SPECIFICITIES IN OBJECT CLITIC DOUBLING IN BALKAN ROMANCE AND BALKAN SLAVIC

OLGA MIŠESKA TOMIĆ[1]

Abstract. The present paper examines the specificities in object clitic doubling in two Balkan Romance languages, Romanian and Aromanian, and two Balkan Slavic languages, Macedonian and Bulgarian. Having illustrated the conditions on clitic doubling in Romanian, Aromanian, Macedonian and Bulgarian, the author analyses and compares these conditions. It is pointed out that the conditions on clitic doubling in Aromanian and Macedonian are almost analogous – definiteness plays a central role in clitic doubling of the direct objects of the two languages, whereas the clitic doubling of indirect objects mainly depends on specificity. The conditions on clitic doubling in Romanian and Bulgarian differ substantially from the conditions on clitic doubling in the Balkan languages with which they are in close genetic relationships. In both Romanian and Bulgarian, clitic doubling depends on discourse factors, but the types and usage of these factors are idiosyncratic. In Bulgarian, all topicalized definite objects are clitic-doubled, while the indefinite topicalized objects are clitic-doubled only under specific conditions. In Romanian, the cliticization of both direct and indirect objects is typically triggered by topicality and specificity, while direct object clitic doubling is, in addition, triggered by humanness. It is argued that object clitic doubling results from a centuries-long socio-linguistic contact in an environment in which direct inter-translatability is needed. Clitic doubling in Macedonian and Aromanian occurs under almost identical conditions, because the two languages have for a long time been in such an environment. When the object clitic doubling phenomenon spreads in areas where no direct inter-translatability is required, distinct phenomena appear.

Keywords: Balkan Romance, Balkan Slavic, object clitic doubling, definiteness, topicality, focusing, specificity, humanness, discourse factors, socio-linguistic contact, inter-translatability.

1. INTRODUCTION

Object clitic doubling is a phenomenon by which clitic personal pronouns occur in the same clausal domain and have the same grammatical function as strong personal pronouns or noun phrases (NPs) functioning as direct or indirect objects in that domain. Following Franks and Rudin (2005), I assume that the clitic pronouns originate as heads of

---

[1] Department of English, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Novi Sad, olgamiseskatomic@gmail.com.

phrases which take as complements the strong personal pronouns or NPs with which they associate. The clitics always move to the left, while their associates can (a) stay in situ, (b) move to a topic position in the Left Periphery of the clause, or (c) dislocate to the Right Periphery of the clause.

Cliticization of personal pronouns has spread over the Mediterranean region of Europe. In Western Mediterranean, it appears in Spanish and, to a limited extent, in Italian. In most of the languages in the Balkan Peninsula (at the south-eastern corner of Mediterranean Europe) it is, however, a distinct typological characteristic.

The occurrence of the clitic doubling phenomenon and the conditions for its appearance in the Balkan languages differ. I shall examine the cliticization processes and the occurrence of the doubling clitics in the Balkan Romance languages Romanian and Aromanian, and the Balkan Slavic languages Macedonian and Bulgarian.

2. OBJECT CLITIC DOUBLING IN ROMANIAN

In Romanian, the cliticization of both direct and indirect objects is typically triggered by topicality and specificity, while direct object clitic doubling is, in addition, triggered by humanness (Tomić 2006). (I understand topicality to express a discourse related notion, informally characterized as "old information" and juxtaposed to focus – informally characterized as "new information" (Firbas 1992), while specificity expresses referential dependency between items introduced in the discourse (Heusinger 2002).

Direct objects featured by strong DPs, such as names, pronoun and quantified nouns, are obligatorily clitic-doubled in Romanian:

(1) L-am   văzut   pe[2]   Petru/ea.[3]
     3SG.M.CL-have.1SG.PRES   seen.PART   ACC.MARK   Petru/her[4]
     'I saw/have seen Petru/her.'
(2) O   pupă   pe   fiecare   fată.
     3SG.F.ACC.CL   kiss.3SG.PRES   ACC.MARK   every   girl
     '(S)he kisses every girl.'

