

Eirik Welo (ed.)

# Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches

Oslo Studies in Language, 3(3), 2011.

Eirik Welo (ed.):

*Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches*

Oslo, University of Oslo

ISSN 1890-9639

© 2011 the authors

Set in  $\text{\TeX}$ , fonts Gentium and Linux Libertine by Eirik Welo

Cover design by UniPub publishing house

Printed by UniPub from camera-ready copy supplied by the editors

<http://www.journals.uio.no/osla>

# Contents

Introduction <i>Eirik Welo</i>	1
Categories of definiteness in Classical Armenian <i>Angelika Müth</i>	11
The puzzle of Albanian <i>po</i> <i>Brian D. Joseph</i>	27
The sacral stamp of Greek: Periphrastic constructions in New Testament translations of Latin, Gothic, and Old Church Slavonic <i>Bridget Drinka</i>	41
Native syntax and translation effects: adnominal arguments in the Greek and Latin New Testament <i>Chiara Gianollo</i>	75
The pragmatics of “unruly” dative absolutes in Early Slavic <i>Daniel E. Collins</i>	103
Negation and polarity in the Greek, Gothic, Classical Armenian, and Old Church Slavic Gospels: a preliminary study <i>Jared S. Klein</i>	131
Predicative possession in the Old Church Slavic Bible translations <i>Julia McAnallen</i>	155
Classical and Romance usages of <i>ipse</i> in the Vulgate <i>Mari Johanne Hertzenberg</i>	173
* <i>En</i> -phrases and their morphosyntactic and semantic particulars <i>Olga Thomason</i>	189

# INTRODUCTION

EIRIK WELO

*University of Oslo*

## [1] INTRODUCTION

This book presents a selection of papers from the workshop on Indo-European (IE) syntax which was held at the University of Georgia in Athens, Georgia in May 2009. The workshop was organized by the PROIEL project at the University of Oslo and by professor Jared Klein at the University of Georgia.<sup>1</sup>

The aim of this book is not to give a general picture of the syntax of the Indo-European languages nor to propose reconstructions of Proto-Indo-European syntax. Rather, the papers presented here study the interaction of grammar and discourse structure at various levels: word order, the use and historical development of words and grammatical constructions.<sup>2</sup> These phenomena are also at the heart of the PROIEL project itself.

## [2] RESULTS

In this section, we present some of the major insights from the papers. While the relationship between grammar and discourse structure can be said to form a common theme for the papers collected here, the authors approach this question from different angles. Some focus on language comparison, relying on translations or text corpora containing material from several languages. Other discuss problems in a single language.

The IE languages show differences in many parts of their grammars. One way of highlighting differences between the grammatical systems of different languages is the use of translations. This method is put to good use in the paper by OLGA THOMASON on the translation of *prepositions* in several old IE Bible translations. Her detailed investigation takes as its starting-point the Greek prepositions ἐν ‘in’ and εἰς ‘into’ (from earlier *\*en-s*). The translation languages Gothic, Old Church Slavic (OCS) and Classical Armenian all possess a reflex of the IE preposition *\*en* which also underlies the Greek prepositions. In a tidy universe, the Gothic, OCS and Armenian reflexes of IE *\*en* would be used to translate Greek ἐν/εἰς whenever these occurred. In reality, the reflexes in the various languages are associated with a range of meanings which do not always overlap. Thomason’s use of examples shows clearly how the reflexes

[1] Thanks to professor Klein and to the University of Georgia for all practical help and for providing generous hospitality and enjoyable company during the conference.

[2] See Bakker & Wakker (2009) for some recent studies of Classical Greek along similar lines.

of *\*en* have come to occupy different positions within the grammatical systems of the descent languages. Of course, separate investigations of the prepositional systems of the various languages would ultimately give the same result. The use of translations, however, makes the differences stand out very clearly.

*Possessive constructions* are another area in which the IE languages show interesting grammatical differences. In JULIA MCANALLEN's paper on these constructions in Old Church Slavic, the fact that the OCS texts are translations from the Greek is again exploited to show up important shades of meaning in the Slavic constructions. McAnallen identifies three distinct ways of expressing predicative possession in OCS:

- a verb meaning 'have'
- a dative NP + the copula verb
- a prepositional phrase (*u* + genitive) + the copula verb

She then looks at the possessive constructions in the Greek Bible text to see which OCS construction is chosen to translate them. Incidentally, New Testament Greek also has several ways of expressing predicative possession:

- a verb meaning 'have'
- a dative NP + the copula verb

McAnallen concludes that while the verb 'have' is at once the most frequent and the most flexible way of expressing predicative possession, the 'dative + NP' construction is used in fixed expressions. The use of the preposition *u* + the copula verb is used actively to emphasize the impermanence of possession.

The comparison with the Greek NT text shows that, given the literal approach to translation evidenced by all the early IE Bible translations, a Greek possessive construction is almost always translated with a similar one in OCS. Apparent divergences between Greek and OCS are in most cases due to idiomatic expressions. The cases involving *u* + genitive are especially interesting in this regard since OCS may express a distinction which is not overtly differentiated in Greek.<sup>3</sup>

The *definite article* provides a third example of a category which (when it exists at all) is used differently in different languages. ANGELIKA MÜTH contrasts the use of the definite article in Greek with its use in the Armenian Bible translation. Again, while there are many overlapping functions between the two languages, there are also clear areas of divergence. The use of the definite article with proper names is a case in point.

---

[3] Further research may be needed into the ways in which Greek may express different types of possession.

Consider the name ‘Jesus’ in the New Testament. In the Greek Gospels, Jesus is mentioned by name close to 800 times. In slightly more than half of the cases, his name is accompanied by the definite article: *ho Iêsous*. In the Classical Armenian translation, on the other hand, the name ‘Jesus’ is always bare (with a single exception). The pattern is repeated with Pilate: in Greek, his name carries the definite article in 80% of the cases. In Armenian, the name is always bare. This is not, however, the whole story about proper names: some Biblical names are never used with the article, neither in Greek nor in Armenian. Clearly, the definite article has a wider range of functions in Greek than in Armenian. More specifically, Greek uses the definite article in several “semantic” functions, e.g. with proper names, unique reference nouns, etc., where Armenian prefers to leave it out. As far as the “anaphoric” use of the article is concerned, Greek and Armenian are more similar to each other.

BRIDGET DRINKA takes a different approach to the role of translations in linguistic development. In her paper, she discusses *periphrastic constructions* in the Greek NT and its old IE translations. While tracing the spread of these constructions, she focuses on their symbolic meaning as part of the Word of God. Preserving the linguistic *form* of a holy text is seen as a way of showing reverence for it. When grammatical constructions are associated with religious meaning in this way, this in turn makes it possible to exploit these constructions in original texts to signal the membership of the author in the Christian community, ultimately giving rise to a Christian style of expression. In her paper, Drinka shows that this process took place at least twice in the history of the NT. First, the evangelists, and especially Luke, consciously adopted features of the language of the *Septuaginta*, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, thereby signalling the continued relevance of the Old Testament for the understanding of their own writings. Secondly, the early translators of the Bible took pains to replicate the periphrastic constructions frequently found in the text of the NT. Finally, the importance of the early translations of the Bible in the various speech-communities of Europe may have contributed to the development of periphrastic present and perfect constructions in the modern European languages.

