

TIPOLOGIES OF STANDARDIZATION IN THE
BALKAN LANGUAGES. THE CASE OF TWO
BALKANISMS: THE LOSS OF THE INFINITIVE AND
THE PERIPHRASTIC FUTURE

EMANUELE BANFI

1. In the historical development of every linguistic area there are a few moments, a few periods, that seem to play an exceptional role, if compared with the whole historical linguistic process of the considered area.

A very important moment in regards to the formation of the languages spoken in the balkan area, is the period between the sixth century and the end of the ninth century. The reasons for the importance of this time lapse will be clear from that which we are going to examine.

1.1 Till the end of the sixth century, the balkan environment was an area partially ruled by roman, and partially by (proto)-byzantine greek traditions. The cultural and linguistic models were, till that period, spread out either from Rome or from Byzantion. Latin and Greek, due overall to the imperial and the ecclesiastical administrations, were the only languages of culture diffused in South East Europe.¹

¹ The history of the diffusion of both Latin and Greek as languages of culture within Balkans is, in the main lines, quite clear. For details on this subject, cf. Mihăescu (1978: chap. II); on the discussion about the border between latin and

1.2 When the *σκλαβήνιοι* (i.e. Slavic peoples), coming from the eastern–central side of Europe,² went into the Balkans, they found those regions partially grecized and partially romanized. Only a few marginal areas of the peninsula were inhabited by peoples who had not completely accepted the imposition of either roman or byzantine culture and of either Latin or Greek languages.³

2. Every process of formation of a linguistic system knows, according to E. Haugen (1983: 269–289), at least four main stages:

- I) selection of a linguistic model
- II) codification of a linguistic model
- III) implementation of a linguistic model
- IV) elaboration of a linguistic model.

2.1 In the process of standardization of a language there is always a linguistic reference point: and, this linguistic reference is not necessarily oriented toward a literary tradition.⁴ In many cases, as we will see, there are some dialectal traditions, that can, more than a literary tradition, influence the formation of a linguistic standard. In other words, a literary language *can*, but does not have to be *the* only linguistic model for the formation of other linguistic systems.

greek cultures within Balkans, cf. the very useful article of Gerov (1974: 146–177) and Banfi (1988: 48–55).

² The byzantine chroniclers define with the term *σκλαβήνιοι* a very complex crowd of barbaric peoples. The work of Vasmer (1941), which offers an important series of ancient evidence from byzantine and latin chroniclers, is always useful for this historic point. Cf. also, as regards to the greek environment occupied by slavic peoples, the excellent monography of Weithmann (1978).

³ Around the so-called Jireček–line, that marks the border between the two cultures (latin and greek), a few important substratum–populations were, during the first centuries of the Middle Ages, well thriving. According to Mihăescu (1978: 74): “[the Jireček–line must be considered] comme une simple ligne de séparation entre deux cultures, la grecque et la romaine, qui montre jusqu’à où s’étendaient leurs influences respectives, alors que, en dessous, ce sont les anciennes langues autochtones — thrace, illyrienne, celte, vénète, et autres — qui continuaient à être employées en premier lieu”.

⁴ For general information on linguistic standardization, besides Haugen’s works, cf. the important contribution of Muljačić (1980: 85–96, 1985: 39–55, 1988: 186–193), based on the model of the german scholar H. Kloss.

As far as the balkan languages are concerned, one can see the action of both literary and religious languages (i.e.: Latin and Greek); but, along side, one can also recognize the action of important models, both dialectal and colloquial. These models can depend on the oral uses of either Latin, or Greek, or, lastly, of the balkan substratum-languages.

So, in the case of the formation of the balkan *scriptae*, diachronically very far from each other (cf. footnote nr. 13), the role of both ecclesiastical Latin as well as Greek was indisputably prevalent; while, in the forming of the colloquial level of each balkan language, the influence of the spoken levels of both Latin and Greek was also strong.

3. Without any doubt, in the forming of southern slavic, romanian, and albanian *scriptae*, Latin and Greek, either directly or indirectly, represented the dominant models. However, in the development of the dialectal traditions of the above mentioned linguistic environments, the influence of both Latin and Greek does appear less strong.

3.1 The influence of byzantine Greek was particularly intense in those balkan regions where the Orthodox religion was dominant:⁵ i.e., in Serbia, in Bulgaria, in part of Romania, and in part of Albania.

Besides, one cannot forget that the oldest forms of government in Serbia and in Bulgaria were entirely modelled on the basis of the byzantine imperial pattern. Finally, one must remember that both (proto)-romanian and (proto)-albanian environments were mostly built on the image of the byzantine world (Dvornik 1968: 134 fol.).

⁵ For the role of the greek Orthodox religion in the forming of the consciousness of the balkan world, see, among others, Goldblatt 1984: 123-134; in particular, see p. 125: "...the peoples of Orthodox Slavdom belonged to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Culturally separated from the West, this vast community of peoples stretched from the Balkans (Bulgarians, Macedonians, Serbs, and for several centuries Romanians) to the East Slavic lands (corresponding to the modern nations of Russia, the Ukraine, and Belorussia). The peoples of Orthodox Slavdom had not only a common confession but a common language as well, which we call either *Church Slavonic*, but which they called either the *Slavonic language* (slověnl'skyj jazykŭ) or *our language* (naši jazykŭ). One should note that the chronological limits of *medieval Orthodox Slavdom* extended far beyond those of the Western Middle Ages. The emergence of vernaculars with dignity equal to that of Church Slavonic did not take place in the Orthodox Slavic world until the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries".

3.2 On the other hand, the influence of ecclesiastical Latin was speccially strong in those balkan areas where either the roman Church or the germanic imperial power were firmly established:⁶ i.e. in Croatia, in Slovenia, on the northern side of Albania (geg area), and on the northern side of Romania; and, of course, outside the Balkans, in Czechoslovakia, and in Poland.

4. So, according to Haugen's theory, from the ninth till the thirteenth century, the so-called linguistic and cultural 'byzantine-roof'⁷ did *protect* the whole south-central balkan area, and, mainly, a good deal of the southern slavic environment, the whole albanian tosk area, and finally, thanks to serbo-bulgarian mediation, a great part of the romanian environment.

