

- Vulchanova, Mila, and Lars Hellan (eds). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 193-204.
- Browne, Wayles, and Theresa Alt. 2004. *A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian*. SEELRC. Available at <http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/mainframe.jsp?nl.angaugeID=1>.
- Culicover, Peter W., and Ray Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 2002. *Foundations of Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kordić, Snježana. 2002. *Riječi na granici punoznačnosti*. Zagreb: Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada.
- Stevanović, Mihaljo. 1970. *Savremeni srpskohrvatski jezik*. Belgrade: Naučna knjiga.

#### Other Sources Consulted

- Browne, Wayles. 1993. "Serbo-Croat." *The Slavic Languages*, Comrie, Bernard, and Greville G. Corbett (eds). London and New York: Routledge, pp. 306-87.
- Mrazović, Pavica, and Zora Vukadinović. 1990. *Gramatika srpskohrvatskog jezika za strance*. Sremski Karlovec/Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižara Zorana Stojanovića/Dobra vest.
- Trugman, Helen. 2008. "What Do Demonstratives Demonstrate?" *Formal Description of Slavic Languages. The Fifth Conference, Leipzig 2003* (= *Linguistik International* 20), Zybatow, Gerhold, Luka Szucsieh, Uwe Junhanns and Roland Meyer (eds). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH, pp. 538-54.

## Syntactic Studies in Burgenland Croatian: The Order of Clitics

Wayles Browne  
Cornell University

Während die burgenlandkroatische schriftsprachliche  
Syntax keine neuemswerten Besonderheiten aufweist ...  
ist die Lexik von allerhöchstem Interesse.

0. Our epigraph is from the Berlin scholar Siegfried Tomrow, describing "Das Burgenlandkroatische" for the *Lexikon der Sprachen des europäischen Ostens* (Tomrow 2002); devoting one page out of his general sociolinguistic presentation to the characteristics of the language itself, he found little of interest in its syntax, but much in its vocabulary. Yet when we study Burgenland Croatian syntax and make comparisons with Standard Croatian, we find significant differences and even a counter-example to a seemingly well-founded generalization about clitic rules in Slavic languages. Generalizations in linguistic theory are attempts to reduce the possible range of variation, and hence this range among Slavic languages is wider than had been thought.<sup>1</sup>

This article has a twofold purpose: to introduce Burgenland Croatian (BC) to colleagues and readers of *Balkanistica*, partly through comparison with the more familiar standard Croatian of Croatia, or CC (*Section 1*), and to show where BC data fit into ongoing discussions about rules and generalizations for clitics in Slavic languages (*Sections 2* and *3*). Readers already familiar with BC may skip *Section 1* and the first part of *2*, and go directly to *2.1*.

1. Burgenland (BC and CC: Gradišće) is the easternmost province of Austria, located east and south of Vienna. It was part of western Hungary until 1921. The name is recent, coined from a number of regional names ending in *-burg* 'castle.' The present-day Burgenland Croats (BC and CC: Gradišćanski Hrvati) settled there ca. 500 years ago. There are now estimated to be 25,000-50,000 Croatian speakers in the region, living intermixed with German, Hungarian and Romani speakers (and with Jews until these were dispossessed in 1938). Almost all, as suggested by the name, are in Austria, and use German as well as BC, but there are

also some settlements in Hungary and a few in Slovakia. All three of the main Croatian dialects – čakavian, štokavian and kajkavian – are represented among Burgenland Croats, but čakavian is the most widespread. The čakavian dialect in Croatia extended further to the east in the 1500s than it does now and the early settlers are thought to have come mostly from eastern čakavian regions that later became štokavianized by refugees fleeing northward and westward from the advancing Ottoman Empire. A map showing the Burgenland Croats' presumed places of origin and present location can be found in Newkowsky 1998a.

There has been some writing and publishing in local Croatian for the settlers through the centuries, exclusively for religious purposes (all are Catholics) until the 20th century. A *de facto* standard Burgenland Croatian language (different from standard Croatian of Croatia) began to take shape in the 1800s.<sup>2</sup> Some explicit standardizing was done in the early 1900s; work has been more intensive since about 1970. Landmarks in standardization have been the two dictionaries (Benecics *et al.* 1982, 1991) and the grammar (Bencić *et al.* 2003). There is now a reasonably lively output of printed matter, radio programs and television shows in BC, much of which is available on the Internet in textual, audio and video form, and there are translations available such as *Novi Testament* (1979). As practicing linguists will appreciate, this greatly eases the task of learning and analyzing BC, as does its surface similarity to CC. Unfortunately, one frequent theme of much of the material is the decline of BC use among the younger generation in favor of German and the limited availability of BC-language schooling.

Most BC speakers are village dwellers, though they may work in the main urban center in Burgenland, Eisenstadt (BC and CC: Željezno) or in Austria's nearby capital Vienna (BC and CC: Beč).

Burgenlanders had contact with Croatia through the centuries but did not take part in the 19th-century standardization of the Croatian of Croatia (CC) on a štokavian basis and never used štokavian CC. Thus, one cannot say that they once had CC but lost it. Some BC writers have advocated taking CC as the BC standard, but most appear to consider that the structures and vocabularies of the two forms are too different. Nevertheless, CC is a constant influence on BC. The alphabet now used for BC is the same as CC except that it uses *đ* in place of CC *đ*. The BC media (print, radio, television, recordings) are open to texts, songs and interviews in CC. Burgenland choirs and tamburica orchestras often visit Croatia and vice versa.

Central European historians and Croatian dialectologists have been aware of BC and it has been treated by researchers on Slavic diaspora languages and microlanguages such as Dulichenko (1981 and other publications). Recent work by Luka Szucsich (2002, 2007, 2008 and other papers) has introduced BC to Slavists and general linguists.