In his paper, JARED KLEIN explores the syntax of *negation* and *polarity* in the languages of the major old IE Bible translations: Latin, Gothic, OCS and Classical Armenian. Starting out from the Greek NT, Klein investigates the linguistic realization of various aspects of negation, ranging from simple negative statements through negative commands, questions, adverbial clauses (purpose, result, conditional, causal) to relative clauses.

Klein proceeds by discussing the modal categories of the languages. This is important since the functions of the categories are not necessarily the same. For example, the descendant of the Proto-IE optative is used as an imperative in OCS and as a subjunctive in Gothic. Also, the languages employ different means in order to express the functional category ‘future tense’: the present indicative (Gothic),

the subjunctive (Armenian), or the perfective present or periphrastic constructions (OCS).

The investigation shows some interesting differences between the various translations and the Greek original. In particular, the distinction in Greek between specific/definite ‘who’ and non-specific/indefinite ‘whoever’ is not always reflected in the translations.<sup>4</sup>

The picture which emerges from Klein’s study is, as he notes in his conclusion, remarkably stable from language to language. Since the wish to preserve the syntax of the original text may be one major source for this similarity, as convincingly illustrated in Bridget Drinka’s paper, it should be pointed out that the conclusions based on data collected from comparing a translation with its original ought to be checked against original texts wherever possible.

This method is followed by CHIARA GIANOLLO in her paper on *genitive modifiers* in Greek and Latin. Taking the Vulgate translation of the Greek NT as her starting-point, she further draws on data from other Late Latin texts. Combining data from these two different sources, she is able to conclude that while the word order of genitive modifiers is to a large extent the same in the two languages, this should not be seen just as the result of faithful translation. The evidence from Late Latin non-biblical texts shows that developments in Latin grammar allowed the Bible translators to replicate the NT Greek linguistic structures without doing violence to their own language. A further question, posed but not answered by the author, is whether the parallel development, seen in both Late Latin and in Koine Greek, towards post-posed genitive modifiers should be attributed to language contact and bilingualism or seen as independent of each other.

An important topic concerning the interaction between grammar and discourse structure, viz. *word/constituent order*, is dealt with in SVETLANA PETROVA’s paper. In Old High German (OHG) there are two constructions which both function in a similar way to indicate discourse structure: Verb-Subject order and the *tho*-V2 construction. The constructions are similar in that they both involve a subject in postverbal position. In the *tho*-construction, however, the particle *tho* is placed clause-initially, followed by the verb. The author investigates the factors that influence the choice between VS order and the *tho*-V2 construction in Old High German texts. She discusses a set of factors which influence the choice between the two constructions, including:

- argument structure
- lexical semantics
- Aktionsart

---

[4] Note that in New Testament Greek, this distinction is no longer as clear-cut as in Classical Greek. Thus, the choices made by the translators may also tell us something about their understanding of the Greek text.

- information structure

The choice of construction cannot, she argues, be attributed to any single factor. Rather, the factors combine to influence the choice to different degrees. Petrova concludes that e.g. the properties of Aktionsart and Information Structure in particular are closely linked to VS order. She also concludes that the discourse status of *tho* directly affects its position in the clause: when its status is *new* or *indefinite*, it may not be clause-initial, thus precluding the *tho*-V2 construction from appearing.

The distinction between subordination and coordination is another grammatical feature which clearly plays a role in marking discourse structure. DAN COLLINS discusses *absolute constructions* in OCS and old East Slavic texts. The main focus of the paper is on the use of absolute constructions in contexts where they should not be used according to traditional grammar, e.g. when the subject of the absolute construction is coreferential with the main clause subject, or when the absolute construction functions as a main clause in its own right. Collins argues that these cases should not be viewed simply as grammatical mistakes or translation errors. Rather, we should look for the factors which motivate the use of the construction in precisely these contexts. The traditional definition of absolute constructions fails to realize that we need to understand the contextual features which characterize the construction as well as its formal features. The seemingly aberrant uses of absolute constructions should rather be incorporated into the description of the syntactic possibilities of the construction. The use of absolute constructions are often motivated by the need to demarcate discourse structure rather than by purely syntactic considerations.

MARI HERTZENBERG's paper concerns the uses of the demonstrative *ipse* in the Latin Vulgate translation of the Bible. On the basis of Classical Latin texts and the more recent testimony of the Romance languages, it is possible to distinguish between Classical Latin uses and uses pointing in the direction of later Romance languages.

In Classical Latin, *ipse* was used as an intensifier with the meaning 'self'. In the Romance languages, however, *ipse* has developed in several ways:

- demonstrative pronoun/adjective
- definite article
- third person pronoun

Hertzenberg discusses several cases where it is reasonable to interpret *ipse* not as an intensifying adjunct but rather as an unemphatic personal pronoun. Apart from two examples, which both allow for alternative explanations, *ipse* is not found in the Vulgate as a definite article. This is surprising, the author argues, given the usage of other late Latin texts. As an explanation, we may suppose either that *ipse*



was not a definite article in Jerome's grammar, or, on the other hand, that it was, but that he chose to keep his translation closer to Classical Latin with regard to this grammatical feature.

In his paper, BRIAN JOSEPH discusses the meaning and etymology of the Albanian particle *po*. This particle marks progressivity, as shown in (1):

- (1)    *Agimi po këndon*  
          'Agim is singing.'

Although the question of the etymology of *po* cannot be settled once and for all, there are several plausible alternatives. The question why Albanian developed this progressive marker in the first place is discussed in the context of language contact. In both the Slavic and Greek neighbouring languages of Albanian, the aspectual notion of progressivity plays an important role in the verbal system, and this may have supported the overt marking of progressivity in Albanian as well. Joseph emphasizes the complex interplay between Indo-European inheritance, contact with other Balkan languages and general linguistic principles, which all have played a part in the development of this grammatical marker towards its present state.

To sum up, the papers selected for this volume cover a wide range of interrelated topics and approaches:

- prepositions
- possessive constructions
- the definite article
- periphrastic constructions
- negation/polarity
- genitive modifiers
- word order/clause types
- absolute constructions
- pronouns
- aspectual particles

All of the topics listed above are important areas in which grammar interacts with discourse. Undoubtedly, future research will deepen our understanding of the precise nature of this interaction, its regularities and limits. We will set yet other ways in which these and other grammatical categories function within the larger structures of discourse. Nonetheless, the categories discussed in the papers in the

following pages are central among the pragmatic resources which languages draw on.

### [3] THE PROIEL PROJECT

The papers presented at the Athens workshop deal with many aspects of Indo-European syntax but focus especially on the old Indo-European Bible translations. The idea of using these translations as a starting point for research into the comparative syntax of (some of) the older Indo-European languages is not new in itself,<sup>5</sup> but has been taken up again in a new context through the construction of the PROIEL corpus of Bible translations at the University of Oslo.<sup>6</sup>

The PROIEL database contains the text of the Greek New Testament (NT) combined with translations into Latin (the Vulgate), Gothic, Old Church Slavic and Classical Armenian. The texts of the PROIEL corpus are annotated on various levels:

- lemmatization
- morphology
- syntax (dependency grammar trees)
- givenness (information structure)

The texts are also aligned word by word (the alignment was done automatically). Thus, for every Greek word in the corpus, we have information about its features and syntactic function as well as its relationship to words in the translated versions. Likewise, the non-Greek words contain information about which Greek words of the original NT they translate.

