

Kusmenko J.K.

The typology of the language contact on the Balkans and in Scandinavia. A case of the suffixed definite article.

The Scandinavian and the Balkan languages have a common morphological feature: a suffixed definite article (further SDA). This feature has always been treated as an important Balcanism, that differs the languages of the Balkan *Sprachbund* from the related languages, which either have a prepositive definite article, as the other Romance languages compared with Rumanian, or have no article at all, as the other Slavic languages compared with Bulgarian and Macedonian. The Scandinavian suffixed article differs the Scandinavian languages from the other Germanic languages which have an analytical prepositive definite article. The West Germanic, West Romance, the Scandinavian and the Balkan languages have had the same structural conditions for the rise of the category “definiteness”, that is the development of the grammaticalised rigid word order or the disappearance of the morphological difference between the case of the subject and the case of the object and the necessity to develop other means than word order to indicate the topic. But the morpheme of definiteness has different form in the West Germanic and West Romance languages on the one hand, where the article is prepositive and freestanding, and in the Scandinavian languages and the languages of the Balkan *Sprachbund* on the other hand, where the definite article is suffixed. The purpose of my paper is to find out the reason for this morphological parallel.

1. Hypotheses

1.1 Dating

The first examples of the suffixation of the original demonstrative pronoun occur already in the first Scandinavian manuscripts in the Latin alphabet in the 12th-13th centuries and in some runic inscription in the younger *futhark* (earliest in two Swedish inscriptions from the 11th century). Though the skaldic poetry escaped to use the suffixation and remained archaic even in the 15th century, when the SDA was already fully developed, we can find some examples with the suffixation already in the 10th century in Kormak (Seip 1971: 64). It is traditionally assumed that the SDA developed in the Viking Age (8th -11th) (Wessén 1970: 32; Seip 1958: 240). The development of the SDA in the Scandinavian languages preceded the loss of the case system (which is completely preserved in the Modern Icelandic) but followed the establishment of the most important step in the development of the rigid word order, the verb after the „fundament“. In the runic inscriptions in the younger *futhark* and in the oldest Old Scandinavian manuscripts with a very rare proto-article suffixation, the rule of the verb position is already completely established.

The difference in the dating of the SDA in the Balkan languages especially in Albanian and Rumanian is great. Both Albanian and Rumanian have written documents only from the 16th century, when SDA had almost the same form and function as now. The dating of the development of the SDA in Albanian varies from the beginning of the first millennium

(Lit. see by Demiraj 1993, 130-134) to the beginning of the second millennium (Пиотровский 1960, 133-134). The same dating has been considered for Rumanian from the period of the Eastern Latin (Sandfeld 1930) to the beginning of the second millennium (Пиотровский 1960).

The only Balkan language that has manuscripts from the period of the formation of the SDA is Middle Bulgarian (12th-14th century). The first and very rare examples of the suffixation appeared in the Old Bulgarian manuscripts from the 11th century. The same dating confirmed Bulgarian toponimics (Гълъбов 1962, 72-73). Some Bulgarian linguists consider the development of the SDA to have been fully concluded in the 11th century (Гълъбов 1962, 65). But the irregularity of the suffixation in the 11th and 12th centuries speaks against the grammaticalisation. Even when the original demonstrative pronoun was postpositive and even suffixed in the Middle Bulgarian its semantics could differ from the semantics of the modern Bulgarian SDA (Курц 1958, 448). On the other hand the predominance of the forms, which are semantically «definite» but have no SDA testifies the lack of the grammaticalisation. It becomes clear when we compare late Old Bulgarian and the earliest Middle Bulgarian texts with their translations into the Modern Bulgarian and Macedonian where the SDA is fully grammaticalised (cf. e.g. the modern translations of The New Testament).