Specific human direct objects without articles, specific human DPs with indefinite articles, and specific bare human DPs, are also clitic-doubled in Romanian:

(3) Îl   caut   pe   profesor/
     3SG.M.ACC.CL   look for.1SG.PRES   ACC.MARK   professor
     un   profesor.
     a.M.SG professor
     'I am looking for the professor/a (specific) professor.'

---

[2] All Romanian clitic-doubled NPs are introduced by the accusative marker pe.

[3] The Romanian clauses have been provided by Virginia Hill, Dana Isac and Aleksandra Popescu.

[4] The following abbreviations are used in all the examples in this paper: ACC – accusative; ACC Mark – accusative marker; CL – clitic; DAT – dative; DIMIN – diminutive; F – feminine; GEN – genitive; N – neuter; PRES – present; PART – participle; PAST – past; PL – plural; PRES – present; PROX – proximate; REFL – reflexive; SG – singular

(4)	L-am	întâlnit	pe	un
	3SG.M.CL-have.1SG.PRES	met.PART	ACC.MARK	a.M.SG
	vecin.			
	neighbor			
	'I met/have met a neighbor (I know).'			
(5)	L-am	văzut	pe	copil.
	3SG.M.ACC.CL-have.1SG.PRES	seen.PART	ACC.MARK	child
	'I saw/have seen the child (we know).'			

The strong reading of weak [+human] direct object DPs may also require clitic doubling (Gierling 1998). Thus, the NP in (6) is clitic doubled, while in (7) it is not:

(6)	I-am	văzut	pe
	3SG.M.ACC.CL-have.1SG.PRES	seen.PART	ACC.MARK
	mulți	copii.	
	many.M.PL	children	
	'I saw/have seen many of the children.'		

(7)	I-am	văzut	mulți	copii.
	3SG.M.ACC.CL-have.1SG.PRES	seen.PART	many.M.PL	children
	'I saw/have seen many children.'			

Human DPs with definite articles and non-topicalized, non-human DPs are not clitic-doubled in this language, whether specific or not.

(8)	*L-am	văzut	profesorul.
	3SG.M.ACC.Cl-have.1SG.PRES	seen.PART	professor+the.M.SG
	'I saw/have seen the professor (whom we mentioned).'		

(9)	*L-am	mâncat	peștele.
	3SG.M.ACC.CL-have.1SG.PRES	eaten.PART	fish+the.M.SG
	'I ate/have eaten the fish.'		

Romanian indirect objects, whether or not definite or human, are obligatorily clitic-doubled when in topic position in the Left Periphery, and optionally clitic-doubled when in non-focused position to the right of the verb:

(10)	Fetei	i-a	dat
	girl+the.F.SG.DAT	3SG.DAT.CL-have.3SG.PRES	given.PART
	Petru	o	floare.
	Petru	a.F.SG	flower
	'The girl was given a flower by Petru.'		
	(literally: 'To the girl Petru gave/has given a flower.')		

(11)	Petru	(i)-a	dat	fetei
	Petru	3SG.DAT.CL-have.3SG.PRES	given.PART	girl+the.F.SG.DAT
	o	floare.		
	a.F.SG	flower		
	'Petru gave/has given to the girl a flower.'			

In some cases, the Romanian indirect articled indirect objects occurring after the verb may be optionally clitic-doubled when they are given specific interpretation:

(12)   Nu   (le)   am   scris   multor
        not   3PL.DAT.CL   have.1SG.PRES   written.PART   many.PL.DAT
        elevi.
        students
        'I didn't write/haven't written to many students.'

Focused Romanian indirect objects are not clitic-doubled even when they are definite and human.

3. OBJECT CLITIC DOUBLING IN AROMANIAN

In Aromanian, a Romance language spoken in the south-western part of Northern Macedonia and the north-western part of Greece, clitic doubling of indirect objects is triggered by specificity, whereas clitic doubling of direct objects is triggered by definiteness and specificity. The clitics most often procliticize to the verb.
        Not only direct objects featured by strong DPs, but rather all Aromanian definite direct objects are clitic-doubled:

(13)   L-om   vidzută   Petri.[5]
        3.SG.M.ACC.CL-have.1SG.PRES   seen.PART   Petri.
        'I have seen Petri.'