The information added by the annotation is stored in a database which makes it possible to search for complex combinations of features. This opens up new possibilities for detailed (and quantitative) study of Indo-European syntax. The PROIEL corpus is publicly available and may be used for all kinds of research focusing either on the Bible or on the languages of the NT and its translations.<sup>7</sup>

The PROIEL project itself was motivated by a desire to know how the various old Indo-European languages exploit the resources of their grammatical systems in order to express pragmatic categories like *topic* and *focus* and other elements contributing to discourse coherence. The project starts from the premise that the translation languages try to recreate the structure of the Greek NT text with regard not only to lexical and syntactic structures but also to textual coherence, the project poses the question of how the grammatical systems of Latin, Gothic, OCS and Armenian differ from Greek in their ability to express aspects of textual coherence.

[5] See e.g. the studies by Cuendet (1924, 1929) and Klein (1992a, 1992b).

[6] The corpus is publicly available at <http://foni.uio.no:3000/>.

[7] For further discussion of how the corpus was made, cf. the papers Haug et al. (2009a) and Haug et al. (2009b).

Consider again the example of definiteness marking. We have good reason to believe that Proto-IE, like Classical Latin, did not mark definiteness by means of a definite article. In Greek, on the other hand, such an article developed well before the time when the NT was written.<sup>8</sup> Of the translation languages in the corpus some have a definite article (Armenian) while others do not (Latin, Gothic, OCS). Accordingly, we may use the PROIEL corpus to try and answer the question: how did the Bible translators deal with the Greek article, how did they analyze its functions, and, for the languages which lacked a definite article of their own, what resources of their own grammar did they employ to express the meaning contributed by the definite article in Greek?<sup>9</sup>

Our data on how the Greek definite article is translated throws light also on the development of the definite article in Late Latin and Romance. The Latin Vulgate Bible translation is one important source of information about how the demonstratives *ipse* and *ille* developed into definite articles. As in the case of Classical Armenian, however, the translation also provides information about distinctions in the use of the category in the language of the original.

Another area of grammatical difference is the system of participles. All old IE languages have (inflecting) participles, and some of these may be inherited from PIE. The participles are not, however, used in the same way in every language. In a paper on the use and translation of Greek participles, Dag Haug showed how the participles in Greek fulfil several different discourse functions, and how they are translated differently according to their function.<sup>10</sup>

As we have seen, using translations in linguistic research offers many advantages, chief among which are the fact that we are allowed to see how languages behave in a controlled environment: the original and the translation are in some sense the ‘same’ text. There are, however, also problems involved in the use of translations, and some of these are specifically related to the use of *Biblical* translations.

One problem is common to all texts which are transmitted over time: the transmission process generates errors. Words are added or left out, misplaced or misspelled. This means that we cannot always be sure that what we read is in fact a grammatical sentence of the language we study. The problem is more acute whenever we are dealing with constructions of low frequency. As far as Greek and Latin are concerned, we are often able to use the vast amounts of other texts as a control. For some of the other languages in the corpus, most notably Gothic and Old Church Slavic, the lack of non-translated texts makes it difficult to evaluate the language of the texts that we actually have.

---

[8] Although Homer does not use the article consistently in his poems, they contain clear indications of the way in which the old demonstrative pronoun would develop into a definite article by the time of Classical Greek.

[9] See the paper by Angelika Müth in this volume.

[10] The paper was given at the Athens conference, but was already scheduled to appear elsewhere. It can be read in [Haug \(Forthcoming 2012\)](#).

A problem related to comparing translations with their original is that we cannot be sure that the version of the translation we happen to have was made on the basis of the version of the original that we happen to have. As a quick glance at the critical apparatus of any Greek Bible text will demonstrate, the textual transmission of the Greek NT is complicated: there are text families and endless variation in detail. In the case of the Gothic Bible, even though the translation was ultimately made from a Greek original, the translator may have been influenced by Latin versions as well. The Armenian translation of the NT perhaps was first made from a Syriac text and then at a later stage corrected against a Greek text. Naturally, all these facts must be taken into account as possible sources of error affecting the value of the translations for syntactic research.<sup>11</sup>

More directly related to the linguistic side of Bible translation is the question of *literalness*. To what extent were the early Bible translators willing to go beyond the borders of their own grammar in order to replicate the structure of the source text? In this context, we should not forget, as Bridget Drinka convincingly showed in her paper at the conference, that the Greek NT as a text was holy to its readers, and that this holiness extended also to its linguistic form. While this fact is most clearly visible in the case of the word order of the text, we cannot be sure that it did not also extend to other areas, e.g. lexical semantics. In the great majority of cases, the translators did their utmost to preserve the word order of the original text. This creates problems for a linguistic evaluation of the word order of the translations, not least because we may reasonably infer that word order in all the older IE languages was quite free. For Gothic, Armenian and OCS, as we cannot use non-translated texts as a control, it is difficult to use the word order in the Bible translations in these languages as linguistic data.<sup>12</sup> Thus, it is only in the cases where a translation deviates from the word order that we may feel reasonably sure that the translator had a linguistic reason for not replicating the word order of his source.<sup>13</sup>

To conclude, in spite of the limitations discussed above, the old Indo-European Bible translations provide important source material for the comparative study of Indo-European syntax. Above all, the controlled context provided by an original text and its translations allows us to study in detail how grammar, and, more specifically, syntax interacts with discourse structure in order to make texts as cohesive as possible.

The development of electronic text corpora which include rich annotation of

[11] See [Metzger \(1977\)](#) for a detailed presentation and discussion.

[12] In the case of Gothic, we may argue for the grammaticality of some word orders by using data from the other old Germanic languages. In the case of Armenian, we have original texts only slightly newer than the translation of the Gospels, but these all come from a written culture heavily influenced by the Bible translations anyway.

[13] Although, again we cannot be sure that the translation was made from a source with the same word order as the current version of the Greek NT or that the original word order of either the translation or the source text has not been changed in the process of manuscript transmission.

grammatical information promises to make the investigation of these phenomena even more practical, by giving researchers access to complex searches and precise quantitative data. Even though the number of old IE texts available in this format is still small, we may expect a steady growth in the amount of material available for study in the coming years.