2. As will be clear from the examples below, most words mean the same in BC and CC. A sampling of those that do not are given in (1) (*cf.* Ohjić 2006, Benecics *et al.* 1982, 1991).

(1)	BC	CC	Gloss
	jur	već	'already'
	već	više	'more'
	lijeto	godina	'year'
	godina	kiša	'rain'
	stvar	životinja	'animal'
	dugovanje	stvar	'thing'
	dug	dug, dugovanje	'debt'

One source speaks of as many as 400 such paronyms (Newkowsky 1987), but even this small sampling illustrates why it would be difficult for BC speakers to drop their own usage and adopt a strictly CC vocabulary. A sample of BC standard is provided in (2), with a corresponding passage in CC in (3) for comparison. The bracketing and subscripts are explained below.

- (2) BC Ah! Mali prinče, tako sam lipo polako razumio tvoj mali, turobni žitak. Dugo vrime je samo lipota zahađanja sunca bila tvoja jedina zabav. [Tu novu pojedinost], samg doznao četvrti dan jutro, kada si mi rekao: Jjubin zahađanja sunca (MP: 24).<sup>3</sup>
- 'Oh! Little prince, thus I gradually understood your small, sad life. For a long time only the beauty of sunset was your single amusement. This new detail I discovered on the fourth day in the morning, when you said to me: I love sunsets.'

- (3) CC Ahi Mali prince, tako sam, malo po malo, shvatio tvoji mali sjelni život. Tebi je dugo vremena jedina razonoda bila samo ljepota sunčevih zalazaka! [Tu novu pojedinost]<sub>lo</sub> [saznao]<sub>l</sub> sam<sub>2</sub> četvrtog dana ujutro, kada si mi rekao: Jako volim zalaske sunca (Saint-Expéry 2000a).

2.1. As is well known (see, e.g., Browne and Alt 2004, 3.1.5f), CC has multiple possibilities for clitic-group placement in sentences:

- (4) a. [Tu novu pojedinost]<sub>l</sub> sam<sub>2</sub> saznao četvrtog dana ujutro.  
 this<sub>acc</sub> new<sub>acc</sub> detail<sub>acc</sub> Aux<sub>1sg</sub> discovered<sub>msg</sub> fourth<sub>gan</sub> day<sub>gan</sub> in-  
 morning  
 b. [Tu<sub>1</sub> sam<sub>2</sub> novu pojedinost]<sub>l</sub> saznao četvrtog dana ujutro.  
 c. [Tu novu pojedinost]<sub>lo</sub> [saznao]<sub>l</sub> sam<sub>2</sub> četvrtog dana ujutro.  
 'This new detail I discovered on the fourth day in the morning.'

That is, CC can have its clitic group:

- after the first multi-word syntactic constituent (marked with subscript 1 in the examples of *Sections 2 to 2.4*), as in example (4a), though this possibility is disapproved of by purists;

- or after the first word of the first constituent (marked 1.1), as in (4b), which is thought of as being specially characteristic of literary Croatian;

- or, ignoring one or more multi-word constituents (marked with 0), CC can put the clitics after (or in) a subsequent constituent (marked as 1), as in (4c) (= the original text of the 2000a translation).

BC, on the other hand, almost always puts its clitics after the first constituent.

- (4) d. BC [Tu novu pojedinost]<sub>l</sub> sam<sub>2</sub> doznao četvrti dan ujutro.

It never puts them inside a constituent, (5):

- (5) BC \*Tu sam novu pojedinost ... (Luka Szucsich, personal communication)

It only rarely – as compared with CC – ignores a constituent (so as to begin counting after a break, marked |):

- (6) BC Tu novu pojedinost | doznao sam ...

2.2. A very strong rule of CC is that if a multi-word constituent is the predicate of the clause, the clitics must be inserted after its first word (7a); they cannot follow the whole constituent (\*8a).

- (7) a. CC Hrvatski su filatelisti.  
 Croatian Aux/Copula<sub>3pl</sub> philatelists  
 'They are Croatian philatelists.'

- (8) a. CC \*Hrvatski filatelisti su.

This is different from what happens when the same constituent is the subject or some other element of the clause. Compare also (4a) and (4b).

- (9) a. CC Hrvatski su filatelisti radili.  
 Croatian Aux/Copula<sub>3pl</sub> philatelists worked  
 'The Croatian philatelists worked.'

- (10) a. CC Hrvatski filatelisti su radili.

BC predicate phrases lack the "very strong rule" of CC. The judgments of these sentences (L. Szucsich) are the following, where ✓ is used to make explicit that (8b) and (10b) are grammatical unlike their CC counterparts:

- (7) b. BC \*Hrvatski su filatelisti.  
 (8) b. BC √ Hrvatski filatelisti su.<sup>4</sup>  
 (9) b. BC \*Hrvatski su filatelisti djelali.  
 'The Croatian philatelists worked.'  
 (10) b. BC √ Hrvatski filatelisti su djelali.

2.3. A comparatively strong rule of CC is that, if a multi-word constituent begins with an interrogative word, the preferred place for the clitics is after the interrogative (11), rather than after the whole constituent (12). It is also possible for the interrogative to come out of the whole constituent and move to the beginning of the sentence alone; in this case, the clitics come directly after it (13). (Proclitics like *s* 'from' group together with their host word into one "phonological word" and hence do not count as separate words here.)

- (11) CC S kojeg si planeta? (Saint-Exupéry 2000b: 14)  
 from which Copula<sub>2sg</sub> planet  
 'Which planet are you from?'  
 (12) CC ?S kojeg planeta si?  
 (13) CC S kojega si ti planeta? (Saint-Exupéry 2002: 18)  
 from which Copula<sub>2sg</sub> you planet

BC also lacks the "comparatively strong rule." Constituents beginning with an interrogative stay together, and the clitics come after them.