4.1 The case of the romanian linguistic environment is from this point of view interesting. In fact, in the forming of romanian dialects, two main "linguistic roofs" acted: on the one hand, one can find traces of an old slavic influence,⁸ which is present in the daco-romanian phonetics, morphology and, partially, in the lexicon; on the other hand, in the daco-romanian environment, a great serbo-bulgarian influence is also evident. This point of view seems to be accepted, at last, by romanian scholars as well (Ivănescu 1980: 273-274).

5. The slovenian and the croatian areas, oriented toward the latin culture (or better, romance culture), mediated through germanic culture too, were strongly influenced by ecclesiastical Latin, used both as the language of the catholic Church and as the administrative language. The forming of both the slovenian and croatian *scriptae* has been influenced by latin patterns.

⁶ On the role of Latin in the process of forming of the balkan systems, cf. Goldblatt 1984: 124-125: "The cultural community of Roman Slavs, composed of Croats, Slovenes, Czechs, Slovaks, and Poles, owed their allegiance to the Roman Church. In the Middle Ages the peoples of Roman Slavdom had a common literary and liturgical language (Latin): this made possible their full participation in the *rules of game* accepted by the Western *Respublica litterarum*". Also, cf. Banfi 1987: 7-17.

⁷ The term *linguistic roof* was first used by H. Kloss. Here, I use the same term, in reference to a particular cultural context, i.e., the greek-byzantine context.

⁸ For the slavic component in romanian culture and language, cf., among others, Rossetti 1964: 2-86. For a concise examination of the whole matter, cf. Solta 1980: 85-101 and Banfi 1985: 102-105.

One can find a similar latin (romance) influence in the northern side of the albanian environment too, i.e. in the geg albanian area.

6. The study of the distribution of *balkanisms*⁹ within balkan linguistic systems is very important in order to illustrate the dynamics of the different *linguistic roofs*.

6.1 For this reason, I will take into account a few balkanisms, considering above all those that document a diachronic continuity, i.e. those that permit to following of the process of standardization of morphosyntactic patterns within balkan languages. I will consider two *classics* of Balkanology: the loss of the infinitive and the so-called periphrastic future.

7.1 The problem of the reduction (or of the loss) of the infinitive¹⁰ in South East European languages and of its substitution by final and declarative subordinate structures has traditionally been studied within the greater problem of the so-called balkanisms.¹¹

Having been evaluated within balkan dynamics, it has often lead to a unilateral evaluation of the problem.

In addition, the analysis was generally done on the basis of linguistic data taken from the standard level¹² of South East European languages and according to strictly synchronic parameters. This means, on the one hand, a simplification of the research, reducing the number of elements (often written and standardized linguistic traditions were privileged); on the other hand — above all in the case of southern Slavic languages, of Romanian and Albanian — linguistic

⁹ The term *balkanism* has been used, among others, by Schaller (1975), which distinguishes between *primary* and *secondary* balkanisms, in relation to the diffusion of the linguistic phenomena within Balkans. Cf. Solta 1980: 5–6, 180–231.

¹⁰ Paragraph nr. 7 is an adaptation of my paper *The Infinitive in South East European Languages* that will appear in Bechert–Bernini–Buridant 1990: 1–21.

¹¹ Sandfeld 1930: 173–180 and Schaller 1975: 156 consider the partial reduction of the infinitive in balkan languages as a *primary balkanism*. Lastly, see Solta 1980: 210

¹² On the contrary, Rohlf's (1958: 733–744) considers the linguistic data pertaining to the reduction of the infinitive, in the light of a few albanian, modern greek, bulgarian, macedonian, and serbian dialectal forms. He considers, as well, some parallel dialectal forms, coming from both the romance and greek dialects spoken in the South of Italy.

data coming from older texts, containing some important examples of the history of the infinitive, had been omitted.¹³

The origin of the reduction (or of the loss) of the infinitive within South East European languages has been explained according to four main theoretical points of view:

1) Weigand (1925: 11) thought that the reduction of the infinitive had been caused by the old balkan *substratum-languages*.

2) Reichenkron (1962: 104–105) and Iliescu (1968: 115–118) saw in the reduction of the infinitive a phenomenon of linguistic convergence on the latin model.

3) Sandfeld (1930: 19) spoke of a phenomenon of linguistic convergence on the byzantine–greek model.

4) Finally, Togeby (1962: 221–233) has considered the reduction of the infinitive as a result of a process of linguistic simplification pertaining to the different linguistic systems of South East Europe.

7.2 Here I would like to re-define the problem of opposition *use of the infinitive* [INF +] vs. *reduction of the infinitive* in South East European languages. I will examine a series of elements seldom considered in previous research:

firstly, besides linguistic material documented by the standard level of South East European languages, I have also examined — as far as possible¹⁴ — the data coming from dialects of the balkan area;

¹³ Among balkan languages, only Greek has a diachronical uninterrupted tradition. Southern Slavic languages are only attested from the 12th century; Romanian, from the 15th century; and Albanian from the 16–17th centuries. On the one hand, in the case of the first evidences of Bulgarian, Serbian and Macedonian, we have to consider very particular linguistic data (translations from byzantine–greek texts); on the other hand, in the case of the first evidences of Slovenian and Croatian, we are dealing with translations based on the Latin model. Finally, in the case of the first evidences of Romanian, texts are presented, which are simply translations of byzantine–greek models, through a slavic mediation. It is clear that these texts are strongly *standardized*, and it is very difficult to analyze them.

¹⁴ The research on balkan dialectology appears very different, depending on the different regions. For instance, as regards the modern greek dialectology, satisfactory descriptions lack pertaining to several areas of the greek environment. In Triandaphyllidēs (1938: 62–74), Browning (1983: 119–137), and in Newton (1974), one can find some interesting linguistic data. More satisfactory, as regards the albanian environment, are the descriptions of Gjinari (1966: 31–50 and 1970), Desnickaja (1968), and Pellegrini (1977: 12–17). The description of romanian dialects is very excellent, due to the fact that one can consult the rich material of the NALR 1967. As regards the serbocroatian dialects, one can consult Popović

secondly, I have also considered some diachronic aspects (an excellent monography on the diachronic evolution of the infinitive in balkan languages is the work of Joseph (1983), rich with a lot of evidence), of differing importance, depending on the history of the *scriptae* of South East European languages.