#### REFERENCES

- Bakker, Stéphanie & Gerry Wakker (eds.). 2009. *Discourse cohesion in Ancient Greek*. Leiden-Boston: Brill.
- Cuendet, Georges. 1924. *L'impératif dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique, arménienne et vieux slave des Evangiles*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Cuendet, Georges. 1929. *L'ordre des mots dans le texte grec et dans les versions gotique, arménienne et vieux slave des Évangiles. Première partie. les groupes nominaux*. Paris: Champion.
- Haug, Dag. Forthcoming 2012. Open verb-based adjuncts in New Testament Greek and the Latin of the Vulgate. In Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen & Dag Haug (eds.), *Big events and small clauses*, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haug, Dag T. T., Hanne M. Eckhoff, Marek Majer & Eirik Welo. 2009a. Breaking down and putting back together: analysis and synthesis of New Testament Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9. 56–92.
- Haug, Dag T. T., Marius L. Jøhndal, Hanne M. Eckhoff, Eirik Welo, Mari J. B. Hertzberg & Angelika Müth. 2009b. Computational and linguistic issues in designing a syntactically annotated parallel corpus of Indo-European languages. *Traitement Automatique des Langues* 50(2). 17–45.
- Klein, J. S. 1992a. On the independence of Gothic syntax, I: Interrogativity, complex sentence types, tense, mood, and diathesis. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 20. 339–79.
- Klein, J. S. 1992b. On the idiomatic nature of the Gothic New Testament: A comparative study of prepositional usage in Gothic and New Testament Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 90. 1–80.
- Metzger, Bruce. 1977. *The early versions of the New Testament: Their origin, transmission, and limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

## THE PUZZLE OF ALBANIAN PO

BRIAN D. JOSEPH  
*The Ohio State University*

## [1] PRELIMINARIES

Albanian has an aspectual marker *po* that is used in marking progressive (continuative) aspect; it is described in grammars, e.g. in Newmark et al. (1982, 36), as denoting “a momentary action in progress”. It occurs in the present with present tense forms, as in (1a) and also in the past, with the imperfect tense, as in (1b):

- (1) a. Agimi *po* këndon ‘Agim is singing’  
 b. Agimi *po* këndonte ‘Agim was singing’

The value of *po* becomes clear when a sentence like (1a) is contrasted with a simple present tense without *po* that then denotes a general state, as in (2):

- (2) Agimi këndon ‘Agim sings’ (habitually, i.e. ‘is a singer’)

It should be noted that there is an alternative way of expressing progressivity, described as follows by Newmark et al. (1982, 36): “an action already in progress [can be] constructed with the verb *jam* [‘be’] in the present or imperfect followed by a gerundive introduced by *duke*” and exemplified by (3):

- (3) a. I huaji ishte duke kaluar kafshën  
 the stranger-NOM was-3SG PROG move-PPL animal-ACC.DEF  
 ‘The stranger was moving the beast’  
 b. Agimi është duke kënduar ‘Agim is singing’ (cf. (1a))

Although from these descriptions there is no reason to doubt that *po* is a progressive marker, there is some further independent supporting evidence. Newmark et al. (1982, 66) note that “verbs which designate actions or states that normally characterize the subject for an indefinite time are rarely, if ever, accompanied by... *po*”, and this includes the verbs *dua* ‘want’ and *di* ‘know’, which do not happily occur in progressive forms in other languages, such as standard English. Thus on cross-linguistic grounds, the progressive nature of sentences with this verbal modifier *po* seems clear.

Still, there is more to be said. Thus, I offer here a fuller consideration of the nature of *po*, both as to its function and as to its origin. I argue that to fully understand how *po* functions in Albanian, or more accurately, how it came to function

as it does, one needs to examine this form from a Balkan, an Indo-European, and a cross-linguistic perspective, as aspects of all three ways of placing Albanian into a larger linguistic context contribute towards an insightful account of *po*. This investigation thus leads to a consideration of the etymology of the form and how it developed within Albanian and in relation to other phenomena in neighboring languages.

Of particular interest is the fact that even though there are numerous striking parallels between Albanian and other languages in the Balkans, e.g. Greek and Romanian (and similar facts can be found for Slavic), with regard to the structuring of the “verbal complex”, i.e. the string of elements that occur with the verb in the marking of negation, tense, mood, voice, and argument structure, nonetheless *po* stands out as unusual in certain respects. The parallels in question are illustrated by the sentences in (4) and (5), from Albanian, dialectal Greek, and Daco-Romanian, respectively; this exercise could be extended with data from other Balkan languages, including Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Romani, though the examples in (4) and (5) suffice to make the point that the languages match up morphemic-slot-by-morphemic-slot with regard to various preverbal elements that modify the verb in some way. Structurally, therefore, even if the content of the particular morphemes serving as exponents of the relevant categories differs for each language, the slots are the same and thus the verbal complexes converge in terms of their form:

- (4) a. s' do të j a- jep (Albanian)  
NEG FUT SUBJVE him-IO it-DO give-1SG  
b. ðe ðe na tu to ðóso (dialectal Greek)  
NEG FUT SUBJVE him-IO it-DO give-1SG  
c. nu o să i -l dau (Daco-Romanian)  
NEG FUT SUBJVE him-IO it-DO give-1SG  
'I will not give it to him'
- (5) a. të mos j a jep? (Albanian)  
SUBJVE NEG him-IO it-DO give-1SG.SUBJUNC  
b. na min tu to ðóso? (Greek)  
SUBJVE NEG him-IO it-DO give-1SG  
c. să nu i -l dau? (Daco-Romanian)  
SUBJVE NEG him-IO it-DO give-1SG  
'Should I not give it to him?'

Moreover, “convergence” is precisely the right characterization for the facts in (4) and (5), since the means by which these modifying categories were realized in earlier stages of these languages was quite different; Ancient Greek, for instance, expressed future tense via a suffix on the verb stem, and the placement of weak object pronouns (treated here as markers of argument structure) operated within the do-



main of the clause and was not bound to the verb as it is in the modern language.

What is interesting about Albanian *po* is that despite such cross-language parallelism in the verbal complex, this Albanian element is unique among the Balkan languages. That is, no other language shows a (more or less) free preverbal form that marks aspect and specifically a type of imperfectivity (in the sense of signaling an on-going event), that is, progressivity; Slavic, for instance, generally uses bound preverbs and stem-forming suffixes to mark different aspects, while Greek uses stem-forming suffixes, and Romanian does not formally distinguish aspect at all.<sup>1</sup>

## [2] DISTRIBUTION WITHIN ALBANIAN

There are two relevant dimensions to the matter of the distribution within Albanian of *po*. First, there is the question of how it is represented lexically and functionally, since within Albanian, there is actually a wide range of meanings and thus functions associated with the form [po]. Without taking a stand on whether they are all the “same” element synchronically, a vexed issue for any language when there are homophonic forms serving distinct functions,<sup>2</sup> we can discern the following uses, based on the characterizations given in Newmark (1998, 680); the illustrative meanings given follow Newmark:

- (6) a. Particle:
  - affirmative particle: ‘yes; indeed’
  - confirmative tag in questions: ‘is that right?’
  - confirmative identifier: ‘exactly; precisely; the very’
  - indicator of momentaneous (on-going) activity: ‘be VERB-ing’
- b. Interjection:
  - ‘oh say! Say! But say!’

[1] Albanian, of course, offers *duke* (and dialect variants) as another instance of a more or less free preverbal form marking progressivity, though with *duke*, one has to factor in the need for a co-occurring participle, so that *duke* by itself does not mark aspect. It can be noted too that in modern Tsakonian Greek, there is a direct continuation of the Hellenistic Greek ‘be’ + *participle* construction, which, though signaling a simple present in New Testament Greek, presumably originated with a progressive sense, that is, ‘I am (one-who-is-in-a-state-of) seeing’ (see, e.g., Decker 2007). The Tsakonian formation continues the simple present meaning, with no hint of progressivity, despite the periphrastic origin (so that *emi oru*, from earlier εἰμι ὁρῶν, means not ‘I-am seeing’, but rather simply ‘I see’). Thus even though aspect is marked in many Balkan languages, *po* is unlike its functional counterparts.