- (14) BC [S koga planeta]i si ti? (MP: 14)

2.4. In BC, an entire subordinate clause can count as the first constituent, notated  $\Pi_1$  in (15a), and the clitics then follow it directly. (15a) also shows that a clitic such as *ga* 'it' can follow the coordinating conjunction *i* 'and' directly.

- (15) a. BC [Ako imam svileni rubac]<sub>1</sub>, ga morem motati okolo  
 vrata i ga sobomzeti (MP: 46).  
 'If I have a silk scarf, I can wind it around my neck and  
 take it with me.'

Compare CC, where subordinate clauses do not count as the first constituent for placement of clitic pronouns (15b), and *i* can never be followed by a clitic (15c).

- (15) b. CC [Ako imam šal]<sub>6</sub>, [mogu]<sub>1</sub> ga staviti oko vrata i  
 [nositi]<sub>1</sub> ga (Saint-Exupéry 1995: 44).  
 c. CC ...\* i ga nositi.

2.5. BC has a tendency toward verb-second sentence order. This can be seen in many instances by comparing the BC reference grammar Benčić *et al.* (2003) with the CC grammar on which parts of it are loosely based, Barić *et al.* (1990). To give only one illustration, in (16a) *imaju* 'have' shows up in second position, after the prepositional phrase and before the subject. CC has a slight tendency toward verb-second, but (16b) does not manifest it.

- (16) a. BC [U GDAj]i [imaju]<sub>2</sub> lične zamućenice naglašene  
 (duže) i nenaglašene (kraće) oblike (Benčić *et al.* 2003:  
 154).<sup>5</sup>  
 'In the genitive, dative, and accusative singular, personal  
 pronouns have accented (longer) and unaccented  
 (shorter) forms.'

- (16) b. CC U GDA jedn. lične zamućenice i lična povratna imaju  
 naglašene (većinom duže) i nenaglašene (većinom kraće)  
 oblike (Barić *et al.* 1990: 109).  
 'In the genitive, dative, and accusative singular, personal  
 pronouns and the personal reflexive have accented  
 (mostly longer) and unaccented (mostly shorter) forms.'

But the V2 tendency is not the same as the strong clitics-2 rule. The second-position clitics (*sam* and *je* in the following example) and the verbs (*razumio* 'understood,' *bila* 'was') need not be in contact in the sentence and can end up far

apart, as in the example (17), taken from (2), above. Here *sam* is in clause-second position, while the verb *razumio* is separated from clause-second position by the two adverbs *hipo* 'nicely' and *polako* 'slowly,' which together mean 'gradually.' In the second sentence of (17), the clitic *je* is clause-second, and a lengthy subject phrase *samo hipota zahadjanja sunca* 'only the beauty of sunset' separates the verb *bila* from clause-second position.<sup>6</sup>

- (17) BC Mali prince, tako sam hipo polako razumio tvoji mali,  
 turobni žrtak. Dugo vrime je samo hipota zahadjanja sunca bila  
 tvoja, jedina zabav.  
 'Little prince, thus I somewhat slowly understood your small,  
 sad life. For a long time only the beauty of sunset was your  
 single amusement.'

### 3. Order of Clitics

3.1. In most Slavic languages, the clitics belonging to a clause all come next to each other; they form a group within which they occur in a fixed order. The ordering of the clitics in Slavic standard languages has been an important topic of study since the 1970s. Results so far are summed up in Franks and King 2000. Franks and King's tables, which they term "templates," show the ordering within the clitic group for several of the languages. Based on the tables, Franks and King propose some generalizations. A particular point of interest for them, and for this article as well, is the location of the reflexive clitic *vis-à-vis* the personal-pronoun clitics. Comparing the Slavic languages, Franks and King find two types: those in which the reflexive follows all the personal-pronoun clitics, and those in which the reflexive precedes the pronoun clitics. In keeping with this, their generalizations contain the formulation 'either ... or ....' To show Franks's and King's method of work, we will accordingly need to give at least two sample tables. We might give Macedonian as an example of a language in which the reflexive follows pronoun clitics, and Czech might serve as an example in which the reflexive precedes pronouns, but comparison with BC will be facilitated if we instead cite the two languages most closely related to it genetically, namely CC (with pronoun-reflexive order) and Slovenian (with reflexive-pronoun order). We hence redraw the tables for CC (18) and Slovenian (20) in a consistent format. We then give the corresponding information for BC and test the generalizations against it.

(18) The CC (and Bosnian and Serbian) Clitic Group

li	sg. sam, si, _; pl. smo, ste, su	sg. mi, ti, mu <sub>3</sub> ,ma <sub>3</sub> , joj <sub>3</sub> ; pl. nam, vam, im	sg. me, te, ga <sub>3</sub> ,ma <sub>3</sub> , je <sub>3</sub> (-j <sub>3</sub> us <sub>3</sub> pac); pl. nas, vas, ih	se	je
	sg. ču, češ, će; pl. čemo, ćete, će	(si)			
	sg. bih, bi, bi; pl. bismo, biste, bi				
yes- no interr.	present copula and Aux of past (but not 3sg); Aux of future; Aux of condit.	dative pronouns; reflexive dative (if used—CC only)	accusative and genitive pronouns	reflexive	3sg of present copula and of Aux of past
1	2	3	4	5	6

For CC, once the clitics have been placed in the order shown in (18), two rules apply, (19a) and (19b). The first is optional but is usually applied in CC, though non-application is also seen in present-day CC. The second is required, since \**je je* is not found in CC.

- (19) a. se [5] + je [6] → se.  
 b. je<sub>3</sub>pac [4] + je [6] → ju je.