7.3 A very unusual view comes out of the examination of the present study. It is possible to re-examine the history of the infinitive (a synthesis of the different points of view is in Banfi 1985: 58–64) in South East European languages, and to propose a new interpretation based on synchronic data, diachronic documentation, as well as on geo-linguistic factors.

7.4 To the light of linguistic data coming from different balkan traditions, it is possible to challenge the thesis of the *weakening* of the infinitive of South East European languages. In effect, the infinitive as an autonomous syntactic, grammatical category is thriving in the greater part of South Eastern Europe:

in the serbocroatian area, the infinitive is present in the whole kajkavian (near Zagreb; in transitional dialects between Croatian and Slovenian) and in čakavian dialects (central and eastern Istria; region of Rijeka, almost all the dalmatian islands; and the region of Split). We can still find the infinitive in the stokavian area (the remaining parts of Jugoslavia); with the exception of South East regions, such as Timok and Morava areas, where the infinitive is absent and substituted by a subordinate structure introduced by *da*. One could say that in the regions with [INF +] either the ancient slavic *-ti* infinitive or the slavic *-t'* reduced infinitive are used:¹⁵

- (1a) *živet(i) bez ikoga je teško* "to live alone is difficult"
- (1b) *ptice prestaju pevat(i)* "the birds stop singing"
- (1c) *rad sam otić(i) kući* "I am happy to go home".

Serbo-croat accepts the infinitive (Joseph 1983: 136–139):

(1960: 401–455); for the bulgarian dialects, see Mladenov (1929) and Choliolčev–Kostov–Mladenov (1977: 65–71); for the macedonian dialects, see Koneski 1966.

¹⁵ On the one hand, the *-ti* slavic infinitive is thriving in the eastern Hercegovien, in the Šumadija Vojvodina, in the Kosovo, in the Smederevo–Vršac area, and in the ikavo-istrian area. On the other hand, the *-t'* infinitive is used in both Croatia and Slovenia. Elsewhere, one can find both infinitives.

- (2a) *bojiš se meni kazati* “you are afraid to tell me”
 (2b) *jeste nama putovati vreme* “it is time for us to travel”.

But all forms with the infinitive can always be replaced with a subordinate introduced by *da* + indicative present: so, we can say either *bojiš se kazati* or *bojiš se da kažeš* “you are afraid to say”.

In Bulgarian, the infinitive is documented in eastern bulgarian dialects, particularly in the dialects beyond the line going from Nikup to Thessaloniki through Pleven, Teteven, Tatar Pazardžik:¹⁶

- (3a) *ne možeš go stigna* “you can’t catch up with him”
 (3b) *ne smea se obadi* “he does not dare answer”
 (3c) *stiga čete* “you have read enough” (Joseph 1983: 122–126).

In northern Albanian (geg area) there is a particular form of infinitive (*me* + participle):¹⁷

- (4a) *dëshiroj me pa* “I want to see”
 (4b) *Gjergji shkoj me mësue* “George went to study”.

In Romanian, the infinitive is well preserved (Iliescu 1968: 115–118, on the basis of NALR data) in both Istro–Romanian and in Daco–Romanian (Transylvania, Bukovina and Moldavia), that is, in the north–eastern romanian territories:

- (5a) *I am auzit veni* “I heard him arrive”
 (5b) *știi a înota* “you can swim”
 (5c) *nu puteam veni* “I could not come”
 (5d) *pot cânta* “I can sing”.

7.5 The remains of the ancient infinitives are still present in South–East European languages, especially in the periphrastic future (for the periphrastic future in the balkan area, cf. Banfi 1985: 54–55) with verb of volition + infinitive, according to the greek type $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ + infinitive (that which survives in some modern greek dialects: e.g. $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\pi\epsilon\iota$ “I will say”). So, cf. Scr. *ja ću ćiniti/ ćini ću* “I will do”; (but one

¹⁶ The phenomenon distinguishing the two bulgarian dialectal areas is the treatment of the old slavic vowel /ĕ/ > west bulgarian [e] vs east bulgarian [ja]: cf. *mlĕko* “milk” > [mleko] in the west bulgarian dialects, vs [mljako] in the east bulgarian dialects.

¹⁷ For this particular form of infinitive (with *me* < Lat. MODO), cf. Pellegrini 1977: 184.

can also say *ja ću da ćinim* “id.”); Rom. *voi cînta* “I will sing”; *el va afla* “he will find”; *vom veni* “we will come”; Bulg. *vide-šta* (< **videti-šta*) “I will see”, but one can also say *šte da vidiš* “you will see” with *šte* third person singular of the present indicative of the verb “to will”, according to the greek-byzantine form *θέλει* + infinitive > *θέ* + infinitive, which is the basis of the modern greek future *θα* (< *θέλει* + *ἴνα* + subjunctive); but, we can find in Albanian (geg) *kam me punue* “I will work” (with *kam* “I have”).

In Greek one finds the remains of the infinitive in perfects such as *ἔχω γράφει* (with *γράφει* < *γράφειν*) re-analyzed as an autonomous form (because /-n/ > [Ø]), this form was interpreted as a form similar to Engl. *have written*, Fr. *avoir écrit*, rather than to the structure *ἔχω* + infinitive of medieval Greek, Joseph 1983: 79). One can still find remains of the infinitive depending on imperative negative forms (Joseph 1983: 108):

- (6a) Scr. *nemojte gledati* “don’t you look!” (but also *nemojte da gledate*)
- (6b) Bulg. *nedej/nedejte chodi* “don’t go!” (but also *nedej da chodeš* “id.”)
- (6c) Maced. (Gevgeliya dialect) *nim se kosi* “don’t get angry!”
- (6d) (Tikveš dialect) *numu lafi* “don’t speak!”