[2] One can compare the question of whether all the forms *to* in English (leaving aside *two* and *too*!), namely the prepositional *to*, the infinitival *to*, the word-formative *to* (as in *today*), and so on, constitute manifestations of one and the same element. It is not easy to give a definitive answer here. For what it is worth, Newmark (1998, s.v.) lists them all in one dictionary entry but that could conceivably be merely a space-saving move (which dictionaries might engage in out of economic motivation), and not something based on an analytic judgment.



- c. Conjunction:
  - ‘but’
  - in conditional clauses: ‘if; if only’

Second, there is the issue of the dialect distribution of *po*, focusing attention on the aspectual verbal progressivity function. It turns out that this particular *po* occurs in both Tosk (southern) and Geg (northern) Albanian, a fact that suggests strongly that it presumably is old within Albanian. Still, though represented in Tosk generally, as part of the standard language (*qjuha standarde*) for instance, progressive *po* is not found in outlying Tosk dialects, being absent from Arvanitika (in Greece) and Arbëresh (in southern Italy), where forms of *duke* (*tuke*, *tue*) occur with participials in progressives instead (a construction that is also an option in the standard language – see (2) above).

This distribution raises some questions about what the proto-Albanian status of *po* is, and thus invites an examination of the etymology of *po*, since the determination of the etymological starting point for *po*, in any or all of its uses, can in principle have an illuminating effect on our understanding of the paths of development *po* took and even on its synchronic behavior. As becomes clear in the next section, however, there is little in the way of definitive etymological light to be shed on *po*. Nonetheless, the investigation does yield some interesting and useful insights into the development of *po*.

### [3] ETYMOLOGY

There is a seemingly obvious external source for an aspectual marker in a Balkan language with the shape *po*,<sup>3</sup> namely the Slavic aspectual prefix *po*. However, at first glance, this presents a rather difficult starting point for aspectual *po*, on semantic grounds. That is, it would seem to be able to be ruled out as a source of Albanian *po*, as Slavic *po* is generally a perfectivizing marker not an imperfectivizing one. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that there are some functions for *po* to be found in various Slavic languages that make this possible source at least a plausible one, even if not necessarily compelling. In particular, while mainly perfectivizing, *po* shows some uses in various Slavic languages, including some South Slavic languages, that are imperfectivizing, or associated with imperfectivity,<sup>4</sup> as in Russian *po-kupat* ‘to buy’ vs. perfective *kupit* or Slovene *pobolévati* ‘keep getting sick, but not seriously’ (IMPF). Moreover, there are some uses that mark duration, especially for relatively brief periods of time, a notion that can be construed as imperfective or progressive in the sense that while bounded the action is viewed as on-going even if just for short time; some examples are, again, Russian *po-stojat* ‘to stand a little’ but

[3] See below in section [4] and especially footnote 14 regarding the question of apparent homophony between Albanian *po* and Slavic *po*.

[4] I say this since the change in the suffix may well be involved in the imperfective/perfective derivation here.

also, more important for the Balkans, Serbian *po-plakati* ‘to weep for a while’ and *po-plivati* ‘to swim for a while’, Bulgarian *po-vârvja* ‘go for while’, and the Slovene use of *po* in what Greenberg (2006, 93–4) calls “attenuation”, as in *pobolévati*, cited above, and *posedéti* ‘sit for a while’. Finally, Dmitrieva (1991, 71) has shown that in Old Russian the preverb *po* combines with verbs of distributive, delimitative, and ingressive meanings, for which the semantics offer a parallel to the function proposed for Albanian aspectual/progressive *po*. Putting all of these together, Slavic *po* gains some degree of plausibility as a good source of the Albanian progressive *po* (and see below, section [4], for more on Slavic).

Still, these functions of Slavic *po* do not equate exactly with progressivity per se and in any case it is not clear how widespread they are in any South Slavic language, though as noted they are not unknown in that branch. Still, the way Newmark et al. describe Albanian *po*, namely marking “a momentary action in progress”, with its reference to momentariness combined with some durativity, makes especially the South Slavic limited duration use of Slavic *po*, as in the examples cited above (*poplakati/poplivati*, etc.), a reasonable functional match for the Albanian.

Nonetheless, an external (borrowing) source for Albanian *po* as a grammatical element is far from a compelling etymology, given that most Slavic elements in Albanian are lexical in nature,<sup>5</sup> so that one has to consider also possible Albanian-internal sources. Here it can be mentioned that aspectual *po* has often been connected by scholars to the affirmative particle use, namely the word for ‘yes’. This connection is suggested by the listing in Mann (1932, 192) and the more comprehensive one in Newmark (1998), given above in (6), where all *po*’s are under one entry. It is also the case that Newmark et al. (1982, 36, 66) repeatedly refer to *po* as an “emphatic” element, presumably by way of linking it to the affirmative semantics of *po* ‘yes, indeed; exactly’. Moreover, this connection is stated overtly in Orel (1998, 337, s.v. *po*): “The same adverb [affirmative *po*] is used as a particle of progressive forms”. This connection does require a fairly significant semantic and functional shift, but before that is taken up, it is worthwhile considering what the source of affirmative *po* is.

As it happens, somewhat frustratingly perhaps but not unexpectedly when one is dealing with etymology, the origins of the affirmative use of *po* are not entirely clear. Several possibilities have come up over the years. Meyer (1891, 346), for instance, links it to the adversative element *por* ‘but’, a use found for *po* itself as well (see (6c) above). Orel (1998, 337), following Meyer, says that the formal issue standing in the way of this connection, namely the loss of word-final *-r*, is explainable “by the permanent unstressed position of the conjunction”, and ultimately takes this Albanian conjunction to be a borrowing from Latin *porrō* ‘then; moreover; but’. Camarda (1864, I:314) offered a different view, comparing *po(r)* with Sanskrit *apara*

[5] Though see section [4] below for a contact-based account of *po* involving Slavic.

‘later; posterior’, but this connection seems somewhat forced on the semantic side and has not met with much approval.

The important thing to note, however, is that even if any of these suggestions are right, they do not really get one any closer to an understanding of the origins of aspectual/progressive *po*. As a result, it might be better to look to the affirmative sense in and of itself.

In this regard, Eric Hamp has made an important suggestion.<sup>6</sup> In particular, he has suggested that affirmative *po* is from an original asseverative marker *\*pēst* (via the regular loss of a word-final consonant cluster and the regular development of Indo-European *\*ē* into Albanian *o*), which itself derives from PIE *\*pe* (as in Latin *quippe* (< *\*quid-pe*) ‘why so?; of course’<sup>7</sup>) combined with *\*est*, an apparent 3SG injunctive mood form of ‘be’. Literally, therefore, in this account affirmative *po* was originally “it is thus” (or the like).<sup>8</sup>

This account gives affirmative *po* an important Indo-European grounding in categories and formations likely to have been inherited into Albanian from PIE, even if combined innovatively within Albanian, and moreover takes this function of *po* as primary. In any case, though, going from either emphatic (as Newmark calls affirmative *po*) or originally asseverative *po* to a grammatical element marking “a momentary action in progress” requires some motivation, some connection between emphasis or affirmation and progressivity. The link may simply be that affirmation focuses (or can focus) on the here and now, on the present (i.e. “it is so at this very moment”); keeping in mind that the present is an always-moving target as one sec-

[6] This suggestion has a somewhat strange history of its own. In October of 1983, while I was attending a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS) in Kansas City, in the course of a conversation Eric Hamp was having with Ronelle Alexander of the University of California, Berkeley, that I was privileged to be in on, I distinctly remember him offering the etymology I mention here for affirmative *po* (and can even see him in my mind’s eye writing on a blackboard in the meeting room we were in as he was talking about it). In the years since then, this idea was never published, and when I once asked Eric about it, he did not remember ever having said such a thing, though he admitted that it could well be right. I know that I certainly did not make that up myself, since in 1983 I did not know enough about Albanian to be able to advance such an etymology. Thus I am happy to be able to put Eric’s idea forward here and to acknowledge my debt to him for it (and for so much else that I have learned about Albanian over my many years of knowing him).