## (20) The Slovenian Clitic Group

sg. <i>se</i> , <i>si</i> , -, du. <i>sva</i> , <i>sta</i> , <i>staj</i> , pl. <i>sno</i> , <i>ste</i> , <i>so</i>	se; si	sg. <i>mi</i> , <i>ti</i> , <i>mu</i> , <i>joj</i> , du. <i>nana</i> , <i>vana</i> , <i>jima</i> , pl. <i>nani</i> , <i>vani</i> , <i>jini</i>	sg. <i>me</i> , <i>te</i> , <sup>g3M/Ns</sup> <i>jO<sub>Face</sub>/jE<sub>Gen</sub></i> , du. <i>naju</i> , <i>vaju</i> , <i>ju/jih</i> , pl. <i>nas</i> , <i>vas</i> , <i>jih</i>	<i>je</i>
present copula and Aux of past (but not 3sg); mark of conditional	reflexive; reflexive dative	dative pronouns	accusative and genitive pronouns (if both, Acc before Gen)	3sg present copula and 3sg Aux of past; Aux of future
1	2	3	4	5

Franks and King (2000: 206) generalize as follows: "A quick survey of these templates reveals a number of cross-Slavic regularities. For example, dative clitics always precede accusative ones ... and accusative clitics precede genitive ones ... Reflexive clitics appear either to the immediate left of all other pronominal clitics ... or to the immediate right ... Auxiliary clitics precede pronominal ones ... with the exception of certain 3rd person auxiliaries [and the Slovenian future aux.] which appear last in the cluster ..."

In (21), we give a table for BC clitics. BC agrees with both CC and Slovenian and several other Slavic languages in placing the third-person singular copula/auxiliary *je* in a position following all the pronoun clitics and thus separate from the rest of the copula/auxiliary clitic forms, which precede the pronouns. A few morphological differences from CC are given here in boldface. As mentioned above, in the discussion, notations like [5] and [7] stand for clitics from the fifth or

seventh column of the respective table. [5, 7] means that a column-5 clitic precedes a column-7 clitic.

## (21) The BC Clitic Group

<i>ti</i>	sg. <i>sam</i> , <i>si</i> , -, pl. <i>sno</i> , <i>ste</i> , <i>su</i>	sg. <i>mi</i> , <i>ti</i> , <sup>mu3M/Ns</sup> <i>joj</i> ; pl. <i>vani</i> , <i>(j)im</i>	sg. <i>me</i> , <i>te</i> , pl. <i>nas</i> , <i>vas</i>	<i>se</i>	sg. <sup>g3M/Ns</sup> <i>ga</i> , <sup>je3M/Acc</sup> <i>je3M/Acc</i> , <sup>je3M/Acc</sup> <i>ju3M/Acc</i> , pl. <i>ih</i> or <i>jih</i> ) <sup>Gen</sup> <i>je</i> <sup>Acc</sup>	<i>je</i>
yes- no interr.	present copula and Aux of past (but not 3sg); Aux of future; mark of condit.	Dative pronouns; reflexive dative	1st and 2nd person accusative and genitive pronouns	reflexive	3rd person accusative and genitive pronouns	3sg of present copula and of Aux of past
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BC lacks the "rules" seen in CC (19a, b): *se* [5] *je* [7] is always *se je*. The third-person singular feminine accusative [6] is always *ju*. Accusative *je* exists but is either the third-person singular neuter (CC *ga*) or the third-person plural (CC *ih*). Thus the incompatible meanings of *je* in BC and in CC resemble the incompatible

meanings of the lexical items *već*, *godina*, *stvar* in (1) above, and reinforce the point about how difficult it would be for BC speakers to try to adopt CC.

At first glance, the ordering of pronoun and verb clitics is similar to CC (22).<sup>7</sup>

(22) BC [2, 3]: Dao sam ti čisto malu ovcu.

'I gave you a really small sheep' (*Mali princ*: 13).

[2, 3]: To je upravo ono, ča sam si željio.

'This is precisely that which I wanted for myself' (MP: 13).

[2, 4]: kako ćedu me lipo poslušati

how they will obey me nicely' (MP: 38).

[2, 5]: ar ću se ja na jednoj od njih smijati

'because I will laugh on one of them' (MP: 86).

[3, 4, 7]: Žao mi te je, tako slaboga.

'I'm sorry for you, so weak' (MP: 58).

[3, 5, 7]: A činilo mi se je, da ...

'And it seemed to me that ...' (MP: 10).

[6, 7]: Tako ga je ona dosta rano počela trapiti ...

'So she began to bother him quite early ...' (MP: 30).

But sequences involving genitive pronouns and reflexive *se* (23) differ strikingly from CC, where *se* comes after all pronouns. We give examples with the verb *bojati se* 'to fear,' which can take the genitive.<sup>8</sup> Every instance of [5, 6] would be ungrammatical in CC.

(23) BC [5, 6]: Bojim se ga.

'I fear him.'

Bojim se je.

'I fear her.'

[4, 5]: Bojim te se.

'I fear you.'

[5, 6]: Bojim se ji(h).

'I fear them.'

Bojimo se ji(h).

'We fear them.'

[4, 5]: Boju me se.

'They fear me.'

Boju te se.

'They fear you.'

[5, 6]: Boju se ga.

'They fear him.' (L. Sz.: "Boju ga se. ... interestingly, this

variant also sounds not that bad.")

[5, 6]: Boju se je.

'They fear her.'

[2, 5, 6]: Bojao sam se ga.

'I feared him.'

Bojao sam se je.

'I feared her.'

[2, 4, 5]: Bojao sam te se.

'I feared you.'

[2, 5, 6]: Bojao sam se ji(h).