In modern Greek there are some forms of ancient infinitives that today have the function of substantives:

- (7a) τὸ φίλι “the kiss” < AGr. τὸ φιλεῖν “to love”
- (7b) τὸ φατ “the food” < AGr. τὸ φαγεῖν “to eat”
- (7c) τὸ ἔχει “the possession” < AGr. τὸ ἔχειν “to have”.

7.6 On the contrary, in a vast area of the southern–central Balkans, the infinitive has completely disappeared and has been substituted by either final–consecutive, or declarative subordinate structures.

In most dialects of the serbo–croatian area, the infinitive has been substituted by final–consecutive structures introduced by *da* + indicative present: this is a linguistic innovation coming from the eastern serbian region and gaining ground towards the West: although it still hasn’t gained the croatian area where the infinitive is used. But, according to Meillet–Vaillant (1952: 188):

A Belgrade la construction *bojiš se kazati* “tu as peur de dir” est littéraire pour *bojiš se da kažeš*; au lieu de *smem (smijem) pitati* “je me permets d’interroger” on dit couramment *smem da pitam*.

In the bulgarian area, instead of an infinitive, one can find a subordinate final–consecutive structure, introduced by *da*. It is well documented in the standard language, whereas bulgarian dialects show a more fluctuating situation: in fact, the infinitive is more stable in eastern dialects, while weaker in western dialects (Joseph 1983: 118–131), where it is progressively substituted by a subordinate clause introduced by *da*. Instead of the infinitive, Bulgarian uses, along side final–consecutive subordinate clauses, a declarative subordinate introduced by *što/če* + indicative:

(8) *se prestoril što (če) umrel* “he pretended to be dead”.

In Macedonian, one records the complete substitution (Joseph 1983: 105–118) of the infinitive by the final–consecutive subordinate introduced by *da*:

(9a) *možete da dojdete* “you can come”

(9b) *mu rekov da dojde* “I told him to come”.

Furthermore, one can also find the declarative subordinate introduced by *deka*:

(10) *mislam deka Selman–Aga imal sobrano Arnauti da te grabne* “I think that Selman–Aga had gathered the Albanians to carry you off”.

At last, the infinitive, in a few cases, may be substituted by the substantive:

(11) *ne treba sedenje* “One should not sit”.

In the romanian area (southern Daco–romanian, Aroumanian, Macedo–romanian; cf. Joseph 1983: 160–170) the infinitive is substituted by a subordinate introduced by *să* (< lat. *SĪ*).

(12a) Daco–rom. *trebuie să lucrăm* “we have to work”

(12b) Daco–rom. *nu pot să dorm* (but also *nu pot dormi*) “I cannot sleep”

(12c) Macedo–rom. *voi z–dormu* “I want to sleep”

(12d) Macedo–rom. *nu pot z–dormu* “I cannot sleep”.

Also, one can find a declarative subordinate introduced by *că* (< lat. *QUOD*):

(13a) Daco–rom. *il vede că vine* (also *viind*) “he sees him coming”

(13b) *bine a făcut că a plecat* (also *de a plecat*) “he did well leaving”.

In the southern albanian area (tosk area, cf. Joseph 1983: 85–91) the infinitive is substituted either by a final–consecutive subordinate

introduced by *tě* + subjunctive or by a declarative subordinate introduced by *qě/se* + indicative:

- (14a) *dua tĕ shkruaj* “I want to write” (literally: “he wants until I write”)
 (14b) *bĕri qĕ flĕ* “he pretended to sleep” (literally: “he pretended he was sleeping”).

In the greek area the infinitive is constantly replaced (Joseph 1983: 69–74) either by a final–consecutive subordinate introduced by *να* (< AGr. *ἵνα*) + subjunctive, or by a declarative subordinate introduced by *πως, που, ὅτι* + indicative:

- (15a) *δεν μπορώ να κοιμηθῶ* “I cannot sleep”
 (15b) *είμαι σίγουρος πως θάρθω αύριο* “I am sure, I shall come tomorrow”.

These forms are common in the whole greek area, except the greek dialects spoken in the South of Italy (Salento, Aspromonte, cf. Rohlfs 1958: 733–744), where, because of the influence of romance dialects, the infinitive still partially survives:

- (16a) *ton ikua erti* “I heard him come” (Bova)
 (16b) *de sonno ciumiθ* “I cannot sleep” (Bova)
 (16c) *me kanni peθni* “you are making me die”.

7.7 In south–central Serbia, there is a transitional linguistic area (Meillet–Vaillant 1952: 188) that maintains the dynamics between [INF +] vs [INF -].

7.8 The reduction of the infinitive in South East Europe — at least in the case of final–consecutive subordinate clauses — is a linguistic type that was spread by byzantine–medieval Greek, either through popular linguistic uses, or half–erudite linguistic uses. I will deal with this argument in a short while. Otherwise, in the areas where the infinitive is still thriving, a more ancient linguistic condition does survive:

In the northern daco–romanian dialects, the permanence of the infinitive depends directly on the roman inheritance. In fact, the infinitive is thriving in the whole romance tradition and, specifically, in the northern daco–romanian dialects (Transylvania, Bukovina, Moldavia). Those regions — less influenced, either directly or indirectly, by medieval greek culture (due to the serbian and bulgarian com-

ponents) — did not receive the reduction of the infinitive spread by the greek environment from the southern–central balkan area.

In the southern slavic languages (Croatian, Slovenian, East Bulgarian), where the infinitive is still thriving, the normal slavic tradition (with the *-ti* infinitive) survives as well.¹⁸

In the northern albanian dialects (geg area) the infinitival form [*me* + participle] is still surviving.

7.9 In the geo–linguistic areas, where the reduction of the infinitive is documented, one can observe two syntactic types [Typological Matrix (MT)] that replace the traditional linguistic functions of the infinitive:

- a) final–consecutive sentence: in modern Greek, southern Albanian (tosk area), Bulgarian, Macedonian and Romanian.
- b) declarative sentence: in modern Greek, northern Albanian (geg area), Bulgarian, Macedonian and Romanian.

7.10 The diachronic analysis of the linguistic data allows an explanation of the paths followed by this important linguistic innovation.