The relation of the suffixed forms in the earliest Middle Bulgarian to the modern Bulgarian forms corresponds to the relation of the SDA forms in the Old Swedish and Modern Swedish (see above). The later dating of the grammaticalisation in Bulgarian and Macedonian (13th - 14th century or probably even later) assumed by the most modern Bulgarianists (cf. Mayer 1988, 108) seems to be more likely.

The development of the suffixation in Bulgarian coincides with the reduction of the case system (Мирчев 1978). But the Bulgarianists do not observe the development of the more rigid word order at the time of the first examples of the suffixation. That is, the relative chronology of these mutually interdependent developments (the development of the grammatical category definiteness, the loss of the case system and the development of the rigid word order) had different form on the Balkan and in Scandinavia.

1.2 Word order and suffixation

The traditional hypothesis about the development of the suffixed definite article in the Scandinavian and in the Balkan languages connect the suffixation with the postposition of the original demonstrative pronoun. One of the most popular explanation, which has been assumed by Jakob Grimm (1898) for the Scandinavian languages and later by Pedersen for Albanian (Pedersen 1900) and by Graur (1929, 1967) for the development in Rumanian and which can be found most often even in the modern literature (cf. Haugen 1984, 377-378; Репина 2002, 94-95), connects the suffixation with the reinterpretation of the demonstrative pronoun that originally referred to the postpositional adjective (cf. Icel. *maðr + inn góði* > *maðr inn+góði* > *maðrinn+góði*; Lat. *homo + ille bonus* > *homo ille + bonus* > Rum. *omul bun* (“the good man”). After another tradition the suffixation is treated as a pure consequence of the postposition, cf. Scand. *maðr inn* > *maðrinn*; Lat. *homo ille* > Rum. *omul*, without reference to the postpositive adjective (cf. Nygaard 1905; Demiraj 1993; Galabov 1963).

The postposition of the original demonstrative pronouns has been considered to be a sufficient reason for the suffixation in the both language groups. But if we look at the word order before the article suffixation, we can see that the postposition of the original demonstrative pronoun was only one of the two possible variants both in the Scandinavian and in the Balkan languages.

The development in the West Germanic languages reveals also, that the postposition of the original demonstrative pronoun is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the suffixation. We find the postposition not only in the Old High German, Old Saxon or Old English (cf. OE *tó sele þam héan* , OS *nadra diu fêha*) but even in the Middle Germanic time (cf. Middle High German *von cigelin den alten, gewaete daz wizze, here daz groze* - Behagel 1923: 45). On the other hand there was a strong trend even in the Old Scandinavian languages to develop a prepositive definite article (cf. Nygaard 1905: 34; Delbrück 1916: 72). In many Old Danish and Old Swedish law texts *þæn* was used in the context where today the suffixed article is used (Hansen 1927: 127; Larm 1936: 31). This usage is particularly characteristic of the Old West Jutlandic Danish texts (Møller 1945: 45), where the trend to the prepositive article has been completely realised (cf. The West and Southern Jutlandic *æ hus, æ mand*, Dan. *huset, manden* “the house, the man”).

In the only Balkan language, which have written sources from the time before the suffixation (Middle Bulgarian) almost in 40% of all cases the pronoun is prepositive. (Гълъбов 1962, 92). The variations of the same text can have different word order as to the place of the pronouns, though in the Greek original the possessive pronoun and the article as a rule preceded the noun. The translation of the Greek *μου την σάρκα ... μου το ιμα* ... “my (the) blood...my (the) flesh“ preserves the Greek word order in Codex Sogrophensis and Codex Marianus, (*мојѡ плѣтъ...мојѡ кръвь*) changes the word order in other manuscripts as e. g. in Codex Assemanianus (*плѣтъ мојѡ... кръвь мојѡ*) or has both variants (*мое тело... but кръвь мојѡ*) - all examples from Стоянов, Янакиев 1960, 98. Many examples of the Bulgarian postposition instead of the preposition in the Greek original see in Гълъбов (1951, 314-321). The postposition of the original demonstrative pronoun is considered by Гълъбов to indicate the function of a definite article, whereas the preposition of the pronoun indicated the demonstrative function (ibid., 317). But even if the pronoun in the postposition can have a function which remind us the one of a definite article the irregularity of the indication of the definiteness speaks against the grammaticalisation.