'I feared them.' (L. Sz.: "Bojao sam ji(h) se ... sounds ok too,

maybe?" The question mark accompanying the order [2, 6, 5]

is his.)

[2, 5, 6]: Bojali smo se ji(h).

'We feared them.' (L. Sz.: "Bojali smo ji(h) se sounds not

entirely bad.")

[2, 4, 5]: Bojali su me se.

'They feared me.'

Bojali su te se.

'They feared you.'

[2, 5, 6]: Bojali su se ga.

'They feared him.'

Bojali su se je.

'They feared her.'

[2, 5, 6]: Bojali su se ji(h).

'They feared them.' (L. Sz.: "Bojali su ji(h) se sounds ok too,

maybe?" Again the question mark is his.)

As we see, the usual BC order has the first- and second-person genitive pronouns of column [4] preceding the reflexive [5], whereas the third-person pronouns of [6] follow it. Deviations are possible, with [5] and [6] changing places, though these

are not the preferred order. There are also instances of [5] and [7] changing places in BC, as in the attestations from *Mali princ* 'shame' governs an accusative, as in (CC):

- (24) BC [5, 7]: Bilo ju je stran ...  
 'She was ashamed ...' (MP: 31).  
 [7, 5]: I on je ju opet našao.  
 'And he lighted it again' (MP: 48).<sup>9</sup>

Once again it is appropriate to cite Szucsich's comment: "'je ju' and 'ju je' are both fine (and in some sentences 'ju je' sounds even better)."

Nevertheless, it is clear that first-/second-person pronoun clitics vs. third-person pronoun clitics show different ordering restrictions, a situation not allowed for in the generalizations by Franks and King (2000) and hitherto unparalleled in Slavic.<sup>10</sup> The reflexive clitic *se* comes neither to the left of all the pronouns nor to the right of all the pronouns, but rather between the pronouns of columns [3] and [4] and those of column [6]. Readers will, however, recall that Romance languages also have differing column positions for first-/second-person pronouns and for third-person pronouns, as first treated extensively by Perlmutter (1971). Thus in French the first-/second-person dative clitics precede a third-person accusative, as in (25), while a third-person dative follows it, as in (26):

- (25) Il me le donne.  
 'He gives me it.'  
 (26) Il le lui donne.  
 'He gives it to him.'

3.2. Section 3.1, with its demonstration that BC counter-exemplifies a generalization that had seemed to describe all the Slavic languages accurately, is the true climax of this article, and it could stop at this point. However, when a peripheral language in a family manifests a phenomenon atypical of the rest of the family, researchers may be tempted to seek an explanation for it in influences from neighboring languages. BC is geographically peripheral among the Slavic languages and has undeniably been influenced by the two languages it has been in contact with through the last five centuries, namely German and Hungarian. For

instance, the word *sobornizeti* 'take along' in (15a) is one of many compound verbs constructed on German (*mitnehmen*) and/or Hungarian models. The V2 tendency mentioned in Section 2.5 is very likely attributable to the German V2 rule. Loanwords abound, such as *tanac* 'council' from Hungarian *tanács*, *kinč* 'treasure' from Hungarian *kincs*. Yet it is unlikely that we can attribute the rise of person dependence in its clitic ordering to either German or Hungarian.

German does not have clitics as such but does appear to have relatively strict ordering among its personal and reflexive pronouns.<sup>11</sup> There are not many verbs in German that take both a reflexive and an oblique-case object (most reflexive verbs take a PP object or no object). When we test such a verb, *sich nähern* + dative 'to bring oneself nearer to, to approach,' we find the person of the reflexive marker and the person of the object do not influence the word order: it is always accusative-reflexive before dative (Michael Wagner, personal communication).

- (27) a. Ich nähere mich ihm.                   \*Ich nähere ihm mich.  
 I bring-nearer myself<sub>acc</sub> him<sub>dat</sub>  
 'I approach him.'  
 b. Du nährst dich ihm.                       \*Du nährst ihm dich.  
 you bring-nearer yourself<sub>acc</sub> him<sub>dat</sub>  
 'You approach him.'  
 c. Du nährst dich mir.                       \*Du nährst mir dich.  
 you bring-nearer yourself<sub>acc</sub> me<sub>dat</sub>  
 'You approach me.'  
 d. Er nähert sich mir.                       \*Er nähert mir sich.  
 he brings-nearer himself<sub>acc</sub> me<sub>dat</sub>  
 'He approaches me.'

Hungarian does make a distinction between first-/second-person and third-person pronoun direct objects, but it is not a word-order distinction! 'Me, us, you' as direct objects require indefinite-conjugation endings on their governing verb, such as *-nak*, whereas 'him, her, them' need definite-conjugation endings such as *-tök*. But the pronouns are not clitics, and the position of the direct objects is the same for all persons, as in (28).



- (28) a. Látnak engem.  
they-see-IndefConj me-Acc  
'They see me.'
- b. Látnak téged.  
they-see-IndefConj you-Acc  
'They see you.'
- c. Látnák (ő)t).  
they-see-DefConj him/her-Acc  
'They see him/her.'
- d. Látnák őket.  
they-see-DefConj him/her-Acc  
'They see them.'

Accordingly, it seems that we cannot explain the surprising clitic rules of BC by having recourse to a neighboring language; but so far we have no good explanation for how they might have originated.

4. In conclusion, this article has sought to introduce Burgenland Croatian to readers of *Balkanistica* as a fruitful topic for research, to illustrate its clitic-placement and clitic-ordering rules through comparison with CC (the standard Croatian of Croatia),<sup>12</sup> to use BC data to invalidate an otherwise well-supported generalization (due to Franks and King 2000), and to suggest that, even though many phenomena in BC are due to language contact with German and/or Hungarian, the clitic rules are not.