Topicalization plays no role in the clitic doubling in Aromanian, and neither does specificity, if the clitic-doubled direct object is definite, (14)-(15).

(14)   L-caftu   sheflu.
        3SG.M.ACC.CL-look for.1SG.PRES   chief+the.M.SG
        'I am looking for the chief.'
(15)   Sheflu   l-caftu.
        chief+the.M.SG   3SG.M.ACC.CL-look for.1SG.PRES
        'It is the chief I am looking for.'

Indefinite direct objects are, as a rule, not clitic-doubled. For some speakers, however, they can be clitic-doubled if occurring in a heavy (complex) sentence, as in (16), or referring to a partitive DP, i.e. to a DP that denotes part of a whole, as in (17).

(16)   (Lu)   băgără   un   om   s-u
        3Sg.M.ACC.CL   forced.3SG.PAST   a.M.SG man   to-3SG.F.ACC.CL
        scotă   plocia.
        remove.3SG   boulder+the.F.SG
        'They forced a man to remove the boulder.'

---

[5] The Aromanian clauses were collected in the western Macedonian town of Kruševo, in which more than twenty per cent of its 9.000 inhabitants are Aromanian. The usage of these clauses was subsequently tested in an Ohrid suburb where many Aromanians live.

(17)   (U)   mărtă   ună   di   featile.
        3SG.F.ACC.CL married.3SG.PAST   a.F.SG   from   daughters+the.F.Pl
        'For one of her daughters (s)he found a husband.'
        (literally: '(S)he married one of his daughters.')

Bare Aromanian direct objects are, as a rule, not clitic-doubled.

Aromanian specific indirect objects are clitic-doubled, whether definite or indefinite, topicalized or non-topicalized, human or non-human, animate or inanimate, as in (18)-(19).

(18)   Petri   lji   are   dată   lilice   a
        Petri   3SG.F.DAT.CL   have.3SG.PRES   given.PART   flower   to
        featiljei/   unei   feată.
        girl+the.F.SG.DAT   a.F.SG   girl
        'Petri has given flower to the girl/a girl.'
(19)   A   Petri/ficiorlui   va   s-lji   pitrec
        to   Petri/boy+the.M.SG.DAT   will   to-3SG.DAT.CL send.1SG
        prats   măne
        money   tomorrow
        'To Petri/the boy I will send money tomorrow.'

The clitic-doubled specific indefinite object can co-occur with a clitic-doubled definite direct object, as in (20).

(20)   Lji   lu   băgai   un   cicior   a
        3SG.F.DAT.CL   3SG.F.ACC.CL   fixed.3SG.PAST   a.M.SG   leg   of/from
        masăljei.
        table+the.F.SG.DAT
        '(S)he fixed a leg of the table.'

Bare indirect objects are usually non-specific and, consequently, are not clitic-doubled. However, the specificity effect can sometimes disappear, and such objects can be optionally clitic-doubled, as seen in (21).

(21)   Jana   (l)-u   deade   cartea   la
        Jana   3SG.M.DAT.CL-3SG.F.ACC.CL   gave.3SG.PAST   letter+the.F.SG   to
        ficior.
        boy.
        'Jana gave the letter to a (mere) boy.'

4. OBJECT CLITIC DOUBLING IN MACEDONIAN

Clitic doubling in Macedonian direct and indirect object mainly depends on definiteness and specificity. In the indicative clauses of Standard Macedonian, the clitics procliticize to the verb, while in clauses expressing commands they encliticize to the verb.

Definiteness plays a central role in the clitic doubling of direct objects. In Standard Macedonian, and in the western Macedonian dialects, on which Standard Macedonian is based, all definite objects are clitic-doubled, whether human or non-human, animate or inanimate, concrete or abstract, and regardless of whether in situ, as in (22), in topic position, as in (23), or in focus position in the Left Periphery, as in (24).

(22)   Jana   go   zaboravi   Petka/
        Jana   3SG.M/N.ACC.CL   forgot.3SG.PAST   Petko.SG.M.ACC
        volkot/   pismoto/   problemot.
        wolf+the.M.SG   letter+the N.SG   problem+the.M.SG
        'Jana forgot Petko/the wolf/the letter/the problem.'