[7] Although Latin *-pe* by itself may seem like slim evidence for a PIE form, even with the usual comparison with Lithuanian *kaip* ‘how?’, there is now the further evidence of Anatolian forms such as Cuneiform Luvian/Hieroglyphic Luvian *pa-/ppa* to corroborate the PIE reconstruction. See De Vaan (2008, 452–3) for details.

[8] A few comments are in order at this point, and I thank one anonymous reviewer for suggesting these necessary clarifications. First, it is likely (see Praust 2003) that PIE did not have an injunctive of ‘be’ (injunctive function for that verb being filled by nominal sentences with no overt verb). Thus the *\*est* referred to here may not have been a PIE form per se, but rather represents an Albanian creation (possibly even an imperfect formation) that was based on the PIE injunctive category (with past tense endings and no indicative past tense prefix (the “augment”)), along the lines of the development of the Albanian verbal system outlined by Klingenschmitt (2004, 225ff.) (who comments, p. 229, on the “ursprüngliche Existenz einer 3. Sg. *\*je* [for Albanian] < Impf. *\*es-t*”) and Matzinger (2006, 124). Second, although a preform *\*est* looks like a suitable starting point for the Tosk 3SG *është* / Geg *është* ‘is’, this rather is from a prefixed form *\*en-esti*, as argued by Hamp (1980).

ond slips into the next and into the next and so on, the focus is thus on something that is on-going, exactly as progressive *po* does. Originally, therefore, *po* may have been calling attention to something going on before one's very eyes, something true in that sense.<sup>9</sup>

As a typological parallel to this view of the development of *po*, one can compare English *just*, which, like one sense of *po* (see (6a)), can mean 'exactly, precisely', as in *The chef added just the right amount of salt*, and which, often joined with *now*, occurs with progressives to refer essentially to "a momentary action in progress", as in *I am just (now) stepping off of the plane*. It is interesting that there are uses of *just now* in some varieties of English that border on grammatical use as an aspectual for progressives. As Hock & Joseph (2009, 356) note, examples like (7) occur in Indian English:

- (7) I am just now going home

and although "the use of *just now...* at this point is not obligatory, we find here the makings of a complete and systematic shift in the formation of the present-tense system", with constructions like (7) corresponding to British English progressives, while those without *just now* correspond to the simple present tense:

- (8) Indian English vs. British English  
 I am knowing this vs. I know this  
 I am going to school vs. I go to school  
 I am just now going home vs. I am going home

The emergence of an aspectually progressive sense from *po*, therefore, could have involved a similar sort of shift.<sup>10</sup>

Still, more is involved here, since in the (standard) English *just* parallel, the independent adverbial quality of *just* is retained; note for instance that it can occur elsewhere in the sentence, as in *I just am stepping off the plane (now)/Just now I am step-*

[9] The connection of 'be' with 'truth' in Indo-European is perhaps worth remembering here; as discussed most thoroughly in Watkins 1967, 1970, 1987, PIE *\*H<sub>1</sub>es-* 'be' figures in various forms in Indo-European legal language where the meanings are tied to matters of truth and evidence (in a legal sense) more generally; as Joseph 2003, in his summary of Watkins's work, puts it: "Especially relevant here are Skt. *satya-* 'true; truth', Lat. *sons* 'guilty', OIc. *sannr* 'true; guilty', Hitt. *asan* '(it) is (so)' (in public confession). One can speculate that such derivatives might indicate that 'be', at least in a legal context, could mean 'must be' or 'be evident', with 'truth' as one side of what the evidence shows things to be and 'guilty' as the other (cf. Benveniste 1960 on PIE 'be' as originally 'really, actually be, exist')".

[10] It must be admitted, however, that the labels that are conventionally used here may be inadequate for the job at hand. Even though "progressive" is, and has been, used for *po* (witness Newmark et al.'s reference to action "in progress"), the momentaneous sense evident in the description of *po* in Newmark et al. is somewhat at odds with progressivity. In more traditional aspectual terms, is this imperfective, referring to an on-going action, or perfective, referring to a particular limited point? Some of the traditional distinctions may reflect a dichotomy that is too grossly demarcated. The same concern could be raised, of course, for Slavic, with regard to verbs that Dickey (2007, 331) refers to as "perfective verbs prefixed in *po-* that express the indefinite (usually brief) duration of an action".

ping off ...) whereas Albanian *po* seems really to be a grammatical part of the verbal complex. Moreover, one has to wonder about the prosody, since (presumably) emphatic/affirmative *po* would be accentually prominent, yet such is not the case with the progressive marker (whereas English *just* retains its accentual properties in this “momentary action in progress” use).

#### [4] PO IN ITS (FULLER) BALKAN CONTEXT

The etymological speculations discussed in the previous section are admittedly a bit inconclusive, so that we cannot fully understand how *po* developed or from what source. Still, the important matter of why it developed in the first place and moreover why it developed in the way that it did can receive some illumination when language contact and the interactions Albanian may have had with neighboring languages are taken into account.

As to why it developed as it did, one possible explanation is that what might be called “Balkan typology” can be invoked. That is, it is reasonable to assume that once an aspectual marker like *po* were to arise in Albanian, its exclusively preverbal placement is explainable by reference to the prevailing typology of the operators — especially, tense and mood, though even voice, if the Albanian past tense nonactive marker *u* (as in *u lodha* ‘I got tired’) is added into the mix — that occur in the verbal complex more generally. In particular, given the predominantly prefixing structure in Albanian, as elsewhere in the Balkans, as shown in (4) and (5) above, one would naturally expect a new operator, a form of aspectual modification of the verb, to likewise occur preverbally.

Alternatively, as a non-Balkan account, one can note first that in addition to productive and presumably relatively new preverbs in Albanian, such as the reversative *zh-* as in *zhdukem* ‘disappear’ (vs. *dukem* ‘appear’), there are some apparently old preverbs embedded in what otherwise appear to be primary verbs. For instance, *marr* ‘take’ seems to reflect *\*me-Hr-n-*, where *me-* must be a preverb, attached to the root *\*H(e)r-*, as found in Greek ἄρπυμᾱι ‘take’, and the *\*-n-* reflects the Indo-European *\*-n-* presential suffix, as seen in the *-nu-* of the Greek form.<sup>11</sup> If the use of such preverbs in proto-Albanian had a perfectivizing value, as they could for instance in Proto-Slavic, and as possibly also in Gothic,<sup>12</sup> the preverbal placement of aspectual *po* would be consistent with inherited typology for the marking of modifying verbal categories.