### Notes

1. Versions of this article were presented at the Third Southeast European Studies Association Conference, Ohio State University, Columbus, April 26-28, 2007, as part of the "Talks Commemorating the 10th Anniversary of the Naylor Professorship," and at the XVI Balkan and South Slavic Conference, Banff, May 1-4, 2008. I thank the organizers and audiences at these meetings, and particularly Luka Szucsich who has shared his own intuitions, consulted other BC speakers, and helped me obtain rare publications. I am also indebted to two *Balkanistica* reviewers of an earlier version of this paper. Abbreviations used in this paper: BC = Burgenland Croatian; CC = standard Croatian of Croatia (abbreviations also used by Szucsich, and preferable to, e.g., SC for standard Croatian or LC for literary Croatian, given that BC has claims to being both standard and literary); MP = *Mali princ* (Saint-Exupéry 1998), the BC translation of *The Little Prince*; and V2 = verb-second (principle requiring the verb to be in second position in a clause, no matter what element is in first position). Abbreviations used in the tables and glosses are Acc = accusative, Dat = dative, Gen = genitive, F = feminine, M = masculine, N = neuter, Aux = auxiliary verb, sg = singular, du = dual, pl = plural, inter = interrogative, 1sg = first-person singular, 3M = masculine third-person, etc.; and [1], [2], etc. refer to the columns in the tables.
2. As a reviewer points out, the classic source for historical BC studies is Hadrovics (1974). Unfortunately, clitics are treated only briefly (section 208), and word-order rules even more so (section 432).
3. *The Little Prince* is chosen for analysis because it is one of very few works available both in a BC version and in multiple CC versions. In the BC passage (2), the vocative *prince* and the spelling of *červiti* with *v* are CC elements in the BC standard. Colloquial BC usage would be *Mali princ* and *červiti dan* (L. Szucsich, personal communication).
4. Though (8) in BC would usually be *Ovi su hrvatski filatelisti*, with expressed pronoun subject *oni* 'they.'
5. As a helpful reviewer points out, (16a) has the same order as the corresponding German sentence, *Im GDAStg haben die Personalpronomen betont und unbetonte Formen*. German influence on BC is unmistakable, but has not yet made BC a strict verb-second language; witness (17).
6. Future research will compare BC with Slovenian. Suffice it to say at present that Slovenian shares the BC rules enumerated in Sections 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and the V2 tendency in 2.5. Further, Slovenian can place the clitic group at the beginning of a sentence under some contextually-determined conditions, notably in yes-no questions. As a reviewer points out, the same

possibility exists in BC. *Mali princ* contains five examples of clitic-first, such as (i) and (ii). All are yes-no questions, and Benčić *et al.* 2003 (section 1783) suggest that this is what initial clitics are used for in BC.

- (i) *Ši ta dan sa četredeset i trimi zahadjanji bio toliko tužan?* (MP 25)  
Aux/Cop<sub>2sg</sub> that day with 40 and 3 sunsets be so sad  
'Were you so sad on that day with 43 sunsets?'
- (ii) *Se ide pogledati?* (MP 53)  
Refl go<sub>3sg</sub> to-look  
'Does one go to look?'

7. As one reviewer correctly observes, the ordering of clitics among themselves is treated in less than full detail in the otherwise authoritative and very complete BC reference grammar (Benčić *et al.* 2003, sections 1782ff). Therefore it was necessary to draw data from texts (here the *Mali princ* 1998 translation is cited) and from work with speakers of the language (Luka Szucsich, and through him, also Ivo Sutić, one of the co-authors of Benčić *et al.* 2003). In (23) we quote some reactions by Szucsich (personal communication) directly (with attribution to "L. Sz."):

8. In further studies, additional data will need to be sought about the co-occurrence of genitives and *se*, since the BC verb *bojati se* is not an exclusively genitive-taking verb the way it is in CC. Under German influence, the government patterns *bojim se od vuka* 'from the wolf' or *bojim se pred vukom* 'before the wolf' are also used instead of *bojim se vuka* 'I fear the wolf' (Kinda-Beršković 2001). And younger speakers tend to turn *bojati se* + genitive into *bojati se* + accusative (Szucsich, personal communication).

9. The reviewer who provided the German gloss in Note 5 also suggests that *I on je ju opet nazgao* represents the German word order *Und er hat sie wieder angezindet*. Yet by no means every attested BC sentence with an auxiliary verb and an object pronoun has these in the same order as in German. Thus, the last example under (22), *Tako ga je ona dosta rano počela trpiti*, would be *So hat sie ihn ziemlich früh ...* in German, and not the word-for-word equivalent *\*So ihn hat sie ziemlich früh ...*

10. Subsequent to the work here reported on, it has been found that the Rusinski used as a standard language in parts of Vojvodina and adjacent parts of Croatia also has different orderings among the clitic pronouns for different persons. The second-person singular dative *ju* appears before the reflexive *me*, whereas all other pronouns come after *me*, both the rest of the datives and all the genitives and accusatives; see Browne (2008a) and (2008b).

11. A reviewer versed in standard and Austrian German finds the data of (27) to be bookish in style and therefore irrelevant for the study of influences from German on BC. He brings up

*Balkanistica* 23 (2010)

instances of free ordering in colloquial German between dative and accusative pronouns (*Ich gebe es dir / Ich gebe dir 's* 'I give it to you'), but these involve non-reflexive pronouns, so they are not directly relevant for the question of what could have made the reflexive of BC column [5] follow some genitive pronouns, column [4], while preceding other genitive pronouns, column [6].