(23)   Petka/   volkot/   pismoto/   problemot
        Petko.SG.M ACC   wolf+the.M.SG   letter+the.N.SG   problem+the.M.SG
        go   zaboravi   Jana.
        3SG.M/N.ACC.CL   forgot.3SG.PAST   Jana
        'As for Petko/the wolf/the letter/the problem, Jana forgot it.'

(24)   Jana   Petka/   volkot/   pismoto/
        Jana   Petko.SG.M ACC   wolf+the.M.SG   letter+the.N.SG
        problemot   go   zaboravi.
        problem+the.M.SG   3SG.M/N.ACC.CL   forgot.3SG.PAST
        'It was Petko/the wolf/the letter/the problem that Jana forgot.'

The direct objects in the northern Macedonian dialects and the direct objects in the western part of the eastern Macedonian dialects and the direct objects in the Northern Macedonian dialects are only optionally clitic-doubled. In the easternmost Macedonian dialects, direct object clitic-doubling depends on discourse factors, as they do in Bulgarian. The following example, (25), is from the Macedonian language spoken in an area in Bulgaria very close to North Macedonia:

(25)   Ostail   go   na   mira
        left.M.SG.PART 3SG.M.ACC.CL to   peace.GEN
        Petreto.
        Peter.DIMIN+the.N.SG
        'He did not bother Peter (anymore).'
        (literally: 'He left Peter at peace.')

Specificity plays no role in clitic-doubling of Macedonian definite direct objects. Thus, the Macedonian definite direct object in (26) can receive a specific or a non-specific interpretation. But, it is invariably clitic-doubled.

(26)   Jana   go   bara   režiserot.
        Jana   3SG.M.ACC.CL   look-for.3SG.PRES   movie-director+the.M.SG
        1. 'Jana is looking for the movie-director (namely, for X, who happens to be the movie-director).'
        2. 'Jana is looking for the movie-director (whoever he may be).'

The Macedonian indefinite direct objects can be clitic-doubled only in some particular cases – when referring to a partitive DP as in (27) or occurring in a heavy (complex) sentence, as in (28):

(27)   Ja   bendisa   edna   od   devojkite.
         3SG.F.ACC.CL   liked.3SG.PAST   a.F.SG   of   girls+the.PL
         '(S)he liked one of the girls.'

(28)   Go   ubedija   eden   čovek   da
         3SG.M.ACC.Cl   convinced.PL.PAST   a.M.SG   man   to
         ja   ukrade   kolata.
         3SG.F.ACC.CL   steal.3SG   car+the.F.SG
         'They convinced a man to steal the car.'

Bare Macedonian indefinite direct objects are, as a rule, not clitic-doubled. Thus, the doubling clitic in (29) is not accepted, whatever the type of the bare indefinite noun.

(29)   Jana   (*go)   vide   dete/volk/voz.
         Jana   3Sg.M/NEUT.ACC.Cl   saw.3SG.PAST   child/wolf/train
         'Jana saw a child/wolf/train.'

Clitic doubling of Macedonian indirect objects depends on specificity. Compare the interpretation of the clitic-doubled indefinite indirect object in (30) to that of the not clitic-doubled indefinite indirect object in (31):

(30)   Jana   mu   prati   slika   na   edno   dete.
         Jana   3SG.M.DAT.CL   sent.3SG.PAST   picture   to   a.N.SG   child
         'Jana sent a picture to a child (that I know).'

(31)   Jana   prati   slika   na   edno   dete.
         Jana   sent.3SG.PAST   picture   to   a.N.SG   child
         'Jana sent a picture to a child (whose identity is not important).'

Indirect Macedonian objects with definite determiners can also be clitic-doubled or not, depending on whether they are specific or not, as shown in (32) versus (33).

(32)   Ќе   mu   dadam   cveќe   na   našiot
         will   3SG.M.DAT.CL   give.1SG   flower   to   our+the.M.SG
         najslaven   režiser.
         most famous.M.SG   movie-director
         'I will give flowers to our most famous movie-director (namely to X).'