With regard to the question of why such an aspectual marker should have developed at all in Albanian, language contact offers an important perspective on the

[11] The *\*-n-* combines with the preceding *-r-* to give the *-rr-* in the present, whereas in the past tense, where the presential *\*-n-* would necessarily be absent, the form is *mora* ‘took’, with, expectedly, a single *-r-*.

[12] If so, this could be construed as a feature that allies Albanian with other Northern European Indo-European languages; Hamp has argued, for instance, that the Winter’s Law lengthening of vowels before voiced stops found in Balto-Slavic can be seen in some Albanian developments too.



emergence of overt marking for progressive aspect. In particular, there are numerous facts from neighboring languages that seem to be highly relevant.

First, in Macedonian, although the language has been working from a more highly developed overall aspectual system (in South Slavic more generally if not already in Common Slavic) as a starting point, one finds the secondary imperfectivizing suffix *-uva-*, from Proto-Slavic *\*-ova-*, occurring to a greater degree than in other Slavic languages (and especially more so than in Bulgarian). All Slavic languages have a reflex of this Proto-Slavic suffix, but colloquial Macedonian has generalized its use considerably, going beyond what is recognized as appropriate even in the standard language.<sup>13</sup>

Second, Greek has always, starting at least in Ancient Greek, had a distinction between imperfective (presential) and perfective (aoristic), a distinction that is generally encoded by different stems (e.g. Present/Imperfective in *-ιζ-* vs. Aorist/Perfective in *-ισ-*). In the Middle Greek period there was much reshaping of the marking of the different stems (Horrocks 1997, 233–46), usually by reuse (that is, the spread, with some reanalysis) of an Ancient Greek suffix. One fairly productive overt mark that arose innovatively (partly an adaptation of the earlier *-vu-* present suffix) for imperfective aspect on many verbs was the suffix *-n-*. This suffix generally imperfectivized an aorist stem, and was deployed in what Horrocks (1997, 235) calls “the new principle of substituting imperfective [*-n-*] for aorist [*-s-*]”. Some examples, which in some instances involved the reshaping of the imperfective part of an Ancient Greek (AGk) opposition of characterized present vs. differently characterized aorist, include the following:

- (9) *li-n-o* ‘loose’ (vs. perfective (aoristic) stem *li-s-*) [AGk *λυ-/λυ-σ-*]  
*ðilo-n-* ‘declare’ (vs. perfective (aoristic) stem *ðilo-s-*) [AGk *δηλο-/δηλω-σ-*]  
*svi-n-* ‘extinguish’ (vs. perfective (aoristic) stem *svi-s-*) [AGk *σβεννυ-/σβε-σ-*]  
*fer-n-* ‘bear’ (imperf. variant of once bi-aspectual *fer-*) [AGk *φερ-/ένεγκ-*]  
*stel-n-* ‘send’ (vs. perfective (aoristic) *stil-*) [AGk *στελλ-/στειλ-*]  
*ðix-n-* ‘show’ (vs. perfective (aoristic) *ðik-s-*) [AGk *δεικ-vu-/δεικ-σ- (δειξ-)*]

However, this marking is not consistent for all verbs, in that many presents lack the *-n-*, e.g. *ɣraf-o* ‘I write, I am writing’, or enter into other marking schemes, as with *-iz-/is-*. Still, the upshot is that imperfective aspect has a far more consistent overt mark in Modern Greek than it had in any earlier stages, and it is a mark that was absent earlier in many of the verbs that now have it. It is thus innovatively spreading, and has been for some time.

Third, within post-Classical times, Greek has extended the imperfective/perfective opposition into the future tense, since there is now a distinction between *θα ɣraf-o* ‘I will be writing’ and *θα ɣrap-s-o* ‘I will write’ which was not possible in Ancient

[13] Victor Friedman (personal communication).

Greek with its monolectal and, according to [Goodwin \(1875, 19\)](#), aspectually neutral future, e.g. γράψω. This distinction developed most definitively and most systematically only with the *want*-based (and pan-Balkan) periphrastic future of Medieval Greek, where it is solidly entrenched and continues, as just noted, into contemporary Greek; the earlier post-Classical future periphrasis with *have* (ἔχω) did not allow for imperfective/perfective differentiation, and though such a distinction has been claimed (e.g. by [Jannaris 1897](#), 443–4 for the other post-Classical future-referring periphrasis, the construction with μέλλω ‘be about to’), [Markopoulos \(2009, 30–33\)](#) has demonstrated that such is not the case.

If we take progressivity to be one of the dimensions of imperfectivity, as in [Comrie \(1976\)](#), where imperfective is broken down into habitual and continuous, and continuous into nonprogressive and progressive, these three sets of facts mean that in the multi-lingual Balkan context in which Albanian (and the other Balkan languages) existed in the Medieval period, not only was imperfectivity overtly marked in some languages but also that overt marking was spreading. The emergence of a means of signaling one type of imperfectivity in a language that did not otherwise have an overt means of marking aspect can surely happen independently, but the coincidence of relevant developments in adjacent languages might be considered to be difficult to ignore; thus, external influence could well have played a role, though perhaps just a facilitating one, helping along an internally originating process.

What this last possibility would mean in terms of how the development of *po* was implemented is that either Albanians exposed to Greek or Balkan Slavic imported a foreign category into their verbal system, or else Greeks or Balkan Slavs learning Albanian imposed their aspectual category onto their Albanian. But it must be asked why in each case *po* would be selected if it were not already showing signs of such use in Albanian. That is, it is hard to see what the basis would be for innovating an aspectual use for, say, affirmative *po*, if it could not already be used in that way. Thus, it would appear that the best interpretation of what happened is that in this case, contact between Albanian speakers and speakers of other languages in the Balkans helped along an already-emerging native process, a scenario which has been argued, e.g. by [Friedman \(2003\)](#), to be operative in the emergence of marking for evidentiality in the Balkans (where Turkish was the catalyst).

Balkan Slavic might actually be the more suitable catalytic agent in this case, in the light of the perfective but (brief) durational preverb *po-* found (see section 3) in Serbian and elsewhere in South Slavic. Moreover, while aspectual/progressive *po* is found (as noted above) in both Tosk and Geg Albanian, it is missing from the peripheral Tosk dialects, in particular Arvanitika and Arbëresh, and this distribution is consistent with taking Slavic to be a catalyst, inasmuch as Slavic influence on Albanian was weakest in those outlying dialect areas. And, the presumably rela-

tively recent homophony between Slavic *po-* and Albanian *po*<sup>14</sup> is exactly the sort of chance occurrence that can have significance in language contact situations. Janse (2009) has argued for such an effect in certain uses of the Cappadocian Greek 1Pl person-marking ending *-misti* based on the formal similarity with Turkish temporal marking (past tense) suffixes *-mİş-tİ*, and he points to similar sorts of effects in other language contact situations.<sup>15</sup>

## [5] CONCLUSION

From the perspective of Proto-Indo-European, it is particularly interesting that Albanian has innovatively developed an overt marking for a new category associated with imperfectivity, where there apparently was no such marking and perhaps even no such category in the system previously.<sup>16</sup> Proto-Indo-European is generally reconstructed<sup>17</sup> with an aspectual system, but one of limited scope, showing marking for stativity (the classical “perfect” formation generally with reduplication and a special set of endings), and in the past tense, a distinction between perfective (the classical “aorist”) and imperfective (the “imperfect” tense, based on the present stem). But there does not seem to be a basis for reconstructing an overt imperfective marking in present tense forms.<sup>18</sup> The development of *po* in Albanian thus shows how the Indo-European system can be embellished, and more generally how aspectual categories and aspectual marking can develop and come to play an important role in the verbal system.