12. The potentially interesting comparison with Slovenian is incomplete and ongoing; see Note 6.

## References

- Barić, Eugenia, *et al.* 1990. *Gramatika hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Bencsics, Nikolaus, Božidar Finka, Ivo Szucsich *et al.* 1991. *Gradišćansko-hrvatsko-nimški rječnik*. Zagreb and Eisenstadt: Komisija za kulturne veze s inozemstvom R Hrvatske, Zavod za Hrvatske jezik, Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, and Landesarchiv-Landesbibliothek.
- Bencsics, Nikolaus, Božidar Finka, Artur Šojat *et al.* 1982. *Deutsch-burgenländisch-kratoisch-kratoisches Wörterbuch*. *Nimško-gradišćansko-hrvatsko-hrvatski rječnik*. Eisenstadt and Zagreb: Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung, Landesarchiv-Landesbibliothek, Komisija za kulturne veze SR Hrvatske, and Zavod za jezik IPF.
- Benčić, Nikola, *et al.* 2003. *Gramatika gradišćansko-hrvatskoga jezika*. Željazo: Znanstveni institut Gradišćanski Hrvatov.
- Browne, Wayles. 2008a. "Clitic Ordering in Vojvodina Rusinski." Paper given at the Third Annual Meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society, Columbus, Ohio, June 10-12, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008b. "Порядок енклитиков у языке војвођинских Руснаца," *Шестинесу* 3/2008, Novi Sad, pp. 351-61.
- Brown[e], Wayles, and Theresa Alt. 2004. *Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian*. Durham, NC: Duke University, Slavic and East European Language Research Center. Available online at <http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/mainframe.jsp?nl.anglageID=1>.
- Duličenko, Aleksandr D. 1981. *Slavjanske literaturne mikrojazyki*. Tallinn: Valgus.

*Balkanistica* 23 (2010)

- Franks, Steven, and Tracy Holloway King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Chitics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hadrovics, László. 1974. *Schriftum und Sprache der burgenländischen Kroaten im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kinda-Berlakovich, Zorka. 2001. "Njemacke interferencije u jeziku gradišćanskih Hrvata," *Drugi hrvatski slavistički kongres, Zbornik radova 1*, pp. 461-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "Gradišćanskohrvatski prema Hrvatskom standardu," *Bosanski-Hrvatski-Srpski. Wiener slavistischer Almanach, Sonderband 57*, Neweklowsky, Gerhard (ed.), Vienna, pp. 111-22.
- Neweklowsky, Gerhard. 1987. "Lexikalische Übereinstimmungen im nordwestlichen Südslawischen," *Slavistična revija 35*, pp. 3-16, 187-209.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998a. "Die südslawischen Minderheiten (Slowenen, Kroaten) in Österreich," *Ethnos e comunità linguistica: un confonito metodologico interdisciplinare [Ethnicity and Language Community: An interdisciplinary and Methodological Comparison]*, Bombi, Raffaella, and Giorgio Graffi (eds). Udine: Forum, pp. 421-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998b. "Das Burgenländisch-Kroatische," *Einführung in die slawischen Sprachen*, 3rd edition, Rehder, Peter (ed.). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 268-73.
- Novi Tešamenat*. 1979 = *Novi Tešamenat na današnjem gradišćanskom jeziku*. Eisenstadt = Željuzno: St. Martins Verlag.
- Olujčić, Ivana. 2006. "Lazni parovi – gradišćanskohrvatski i karaševskohrvatski prema standardnom hrvatskom," *Strani jezici (Zagreb) 35.1*, pp. 29-36.
- Perlmutter, David M. 1971. *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- de Saint-Exupéry, Antoine. 1995. *Mali kraljević*. Trans. by Ivan Kušan. Zagreb: Znanje.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Mali princ*. Trans. by Ivan Rortter. Željuzno/Eisenstadt, Austria: Hrvatsko Štamparsko Društvo. Sample available at <<http://www.peit-prince.at/pp-kroat-bgld.htm>>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000a. *Mali princ*. Trans. by Luka Paljetak. Rijeka: Leo-Commerce. Samples available at <<http://www.peit-prince.at/pp-kroat.htm>>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000b. *Mali princ*. Trans. by Goran Rukavina. Split: Knjižotisaak.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. *Mali princ*. Trans. by Mia Pervan. 3rd edition. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

- Szucsich, Ivo. 2006. "Fragen der Annäherung des Burgenlandkroatischen an die kroatischen Standardsprache," *Ethnoslavica: Festschrift für Herrn Univ.-Prof. Dr. Gerhard Neweklowsky zum 65. Geburtstag. Wiener slavistischer Almanach, Sonderband 65*, Reinhart, Johannes, and Tillmann Reuther (eds). Vienna and Munich: Sagner, p. 327-41.
- Szucsich, Ivo. 2000. "Das Burgenlandkroatische: Sprachwandel, Sprachverfall, Sprachverschiebung und Sprachassimilation," *Sprachwandel in der Slavia. Die slawischen Sprachen an der Schwelle zum 21. Jahrhundert Teil 2. Series Linguistik International, Bd. 4*, Zybatow, Lew N. (ed.). Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, p. 853-875.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. "Case Licensing and Nominal Adverbials in Slavic," *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 10, The Ann Arbor Meeting 2001*, Toman, J. (ed.). Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 249-70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "Kasusbeschränkungen bei reflexiven Sätzen (Pseudopassiven) in Varietäten des Bosnischen/Kroatischen/Serbischen und Burgenland-Kroatischen," *Zeitschrift für Slavistik 52 (2)*, pp. 189-217.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. "Evidenz für syntaktische Nullen im Burgenland-Kroatischen, Polnischen, Russischen und Slowenischen. Merkmalsausstattung, Merkmalshierarchien und morphologische Defaults," *Zeitschrift für Slavistik 53 (2)*, pp. 160-77.
- Tomow, Siegfried. 2002. "Das Burgenlandkroatische," *Lexikon der Sprachen des europäischen Ostens = Wieser Enzyklopädie des Europäischen Ostens. Band 10*, Okuka, Milioš, and Gerald Kreim (eds). Klagenfurt: Wieser, pp. 235-45.
- Web resources for information on BC include:*
- Znanstveni institut Gradišćanskih Hrvatov <<http://www.zigh.at>>
- Hrvatsko kulturno društvo <<http://www.hkd.at/info.htm>>
- Hrvatsko štamparsko društvo: <<http://www.hrvatskenovine.at/>>
- News <<http://volksgruppen.orf.at/hrvat/visti/>>
- Radio/TV on Internet: <http://volksgruppen.orf.at/hrvat/program/stories/44490/>.