It is fundamental to analyze the history of the infinitive in the whole greek linguistic tradition. In fact, the rich greek documentation permits following the history of the infinitive from the classical greek period till the modern greek period.

It seems that the infinitive was already in a critical situation during the classical period;¹⁹ but, only since the second century B.C., are we able to find examples of the weakness of the infinitive, being more and more replaced by subordinate sentences introduced both by *ὅτι* and *ὅπως*. Examples of this kind are frequent both in the *papyri* (cf. Ljungvik 1932 e Burguière 1960) and in the Greek of the New Testament:

¹⁸ Lunt (1974: 129, 141) discusses the origin of the *-ti* slavic infinitive. According to him, there is a partial coincidence between the slavic *-ti* infinitive and the indo–european *-tu* supine form, both deriving from deverbative nouns. See also Joseph 1983: 101–105.

¹⁹ Cf. Joseph 1983: 37: the first evidence of the reduction of the infinitive is already found in Thukididēs 7, 21.3. For further examples pertaining to post–classical Greek, cf. Mandilaras 1973.

- (17a) Matt. 2.2 ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ “we came to adore him”
 (17b) Matt. 20.19 καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι “and they will give him to the people, in order to mock, whip and crucify him”
 (17c) Jo. 1.44 τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐθέλεσεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν “next morning he wanted to make for Galilee”
 (17d) Matt. 13.5 καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλεν διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος γῆς “and suddenly he stood up, because there wasn’t any more deepness of earth”.

But:

- (18a) Jo. 11.31 ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον ἵνα κλαύσῃ ἐκεῖ “he goes to the tomb, in order to cry there”
 (18b) Acta Pil.11.2.5 θέλουσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα φονεύσουσιν αὐτὸν “the Jews want to kill him”
 (18c) Ignat. 696A θελήσατε ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς θεληθῆτε “you might want even yourselves to be acceptable”
 (18d) 1 Cor. 14.5 θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε “I want you all to speak languages rather than prophesy”.

During both the byzantine and medieval periods, the trend of the substitution of the infinitive is more and more increasing: between the tenth and the fifteenth centuries the infinitive loses its syntactic function (cf. Hesseling 1892 and Mirambel 1961). Modern Greek knows some autonomous infinitives, but these are calques on Italian:

- (19a) εἰς τὸ ἐπαινιδεῖν “arrivederci” (see you later)
 (19b) τρόπος τοῦ λέγειν “modo di dire” (way of saying).

7.10.1 The MT *infinitive* = [ἵνα + subjunctive] was used during the later middle ages as a model for the *scriptae* of Old Church Slavonic, Serbian, Macedonian and Romanian, due to the role of both Serbian and Bulgarian in the birth of Romanian.

The southern slavonic environment, from the diachronic point of view, presents some particular problems:

Old Church Slavonic documents a situation of transition: along side the infinitives (and the supines) one can find some cases where the infinitive (and the supine) seems to be replaced by subordinate structures introduced by *da*. The starting point of this situation is, obviously, the byzantine and medieval greek tradition (cf. Joseph 1983: 101–105):

(21a) Luke, 10.29 (Zogr.) *on" že xote oprav' diti se* "and he, wanting to justify himself"

(21b) Luke 3.16 (Zogr.) *něsm' dostoin" ot" rěšiti remene sapoga ego* "I am not worthy to unloose the laces of his shoe".

But:

(22a-b) Luke 2.6 (Ass.) *ispl' nišę se d' nie da rodit* "they completed the days of birth for him" vs *ibid.* (Zogr.) *d' n' e roditi* (with the infinitive!).

In Bulgarian, from the 15th century, the substitution of the infinitive by subordinate sentences introduced by *da*, after both verbs of volition (Mac Robert 1980) and movement, seems to become more and more frequent.

In the oldest serbo-croatian texts (Joseph 1983: 144–145), the infinitive is always thriving, as in Old Church Slavonic. The first evidence of the substitution of the infinitive by a subordinate introduced by *da* is documented in a manuscript of the year 1501:

(23a) Mon. Serb. (A.D. 1198) *xoteštu počisti obraz* "(onc) wanting to honour her reputation"

(23b) Mon. Serb. 148 (A.D. 1358) *niktože možet' ispovědati* "nobody can confess"

(23c) Mon. Serb. 419 (A.D. 1501) *xoteše (...) da skažu* "they wanted to tell".

Otherwise, the infinitive is still in use:

(24a) Mon. Serb. 30 (A.D. 1537) *i koje kje rěči?* "and who will say?"

(24b) Mon. Serb. 431 (A.D.) 1537 *ima ti govoriti* "he has to tell you"

(24c) Mon. Serb. 486 (A.D. 1618) *xoće (...) skazati* "he wants to tell".

In the oldest documents of Macedonian (translations of the Gospel, 12th century), one can find a situation identical to Old Church Slavonic: the infinitive is alive and well (Joseph 1983: 106–110):

(25a) Luke 18.10 *ělka dva v' nidosta v' c'rkve pomolit' se* "two men entered the church to pray"

(25b) Matt. 11.1 *prěide ot todu ucit' i propovědaet* "he went forth from there to teach and proclaimed".

In standard, modern Macedonian, there is no trace of the infinitive (Hendriks 1976: 1): it is, vice versa, always substituted by both subordinates introduced by *da*, and declarative subordinates introduced by *deka*.

In the oldest romanian texts (16th century, cf. Joseph 1983: 149) one can find many examples of infinitives, as well as many substitutions of infinitives by subordinates introduced by *să/se* (calques on the Bulgarian):

(26a) C.B. I 369,3 *aurul poate sparge cetăți* "gold can destroy cities"

(26b) Cod. Vor. 137, 14 *opu iaste tuturor gata a fi* "everyone must be ready"

(26c) Cod. Vor. 51.2 *gata semu a lu ucide elu* "we are ready to kill him"

(26d) C.B. I, 386, 17 *i era dragă a cetii la scripturi* "it was dear to him to read in the Scriptures".

But, at the same time:

(27a) Cod. Vor. 87,3 *nu putea se protivicască-se vântului* "he cannot resist the wind"

(27b) Cod. Vor. 90,4 *cade-se noao se cădemu* "we must fall" (lit.: it be falls us that we fall).