(33)   Ќе   dadam   cveќe   na   našiot   najslaven
         will   give.1SG   flower   to   our+the.M.SG   most famous.M.SG
         režiser.
         movie-director
         'I will give flowers to our most famous movie-director (whoever it is).'

In the western Macedonian dialects, the specificity effect does not hold, and the clitic can only optionally be clitic-doubled even when the definite indirect object is obviously specific, (34).

(34) (Im)*   davam   knigi   na   decava.
       3Pl.DAT.CL   give.1SG.PRES   books   to   children+the.PROX.PL
       'I am giving books to these children.'

Bare indefinites, which are not specific, can also be optionally clitic-doubled in these dialects, as seen in (35).

(35) Jana   (mu)   prati   slika   na   dete.
       Jana   3SG.M.DAT.CL sent.3SG.PAST picture   to   child
       'Jana sent a picture to a (mere) child.'

The fact that the specificity effect does not always hold, and bare objects can be clitic-doubled, indicates that the Macedonian dative clitics are close to becoming mere case markers.

5. OBJECT CLITIC DOUBLING IN BULGARIAN

In Bulgarian, clitic-doubling most often depends on discourse factors, and the clitics, as a rule, encliticize to elements that occur to their left.

In Standard Bulgarian, and in the eastern Bulgarian dialects, on which Standard Bulgarian is based, all definite objects are clitic-doubled when topicalized. In (36) and (37) we have two of the clitic-doubled topicalized NPs which are listed in Krapova and Cinque (2008). Whereas the direct object NP in (36) is in the Right Periphery of the clause, the indirect object NP in (37) is in the Left Periphery:[6]

(36) Poznavam   go   tova   čuvstvo.
       know.1SG.PRES 3Sg.NEUT.ACC.CL   this.N.SG   sentiment
       'I know this sentiment.'
(37) Na Marija njama   da   ì   piša.
       to Marija not+have   to   3SG.F.DAT.CL write.1SG
       'To Marija I will not write.'

There can be multiple topicalizations of Bulgarian definite direct and indirect objects, each of which is clitic-doubled. Arnaudova (2003) gives the following example:

(38) Az   učebnika   na Stojan   mu
       I   textbook+the.M.SG   to Stojan   3Sg.M.DAT.CL
       go   dadox.
       3SG.M.ACC.CL gave.1SG.PAST
       'The textbook to Stojan was given by me.'

───────────────

[6] The grammatical explanations are mine throughout the paper.

Standard Bulgarian direct and indirect definite objects in clauses with experiencer predicates can often be clitic-doubled even when they are not topicalized. Thus, the use of the clitics that double direct objects in (39) and (40), from Arnaudova and Krapova (2007), and the use of the clitics that double indirect objects in (41) and (42), from Krapova and Cinque (2008), is legitimate, irrespective of whether they precede or follow the object they double:

(39)   Ivan   go   boli   gărloto.
         Ivan   3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL   ache.3SG.PRES   throat+the.N.SG
         'Ivan's throat is hurting (him).'

(40)   Gărloto   go   boli   Ivan.
         throat+the.NEUT.SG   3SG.N.ACC.CL ache.3SG.PRES   Ivan
         'It is the throat that is hurting Ivan.'

(41)   Na   Ivan   mu   xaresa   filmăt.
         to   Ivan   3SG.M.Dat.Cl   liked.3SG.PAST   movie+the.M.SG
         'Ivan liked the movie.'(literally: 'To Ivan the movie appealed.')

(42)   Filmăt   mu   xaresa   na Ivan.
         movie+the.M.SG   3Sg.M.DAT.CL   liked.3SG.PAST to Ivan
         'It is the movie that appealed to Ivan.'

Human DPs with definite articles and non-topicalized, non-human DPs are not clitic-doubled in this language, whether specific or not.

In some western Bulgarian dialects, not only direct objects in clauses with experiencer predicates, but also direct objects in clauses with focused VPs, such as (43), from Arnaudova (2003), can be clitic-doubled.