# BALKANISTICA

*Volume 23*  
2010

**The Banff Papers**

*Edited by*  
Donald L. Dyer, Olga Mladenova  
and Tom Priestly

*Published for*  
The South East European Studies Association

# BALKANISTICA 23

## The Banff Papers

### Table of Contents

Contents:	Page
Table of Contents .....	iii
Foreword .....	v
Introduction .....	vii
<b>ARTICLES</b>	
AB OVO: When OVO and OVO Are Different by <i>Bojan Belic</i> .....	1
Syntactic Studies in Burgenland Croatian: The Order of Clitics by <i>Wayles Browne</i> .....	21
The Grammaticalization of the <i>habere</i> -Perfect in Standard Macedonian by <i>Eleni Bužarovska and Lijana Mirkovska</i> .....	43
<i>Xhorxh, xhoxhmaxhoxh</i> and the <i>xhaxhallerë</i> : The Xenophonemic Status of Albanian /xh/ by <i>Matthew C. Curtis</i> .....	67
On Sacred Time in Balkan Languages: The Lexicon of the Popular Calendar Feasts by <i>Ute Dukova</i> .....	97
Turkish Grammar in Balkan Romani: Hierarchies of Markedness in Balkan Linguistics by <i>Victor A. Friedman</i> .....	107
iii	<i>Balkanistica 23 (2010)</i>

© *Balkanistica 2010*

ISSN: 0360-2206

Library of Congress Catalogue Number: 75-648409

For information, write:  
Donald L. Dyer, Editor

*Balkanistica*

Department of Modern Languages  
The University of Mississippi  
University, MS 38677  
USA

Telephone: (662)915-7298

Fax: (662)915-1086

E-mail: [mldyer@olemiss.edu](mailto:mldyer@olemiss.edu)

Visit the *Balkanistica* WWW site at:

<[http://www.olemiss.edu/depts/modern\\_languages/Balkanistica.html](http://www.olemiss.edu/depts/modern_languages/Balkanistica.html)>

First Published in the United States of America 2010

Printed in the United States of America  
by *The University of Mississippi Printing Services*  
of University (Oxford), Mississippi

The Status of Romanian <i>ia</i> in Imperative Clauses by <i>Virginia Hill</i> .....	125
Elusive Evidentials in Translation: An Analysis of One Folklore Text by <i>Maksim M. Makartsev</i> .....	143
From Linguistic Geography toward Areal Linguistics: A Case Study of Tomatoes in the Eastern Balkans by <i>Darina Mladenova</i> .....	181
Bulgarian <i>ia</i> by <i>Olga Mladenova</i> .....	237
On the Diffusion of Romanian <i>mai</i> in Ukrainian Dialects by <i>Tom Priestly</i> .....	267
The Non-Concordant Neuter <i>L-Perfect</i> (NIC) in South Slavic: General Typology and Constructions Involving Human Experiencers and Patients by <i>Joseph Schaller</i> .....	285
Cross-Linguistic Variation in the Temporal Domain: The Meaning of the Present Tense in Bulgarian and Albanian by <i>Anastasia Smirnova</i> .....	333
Serbo-Croatian as a Bridge between the Balkan and Central European <i>Sprachbinde</i> by <i>George Thomas</i> .....	371
Nominal and Clausal Clitics Expressing Possession in the Balkan Languages by <i>Olga Mišeska Tomić</i> .....	389

Foreword  
From the Editor

Every four or five years, *Balkanistica* takes a break from its publication of volumes containing individually submitted articles on a multitude of topics and brings out an issue devoted to a particular theme or a conference. This is one of those years. The last time this happened was in 2006, four years ago, when *An Anthology of Bulgarian Literature*, guest-edited by Henry R. Cooper, Jr., and Ivan Mladenov was printed and distributed as volume 19 of the journal. This year we have for your reading pleasure a very large issue, which we affectionately have decided to call *The Banff Papers*. This volume of *Balkanistica*, volume 23, the history of which you will read more about in the Co-Editors' Introduction that follows, has been two years in the making.

I was first contacted about this possible volume in 2007, the year before the Banff conference was held, by Olga Mladenova, who was one of the organizers of the Banff conference and who asked me if *Balkanistica* would consider serving as a venue for papers from this conference. I had been thinking it was time for another conference volume (the last one was in 2002, *Papers from the Third Conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic and Balkan Languages*), and although there were a couple of other possibilities for this particular issue, the Banff conference truly fit the bill at the time. I was excited about doing this and before the conference actually took place, its participants knew they would have the opportunity to publish their papers in *Balkanistica* ... and, as you will see, many of them have.

The articles herein, I am proud to say, are now part of *Balkanistica*'s "catalogue" of scholarship. There are fifteen articles contained in the pages you now hold in your hands. The papers cover the wide spectrum of Balkan languages and linguistic foci. The articles from the conference on Slovene, however, may be found elsewhere. This will also be addressed in the Co-Editors' Introduction.

I was reminded over the past two years that one of the most rewarding activities those of us in the profession can experience is the opportunity to work closely with colleagues in the same field. Working with co-editors on this volume was not