).
- Karolak S., Mirkulovska M., 2000, *Inchoatywna konfiguracja aspektualna w języku macedońskim*, [= *Slavia Meridionalis* 3], Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- Koneski 1982: Конески Б., *Граматика на македонски литературен јазик*, Скопје: Култура.
- Koneski 1986: Конески Б., *Директниот на-предмет во македонските говори*, [In:] *Studia Linguistica Polono-Jugoslavica* 4, Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Marković 2007: Марковиќ М., *Ароманскиот и македонскиот говор од охридско-стручкиот регион (во балкански контекст)*, Скопје: Македонска академија на науките и уметностите.

- Marković 2010: Марковиќ М., *Видска и временска акомодација на глаголите на -iga во современиот македонскиот јазик*, [In:] XXXVI научна конференција на XLII меѓународен семинар за македонски јазик, литература и култура, Скопје: Универзитет св. Кирил и Методиј.
- Mirkulovska 2000: Миркуловска М., *Почеток на дејство/состојба како семантичка и граматичка категорија (врз материјал од македонскиот и полскиот јазик)*, [= *Studia Linguistica Polono-Meridianslavica* 10], Скопје.
- Moszyński L., 1984, *Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej*, Warszawa: PWN.
- Petroska 2008: Петроска Е., *Количествените категории во македонскиот. Од семантика кон форма*, Скопје: Македонска реч.
- Topolińska 1984: Тополињска З., *Перифрастични инхоативни конструкции во јужномакедонските дијалекти*, „Македонски јазик” 35.
- Topolińska 1985: Тополињска З., *Из проблематике словенских инхоатива, (однос глаголског вида и фазе радње)*, „Јужнословенски филолог”, бр. 41.
- Topolińska Z., 1996, *Anthropocentric Language Theory as Organizing Principle of the Slavic Case System*, „Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego”, z. 52.
- Topolińska Z., 2010, *W sprawie przypadku. Gawęda językoznawcza*, Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Vidoeski B., 1997, *Morphological Patterns of Imperfective Verbs in Dialects of the Macedonian Language*, „Balkanistica” 10: *Studies dedicated to the Memory of Zbigniew Gołąb*.

Streszczenie

O eksponentach kategorii gramatycznych („Język analityczny” — co to znaczy?)

Posługując się materiałem języka macedońskiego, tj. jednego ze słowiańskich języków bałkańskich ocenianych często jako analityczne, autorka dowodzi, że ocena struktury gramatycznej danego języka jako „analitycznej” polega w dużej mierze na konwencji graficznej, która prepozycyjne formanty kategorialne („afiksy fleksyjne”) każe nam oceniać jako odrębne formy wyrazowe, podczas gdy formanty postpozycyjne uznajemy za rozszerzenie odpowiedniej „odmienianej” formy danego leksemu. *De facto* mamy do czynienia z charakterystycznym dla wielu języków europejskich procesem przenoszenia eksponentów kategorialnych z postpozycji w prepozycję. Proces ten jest od dawna obserwowany w językach romańskich, także w angielskim, ostatnio obserwujemy go i w innych językach germańskich, typowy jest dla kodów językowych objętych pojęciem ‘Average Central European’; polski jak i cała Słowiańszczyzna północna, jest pod tym względem konserwatywny, ale w grę wchodzi raczej tempo niż kierunek zmian. Opiswany proces

motywowany jest semantycznie. U jego podstaw leży chęć zapewnienia maksymalnej przejrzystości relewantnych sygnałów gramatycznych ważnej zwłaszcza w środowiskach wielojęzycznych, a tym samym chęć zapewnienia powodzenia procesu komunikacji.