One can find some examples of texts where there are both forms of infinitives and of subordinates introduced by *să*:

(28) Gaster I, 114,7 *poate vedea și să cunoască* "he can see and recognize".

More complicated is the *albanian tradition*: in the oldest texts (Joseph 1983: 86) of the tosk area, the infinitive is replaced by subordinates introduced by *të/që, se* (depending on the greek byzantine–medieval MT). In the oldest texts of the geg area one can find the *infinitival structure me + participle*.

7.10.2. The diffusion of such a syntactical type is the result of the half-educated influence that effected the balkan *scriptae*: Old Church Slavonic, Serbian, Macedonian, Romanian and Albanian.

But, along side the half-educated influence, through the ecclesiastical patterns based on byzantine–medieval Greek, one must record an important popular influence as well. In fact, in the bulgarian–macedonian–serbian area, *Kerngebiet* of the so called balkanisms,²⁰ there was, during the Middle Ages, an exceptional plurilinguistical area (Sandfeld 1930: 19), oriented toward the greek model. In this

²⁰ In fact, according to Schaller (1975: 96–108), one can find all the so called "primary balkanisms" in a relatively small region of South East Europe. They are present in Macedonia, Serbia, West Bulgaria, South Albania and South Romania.

situation, without any doubt, both the albanian element and proto-rumanian elements took part, when, since the early middle ages, the building process of the balkan national identity began.

7.11 More complicated was the diffusion of the MT (*ὅπως, ὅπου* + indicative).

7.11.1 It was typical of popular Greek, where *ὅπως = ὅπου* (> *ποῦ* Modern Greek *πού*) could be exchanged with *ὅτι*. In the *koine* Greek, one can find *πῶς* with declarative value:

(29a) Epict IV, 13,15 *καὶ ὄψει, πῶς οὐκ ἀναμένω* “and you will see that I won’t wait”

And in N.T. Greek as well:

(30a) Acta 11,13 *ἀπήγγειλεν δὲ ἡμῖν, πῶς εἶδεν τὸν ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ σταθέντα* “and he announced to us that he had seen the angel standing in his house”.

On the value of *πῶς* (used, like *ὅτι*, as completive) *ποῦ* (> Modern Greek *πού*) is modeled, and passes from a consecutive function (cf. *τόσο κακός, που* “so bad, that...”) to a more general completive function (cf. *ξέρω πού εἶμαι καλός* “I know, I am good”). From medieval Greek, either by half-educated mediation, or popular mediation, the greek form is likely to have been accepted by the southern-slavic (bulgarian, macedonian) environment:

(31a) Bulg. *se prestoril če (što) unrel* “he pretended to be dead”

(31b) Maced. *mislam deka Selman-Aga imal sobrano Arnauti* “I think that Selman-Aga had gathered the Albanians”.

7.11.2 On the contrary, Roman. *că* + indicative present, and Alb. *që* + indicative present, represents the continuation of romance forms based on Lat. *QUOD* (cf. Ital. *che*, Fr. *que*, Span. *que* etc.). This is the normal, general romance evolution.

7.12 The synchronical, diachronical and geo-linguistic analysis of the data allows the establishment of an interpretative model of the dynamics [INF +] vs [INF], typical of South East European languages. It is clear that this model must be very articulated.

The crisis of the infinitive within South East European languages began from the byzantine–medieval greek environment, as demonstrated, very correctly, by Sandfeld (1930: 184). But, this innovation spread through two main ways:

I) Through both educated and half–educated ways — because of the contact between the byzantine environment and the macedonian, bulgarian, serbian church environment — the reduction of the infinitive, according to the byzantine MT, spread within the old slavic *scriptae*. Therefore, through southern slavic mediation (Serbian or Bulgarian), the MT was accepted by Daco–rumanian.

II) Through a popular way — because of the contact between northern modern greek dialects and the multilingual environment of the balkan *Kerngebiet* (of which the Vlăhi, the Albanians, the Macedonians, the western Bulgarians, and the Serbians all took part) — the innovation spread into the popular levels of those linguistic systems.

However, this innovation is likely to have consolidated itself between the 9th and 13th centuries, when the balkan ethno–linguistic situation was solidifying itself, before the Turks came. Vice versa, the crisis of the infinitive did not reach the north–west part of the South East European environment (Dalmatia, Croatia, Bosnia, Hercegovina, Vojvodina, the geg area of Albania, the north–east part of the Daco–romanian area: Transylvania, Bukovina, Moldavia). In fact, those regions, quite oriented towards both west–latin and germanic–latin culture, were only superficially touched by byzantine and medieval greek culture. This explains the continuation of the old infinitive, as the result of its normal, general evolution within the Romance, Slavic and Albanian linguistic systems.

8. The periphrastic future, as is well known, is one of the most peculiar common features within balkan languages. It is more important, however, to observe that this common feature is, in most balkan languages, the result of an extraordinary process of linguistic change. In fact, only Modern Greek and its dialects document a *traditional* kind of future, all the other balkan languages having a future that is the result of a linguistic change.

8.1 Within balkan languages there are at least five kinds of MT used to indicate the future:

I) verb of volition + infinitive present, documented in:

(32) Modern Greek dialects: *θέλω λέγειν* “I will say”

(33) Daco–romanian: *vom pleca* “we will leave”

(34) Old Church Slavic: *xzštq viděti* “I will see”

(35) Serbo–croatian: *ja ću dati/ da ću* “I will give”

II) verb of volition (at the third person singular) + conjunction + subjunctive, documented in:

- (36) Modern Greek: *θα γράφω < θέλει ίνα γράφω* “I will write”
- (37) Southern Albanian (tosk area): *do të punoj* “I will work”
- (38) Macedonian: *k'e se napletam* “I shall knit enough”
- (39) Bulgarian: *šte li da si stoiš na dumata?* “will you keep his word?”
- (40) Daco-Romanian, Aroumanian: *o să laud* “I will praise”.

III) verb *to have* + infinitive present, documented in:

- (41) Northern Albanian (geg area): *kam me shkruaj* “I will write”.