Moreover, from a methodological standpoint, the discussion here highlights the importance, for assessing developments in Albanian, of remembering that the language must be considered in its three “personae”, that is, as a member of the set of human languages, as a Balkan language, and as an Indo-European language. All three play a role in this account, in that, as with so much in the Balkans, a combination of language typology, language history, and language contact come together

- [14] Albanian *o* from *\*ē* is probably not all that old a change at least when compared with other developments in the phonology. Note that PIE *\*o* gave Albanian *a* (as in *natë* ‘night’ < *\*nokʷt-*) so that *o* is somewhat new to the Albanian phonological system. And, of course, in some parts of the Slavic world, as in Russian, orthographic “*po*” has a lower and less rounded back vowel than the Albanian.
- [15] Janse writes (p.96): “The conflation of formally, but not functionally identical elements is attested in other contact languages. Russenorsk, for instance, has one all-purpose preposition *på* which is clearly chosen because of the formal, but not functional, similarity between the Norwegian preposition *på* and the Russian preposition *po* (Hock 1991, 523; Winford 2003, 274). Sango has only one locational/temporal preposition, viz. *nà*, which has formal, but not functional, counterparts in Ngbandi and other Ubangian languages, and also in Kitúba, a Bantu-based contact language, and other Bantu languages in general (Pasch 1997, 248).”
- [16] Note that in the Greek and Macedonian cases discussed in section [4] (see example (9), e.g.), what was involved was an extension of an already-existing aspectual marker, not the innovation of an altogether new category where one did not exist before. The reason for the “perhaps” regarding the category is that the *duke* + participle formation, if old enough, would give a basis for assuming a category indicating progressivity before the emergence of *po*.
- [17] See Fortson IV 2009, 83 for a recent summary of the conventional wisdom on aspect in Proto-Indo-European.
- [18] Rather, there were various ways of making “characterized” present tense system stems, e.g. with the nasal affix noted above, but no consistent marking.



to illuminate, even if not to fully explain, Albanian *po*.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several people have contributed to making this study the best it can be. I would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for extraordinarily rich and insightful comments that improved this article considerably. So too I owe thanks to Steve Dickey and Marc Greenberg, both of the University of Kansas, for steering me onto the right course regarding the Slavic preverb *po*. Comments from the audience at the University of Georgia in May 2009, especially those of Paul Kiparsky, Jared Klein, and my colleague Dan Collins, were helpful too. Finally, I thank my good friend Victor Friedman for sharing his insights on Macedonian with me.

#### REFERENCES

- Benveniste, Émile. 1960. “Être” et “avoir” dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 55. 113–134.
- Camarda, Demetrio. 1864. *Saggio de grammatologia comparata sulla lingua Albanese*. Livorno: Successore di Egisto Vignozzi.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Vaan, Michiel. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Decker, Rodney J. 2007. *Koine Greek Reader: Selections from the New Testament, the Septuagint, and early Christian writers*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications.
- Dickey, Stephen. 2007. A prototype account of the development of delimitative *po* in Russian. In D. Divijak & A. Kochańska (eds.), *Cognitive paths into the Slavic domain*, 329–374. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dmitrieva, Olga. 1991. Formirovanie semanticheskoy struktury russkogo glagol'nogo prefiksa *po-*. In *Aktivnye processy v jazyke i rechi*, 68–74. Saratov: Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo Pedagogicheskogo Instituta.
- Fortson IV, Benjamin W. 2009. *Indo-European language and culture*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Friedman, Victor A. 2003. Evidentiality in the Balkans with special attention to Macedonian and Albanian. In Alexandra Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Studies in evidentiality*, 189–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Goodwin, W. W. 1875. *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb*. New York: St Martin's Press.

- Greenberg, Marc L. 2006. *A short Slovene reference grammar*. Duke University/-University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill: SEELRC.
- Hamp, Eric. 1980. Albanian *është*. In Kathryn Klar, Margaret Langdon & Shirley Silver (eds.), *American Indian and Indoeuropean studies: Papers in honor of Madison S. Beeler*, The Hague: Mouton.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. *Principles of historical linguistics*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hock, Hans Henrich & Brian D. Joseph. 2009. *Language history, language change, and language relationship. An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 2nd edn.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1997. *Greek. A history of the language and its speakers*. London: Longman.
- Jannaris, Antonius. 1897. *An historical Greek grammar*. London: MacMillan.
- Janse, Mark. 2009. Watkins' Law and the development of agglutinative inflections in Asia Minor Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9. 93–109.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 2004. Das Albanische als Glied der indogermanischen Sprachfamilie. In Jens Rasmussen (ed.), *In Honorem Holger Pedersen: Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 26. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, 221–233. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.
- Mann, Stuart. 1932. *A short Albanian grammar with vocabularies, and selected passages for reading*. London: D. Nutt.
- Markopoulos, Theodore. 2009. *The future in Greek: From Ancient to Medieval*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matzinger, Joachim. 2006. *Der altalbanische Text Mbsuame e kreshtere (Dottrina cristiana) des Leke Matrenga von 1592. Eine Einführung in die albanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Dettelbach: Röhl.
- Meyer, Gustav. 1891. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*. Strassburg: K. Trübner.
- Newmark, Leonard. 1998. *Albanian-English dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newmark, Leonard, Philip Hubbard & Peter Prifti. 1982. *Standard Albanian: A reference grammar for students*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Orel, Vladimir. 1998. *Albanian etymological dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pasch, Helma. 1997. Sango. In Sarah G. Thomason (ed.), *Contact languages. A wider perspective*, 209–270. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Praust, Karl. 2003. A missing link of PIE reconstruction: The injunctive of \*H<sub>1</sub>es- ‘to be’. In Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin Huld, Angela Della Volpe & Miriam Robbins Dexter (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 8-9, 2002 (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series, No. 47)*, 112–144. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1967. Latin sons. In Walter W. Arndt (ed.), *Studies in honor of G. S. Lane*, 186–194. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1970. Studies in Indo-European legal language and institutions and mythology. In George Cardona, Henry Hoenigswald & Alfred Senn (eds.), *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans*, 321–354. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1987. ‘In the interstices of procedure’: Indo-European legal language and comparative law. In Wolfgang Meid (ed.), *Studien zum indogermanischen Wortschatz*, 305–314. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Winford, Donald. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

#### AUTHOR CONTACT INFORMATION

Brian D. Joseph  
 Department of Linguistics  
 The Ohio State University  
 222 Oxley Hall  
 Columbus, Ohio 43210-1298  
 USA  
[joseph.1@osu.edu](mailto:joseph.1@osu.edu)