(43)   Dadox   mu   go   az   učebnika
         gave.1SG.PAST   3SG.M.DAT.CL   3SG.M.ACC.CL   I   textbook+the.M.SG
         na   Stojan.
         to   Stojan
         'I did give the book to Stojan.'

Arnaudova argues that clauses such as (43) represent information predicated by the "subject of the predication", which is removed from the domain of the focus projection and right dislocated.

Indefinite (articled) topicalized direct or indirect Bulgarian objects are, as a rule, clitic-doubled only in sentences including adjuncts or embedded subjunctive mood clauses. In (44) and (45), I am quoting two of the clauses with topicalized clitic doubled indefinite object that are listed in Guentchéva (2008).

(44)   Edno   dete   go   blăsna
         a.NEUT.SG   child   3SG.NEUT.ACC.CL   pushed.3SG.PAST
         pred   malko   kola.
         before   little   car
         'A child was run down by a car a while ago.'

(45)   Na   edna   studentka   ì   otpusnaxa
        to   a.F.SG female student   3SG.F.DAT.CL   granted.3PL.PAST
        stipendija   za   čužbina.
        scholarship   for   abroad.
        'A scholarship for a foreign country was granted to a (certain female) student.'

These clauses would be unacceptable without the adjuncts.

Bare direct or indirect objects are, as a rule, not clitic-doubled in Bulgarian, though they can be topicalized, as in (46), just as they can be focused, as in (47).

(46)   Pismo   (*go)   vidja   Ani.
        letter 3Sg.N.ACC.CL   saw.3SG.PAST   Ani
        'It is a letter that Ani saw.'
(47)   Ani   (*go)   vidja   PISMO   (ne   kartička).
        Ani   3SG.N.ACC.CL   saw.3SG.PAST   letter not   postcard
        'Ani saw a letter (not a postcard).'

In generic clauses, a bare object can be, however, optionally clitic-doubled.

(48)   Na   kuče   treva ne (mu)   se   dava.
        to   dog   grass not 3SG.NEUT.DAT.CL   REFL.ACC.CL   give.3SG
        'As for dogs, one should not give them grass.'

6. COMPARISON

The conditions on clitic doubling in Aromanian and Macedonian are almost analogous. In both languages, clitic doubling is with limited constraints: definiteness plays a central role in clitic doubling of the direct objects of the two languages, whereas the clitic doubling of indirect objects mainly depends on specificity.

Definite Macedonian and Aromanian direct objects are clitic-doubled regardless of their types, while indefinite direct objects can only be clitic-doubled under special conditions – when referring to partitive DPs or occurring in complex sentences. Specific indirect objects are, on the other hand, clitic-doubled regardless of whether they are definite or indefinite. Bare Macedonian and Aromanian direct objects are never clitic-doubled, while bare indirect objects can sometimes be clitic-doubled. The fact that the specificity effect can disappear indicates that the Macedonian and Aromanian dative clitics are close to becoming mere case markers (Tomić 2008).

The conditions on clitic doubling in Romanian and Bulgarian differ drastically from the conditions on clitic doubling in the two Balkan languages with which they are in close genetic relationship – Aromanian and Macedonian, respectively. In both Romanian and Bulgarian clitic doubling depends on discourse factors, but the types and usage of these factors differ.

In Bulgarian, the cliticization of both direct and indirect objects depends on topicalization. But while all topicalized definite objects are clitic-doubled, the indefinite topicalized objects are clitic-doubled only in sentences including adjuncts or embedded

subjunctive mood clauses. Note, however, that standard Bulgarian objects in clauses with experiencer predicates can be clitic doubled even when they are not topicalized. Neither direct nor indirect bare Bulgarian objects are clitic-doubled.