IV) indicative present = future, documented in:

- (42) Romanian dialects of Transylvania: *iubesc* “I love” and “I will love”

V) verb *to have* + conjunction + subjunctive, documented in:

- (43) Daco-romanian: *am să rog* “I will ask”.

8.2 The MT (I), (II), (V) are clearly calques on different phases of greek linguistic history. Type (I) is modelled, in some balkan linguistic traditions, on a form of future that was characteristic of late Greek, where forms like *θέλω λέγειν* were very frequent (Schwyzer 1950: 264–266).

Type (II) is modelled, in some other balkan linguistic traditions, on a form of future that was common in byzantine Greek and is common, of course, in Modern Greek. The byzantine greek form was *θέλει ίνα >θέλ'νά > θεννά > θα*, cf. MGr.: *θα πω* “I will say” < *θέλει ίνα εἶπω* “he wants until I say” (Browning 1983: 84, 98, 107).

Type (V) is modelled on a modern greek peripheral pattern (cf. *έχω να* + subjunctive). In a few peripheral modern greek dialects one can find the verb *έχω* used as a modal verb.

Types (III) and (IV), isolated respectively in northern Albanian and in the Romanian of Transylvania, are modelled on forms of future that one can find in the west romance area (Sandfeld 1930: 184).

8.3 So, in the case of type (I), documented in Daco-romanian, in Serbo-croatian and in Old Church Slavic, one can see the influence of late Greek. To be more precise, in this case, one can see the influence of ecclesiastical Greek, accepted as a model for the forming of the linguistic situation within the Balkans.

8.4 As regards the case of Aroumanian, Daco-romanian, and Bulgarian, the future of type (II) is likely to have been mediated by modern greek popular tradition, during both byzantine and medieval periods, thanks to the contacts and trade exchanges within the south side of the Balkans. A similar situation is present in the romanian future of type (V), clearly made on the byzantine greek model.

8.5 In the case of the future documented in the northern side of Albania and in Transylvania, one is presented with very particular situations. There, in fact, the future is built on the west romance pattern. Type (III) is also present in the future of southern italian dialects (cf. *aggio kantà / aggio a kkantà* < HABEO AD CANTARE "I have to sing"), while type (IV), distributed in a vast romance area, is likely to represent the most ancient phase of the east-romance future, characterized by the neutralization of the opposition [future] vs [present], with the continuation of the only present.

8.6 On the basis of the linguistic data mentioned above, one can observe that seven balkan linguistic traditions have made the future on a greek type: either late greek, or byzantine-medieval greek. Anyway, the calques on the greek pattern are dominating. It is interesting however to observe that type (I) was spread within three linguistic balkan systems probably through an educated way (or half-educated way); while types (II) and (V) were surely diffused by a popular way. Similarly, type (III), typical of the northern side of Albania, was diffused by popular way as well.

8.7 In fact, Ecclesiastical Greek, unifying different cultural-linguistic traditions through the imposition of a linguistic model, based on greek written use, determined phenomena of the so-called *isogrammatism* (cf. Gořab 1959: 415-435 e 1962: 3-12). Then, during the balkan Middle Ages, the dialects spoken in northern Greece, contributed to the building of new phenomena of religious and cultural identity within a vast area, around the south slavik cultural centers.²¹

²¹ Cf. Dvornik 1968: 197-199. Studenica, Gračanica, Ravanica, Peć, Prizren, Skopje were the most thriving monastic centers of the serbian and macedonian environments. The bulgarian centers were, in the same period, Pliska, Preslav, Asenovgrad, Bojana. The whole bulgarian, serbian and macedonian environment was oriented toward the greek-byzantine culture, spread overall from Mount Athos. On the contrary, the religious centers of both Croatia and Dalmatia (Dubrovnik,

Such linguistic trends are characteristic of Bulgarian, Macedonian, and southern Albanian (tosk area).

8.9 On the contrary, the contacts between the northern side of Albania and the opposite coast of Italy determined new forms of cultural-linguistic identity. These facts connect the South of Italy with the northern side of Albania.

8.10 Lastly, the neutralisation of the opposition [future] vs [present] joins the romanian dialects spoken in Transylvania with the main part of the western romance world, and particularly, with the complicated linguistic situation of the future as it appears on the italian peninsula.

9. On the one hand, the *balkanisms* can be considered as important *vehicula* of the process of linguistic standardization: in the sense that, through the examination of the distribution, within balkan languages, of the *balkanisms* (overall, of the morpho-syntactic balkanisms) it is possible to understand how different linguistic systems, relatively independent from each other, had been *polarized* toward either latin or greek culture.

Similarly, starting from this point of view, one could study the coincidence between Genitive and Dative (documented in Greek, Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Romanian), the analytic Comparison (documented in Modern Greek, Bulgarian, Albanian and Romanian), and so on, considering these *balkanisms*, well documented in the standard level of the above mentioned languages, as the result of a complicated process of linguistic polarization.

10. On the other hand, in many cases, the *balkanisms* seem to have their origin in the popular dynamics of the balkan systems: for instance, the so-called *indistinct vowel* (documented in Bulgarian, Albanian and Romanian) seems to be the result of the balkan substratum languages. In the same way, the formation of numerals between 11 and 19 (in Bulgarian, Serbo-croatian, Albanian, Romanian) seems to be the result of a popular balkan trend. At last, without a doubt, the *balkan common lexical features* must be explained as features of popular origin.