Romanian indirect objects are clitic-doubled if topicalized and may be optionally clitic-doubled if they are in non-focused position or have a specific interpretation. Romanian direct objects are, on the other hand, clitic-doubled only when featuring strong DPs, specific human DPs without articles, specific human DPs with indefinite articles, or specific bare human DPs. Human DPs with definite articles and non-topicalized, non-human DPs are not clitic-doubled in this language, whether specific or not.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Since clitic doubling appears in two Western Mediterranean Romance languages – Spanish and Italian, and in three Balkan Romance languages – Romanian, Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian – a Romance language spoken in a few villages in the Meglena region that spans the border between Greece and Macedonia, west of the Vardar (Axios) River – Vulgar Latin appears as a good candidate for the ancestry of the phenomenon. But if Latin was the ancestor and the Balkan Romance languages were the substrates from which clitic doubling spread in the Balkans, clitic doubling in Romanian would not be so constrained. Moreover, Standard Serbian – a neighbor to Romanian – would have at least some clitic doubling effects. But it has none. Doubling clitics sometimes occur only in the south-western Serbian dialects, which border with Bulgarian, and more frequently in the south-eastern periphery of the Serbian dialects, where they intersect with Macedonian and Albanian.

Object clitic doubling is not actually the product of a simple transfer from a single substrate, or from a transfer from one of the languages in which it appears. Along with other Balkanisms, it is the product of centuries-long socio-linguistic contact between the dialects of several languages in a multilingual setting. The features of these dialects change. As pointed out by Lindstedt (2000), among the random changes, those are more easily spread that contribute to direct inter-translatability.

The epicenter of Balkanisms is the area around the lakes Ohrid and Prespa, where Greek, Albanian, Macedonian and Aromanian intersect. Greek was most prestigious and most frequently used by speakers of these languages. Yet, it is not in Modern Greek that the number of Balkanisms is greatest; probably because, for the native speakers of this language, the need of changes for the sake of communication has not been very urgent. The Macedonian, Aromanian and Albanian dialects in the Ohrid region have much greater number of Balkanisms then Modern Greek.

Clitic doubling in Macedonian and Aromanian is with limited constraints, and occurs under almost identical conditions, because the two languages have for a long time been spoken in environments in which direct inter-translatability has occurred. When the clitic doubling phenomenon spread to Balkan languages in which no inter-translatability between languages was needed, constraints of usage happened. Thus, the conditions on clitic doubling in Romanian and Bulgarian – languages that have not been spoken in the same environment with other Balkan languages – are specific. They differ substantially not only from the conditions on clitic doubling in the other Balkan languages, but also from the conditions on clitic doubling in the languages with which they are genetically closely related.

REFERENCES

Arnaudova, O., 2003, *Focus in Bulgarian clause structure*, unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Ottawa, 175–176.

Arnaudova, O., I. Krapova, 2007, "Clitic reduplication in Bulgarian: Towards a unified account", in: A. Antonenko et al. (eds.), *[Formal] Approaches to [Slavic] Linguistics: The Toronto Meeting 2006,* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 1–24.

Firbas, F., 1992., *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication,* Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press.

Franks, S., C. Rudin, 2005, "Bulgarian clitics as K^0 heads", in: S. Franks et al. (eds), *Formal approaches to [Slavic] linguistics: The South Carolina meeting 2004*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, 106–118.

Gierling, D., 1998, "Clitic doubling, specificity and focus in Romanian", in: J. Black, V. Motapanyane (eds), *Clitics, Pronouns and Movement*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 63–85.

Guentchéva, Z., 2008, "Object clitic doubling constructions and topicalization in Bulgarian", in: D. Kallulli, L. Tasmowski (eds), *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 203–223.

Heusinger, K., 2002, "Specificity and definiteness in sentences and discourse structure", *Journal of Semantics*, 19, 3, 245–274.

Krapova, I., G. Cinque, 2008, "Clitic reduplications constructions in Bulgarian", in: D. Kallulli, L. Tasmowski (eds), *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 257–287.

Lindstedt, J., 2000, "Linguistic Balkanization: Contact-induced change by mutual reinforcement", in: D. Gilbers et al. (eds), *Languages in contact*, Amsterdam, Rodopi, 231–246.

Tomić, O. M., 2006, *Balkan Speachbund Morpho-syntactic Features*, Dordrecht, Springer, 276–292.

Tomić, O. M., 2008, "Towards grammaticalizaton of clitic-doubling: Clitic-doubling in Macedonian (and some neighbouring languages)", in: D. Kallulli, L. Tasmowski (eds), *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 65–87.