Zadar, Rijeka, Lastovo, Korčula and Mljet) were oriented toward the Roman Catholic Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Banfi E.
 1985 *Linguistica balcanica*. Bologna 1985.
 1988 *Tipologia della convergenza linguistica in area balcanica*. — *Atti del Convegno della Società italiana di glottologia* (Bergamo 17–19. Dicembre 1987). Pisa 1988, p. 43–91.
 1990 *The infinitive in South east European languages*. — *Toward a Typology of European Languages*. Berlin New York Amsterdam 1990, p. 1–32.
- Browning R.
 1983 *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge 1983.
- Burguière P.
 1960 *Histoire de l'infinitif grec*. Paris 1960.
- Choliolčev H., Kostov K., Mladenov M. Sl.
 1977 *Fragen der Zusammenstellung eines Atlas Linguarum Paeninsulae Balcanicae*. — *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 20 (1977): 65–71.
- Desnickaja A.V.
 1968 *Albanskij jazyk i ego dialekty*. Leningrad 1968.
- Dvornik F.
 1968 *Gli Slavi nella storia e nella civiltà europea*. Bari 1968.
- Feuillet J.
 1986 *La linguistique balkanique*. — *Cahiers balkaniques* 10 (1986).
- Gabinskij M.
 1971 *O proischoždenii starogo albanskogo infinitiva*. — *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 8 (1971): 32–44.
- Gaster M.
 1891 *Chrestomathie roumaine*. Leipzig–Bucharest 1891.
- Gerov B.
 1974 *Die lateinisch–griechische Sprachgrenze auf der Balkanhalbinsel*. — In: *Die Sprachen in römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*. Editors: G. Neumann, J. Untermann. Köln–Bonn 1974, p. 147–166.
- Gjinari J.
 1966 *Essai d'une démarcation dialectale de la langue albanaise*. — *Studia albanica* 3 (1966) 2: 31–50.
 1970 *Dialektologja Shqipitare*. Prishtina 1970.
- Gołąb Zb.
 1959 *Some arumanian-macedonian isogrammatisms and the social background of their development*. — *Word* 5 (1959) 3: 415–435.
 1962 *Balkanisms in the South Slavic languages*. — *The Slavic and East European Journal* 6 (1962) 2: 138–142.

- Goldblatt H.
1984 The language question and the emergence of slavie national languages — In: *The emergence of national languages*. Ravenna 1984, p. 119–173.
- Haugen E.
1983 *The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice*. — In: J. Cobarrubias, J. Fishmann, *Progress in Language Planning. International Perspectives*. Berlin New York Amsterdam 1983, p. 269–289.
- Hendriks P.
1976 *The Radožda-Vevčani Dialect of Macedonian. Structure, Texts, Lexikon*. Lisse 1976 [PdR Press Publications on Macedonian 1].
- Hesseling D.-Chr.
1892 *Essai historique sur l'infinif grec*. — In: *Etudes de Philologie néo-grecque*. Paris 1892, p. 1–43.
- Iliescu M.
1963 *Encore sur la perte de l'infinif en roumain*. — *Actes du premier Congres international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes*. Vol. 6. Sofija 1963, p. 115–118.
- Ivănescu G.
1980 *Istoria limbii române*. Iași 1980.
- Joseph B.D.
1983 *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A study in areal, general and historical linguistics*. Cambridge 1983.
- Koneski B.
1966 *Istorija makedonskog jezika*. Beograd 1966.
- Ljungvik H.
1932 *Beiträge zur Syntax der spätgriechischen Volkssprache*. Leipzig 1932.
- Lunt H.
1952 *A Grammar of the Macedonian literary language*. Skopje 1952.
1974 *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. The Hague 1974.
- Mandilaras B.
1973 *The Verb in the Greek non-literary Papyri*. Athēnai 1973.
- Meillet A., Vaillant A.
1952 *Grammaire de la langue serbo-croate*. Paris 1952.
- Mihăescu H.
1978 *La langue latine dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe*. Bucarest-Paris 1978.
- Mirambel A.
1961 *Participe et gérondif en grec médiéval et moderne*. — *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 56 (1961): 46–79.
- Mladenov S.
1929 *Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache*. Berlin 1929.

- Muljačić Ž.
 1980 Per una classificazione 'standardologica' delle lingue romanze. — In: *Italic and Romance Linguistic Studies in Honor of Ernst Pulgram*. Editor H. Izzo. Amsterdam 1980, p. 85-96.
 1985 Romània, Germania e Slavia: parallelismi e differenze nella formazione delle lingue standard. — In: *La formazione delle lingue letterarie*. Atti del Convegno della Società Italiana di Glottologia (Siena, 16-18 Aprile 1984). A cura di A. Quattordio Moreschini. Pisa 1985, p. 39-55.
 1988 Emergence et genèse des langues romanes. — In: *Actes du XVIII^e Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes* (Trier, Juin 1986). Tübingen 1988, p. 186-193.
- Newton B.
 1972 *The generative interpretation of Dialect. A study of modern Greek phonology*. Cambridge 1972.
- Pellegrini G. B.
 1977 *Introduzione allo studio della lingua albanese*. Padova 1977.
- Popović I.
 1960 *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden 1960.
- Ramat P.
 1984 *Linguistica tipologica*. Bologna 1984.
- Reichenkron G.
 1962 Der Typus der Balkansprachen. — *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 1 (1962): 91-122.
- Robert (Mac) C. M.
 1980 *The Decline of the Infinitive in Bulgarian*. Oxford 1980.
- Rohlf G.
 1958 La perdita dell'infinito nelle lingue balcaniche. — *Omagiu lui Iorgu Iordan*. Bucureşti 1958, p. 733-744.
- Rosetti A.
 1964 *Istoria limbii romîne*. III: *Limbile slave meridionale (sec. VI-XII)*. Bucureşti 1964⁵.
- Sandfeld Kr.
 1930 *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*. Paris 1930.
- Saramandu N.
 1986 L'étude typologique des langues balkaniques. — *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 29 (1986) 4: 35-50.
- Schaller H. W.
 1975 *Die Balkansprachen. Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*. Heidelberg 1975.
- Schwyzler E.
 1950 *Griechische Grammatik*. München 1950.
- Solta R.
 1980 *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen*. Darmstadt 1980.

Togebv K.

1962 L'infinifif dans les langues balkaniques. — Romance Philology 15 (1962): 221-233.

Triantaphullidēs M. A.

1938 Neollenikē Grammatikē. I (Historikē Eisagogē). Athēnai 1938.

Vasmer M.

1941 Die Slaven in Griechenland. Leipzig 1941.

Weigand G.

1925 Programm des Balkan-Archivs. — Balkan Archiv 1 (1925): 5-15.

Weithmann M. W.

1978 Die slavische Bevölkerung auf der griechische Halbinsel. München 1978.