For the Old Albanian which can be reconstructed on the basis of the dialectology and inner reconstruction Riza assumes the original preposition of the determinatives. He assumed that the preposition of the determinative, which has been preserved in some archaic dialects and in some construction in the Standard Albanian, was replaced by the postposition only in the Middle Ages (Riza 1959; after Sokolova 1983, 95). The main source of the Rumanian - the Latin – does not either show the predominance of the postposition of the qualifiers (cf. *ille locus* „that place“ but *cervos ille* „*stag that“ - Репина 2002 , 94).

But even when we assume that the postposition of the pronoun was dominant before the suffixation (which was not the case), the pure postposition could not be the real reason for the change of the postpositive pronoun into a suffix. In search of the other sources of the suffixation the idea of the language contact, especially concerning the Balkan development, has been often assumed.

1.3 Suffixation and language contact

The suffixation of the original demonstrative pronoun *-inn* in the Scandinavian language has almost never been considered to be a result of a language contact, which seems to be quite natural as the neighbour languages (e. g. Saami and Finnish) have neither grammatical category definiteness nor suffixation of demonstrative pronouns. But in so far as one of the two general types of the morphological development in the Scandinavian languages has been the agglutination, it seemed very likely that the language contact with the agglutinative languages could play a certain role. Kylstra assumed that such agglutinative features in the Scandinavian languages as e.g. suffixed passive voice and suffixed article could have been caused by the Scandinavian-Finnic language contact (Kylstra 1967, 121). But the lack of proofs and first of all the lack of the possible Finnic sources for the Scandinavian suffixed article (there is no definite article in the Saami and Finnish) and suffixed passive voice have not made his idea popular. The traditional assumption about the independent Scandinavian development of the article suffixation is now absolutely dominant.

The idea about an independent parallel development of the SDA in the Balkan languages has not become popular, though it was coined by the one of the founder of the modern Balkan studies Sandfeld (1930). For Sandfeld, whose mother tongue Danish had a SDA, a parallel development was quite possible. But even he did not exclude that the development of the SDA in Bulgarian could be influenced by the Rumanian (ibid., 170). Demiraj following Sandfeld assumes a parallel development for Albanian and Rumanian (Demiraj 1993, 130-134) and a possible influence on the Bulgarian and Macedonian (ibid., 134). But though Sandfeld writes about a parallel development, he considered that this parallel development had the same reason, namely the postposition of the original demonstrative pronoun in the eastern variant of the Latin (*himo ille*). In other words he also considered language contact to be the main reason for the development of a SDA, the source language being the predecessor of the Rumanian. The main idea of Sandfeld was that all Balcanisms have resulted from the contact of the Balkan languages with the Greek (Sandfeld 1930). However he refused to consider the SDA in the Balkan languages as a Greek legacy because of the article suffixation in the Balkan languages, though the Greek is the only language in the region with a definite article. Minčeva assumed that the tendency to enclitisation of pronouns had a Slavic character but the development of an anaphoric semantics can be connected with the Greek and Latin influence (Минчева 1987, 64-65). It is possible that by the grammaticalization of the definiteness in the Balkan languages the contacts with the Greek could play a certain role (Тираспольский 1980, 73), but the suffixation could not be connected either with the Greek or with a Latin influence.

The idea that the SDA has developed in one of the Balkan languages and spread later in the other is very popular in the Balcanistics. The discussion goes about what source language it could be. All theoretically possible combinations have been assumed (Rumanian > Albanian, Bulgarian; Bulgarian > Albanian, Rumanian; Albanian > Rumanian, Bulgarian). The most Bulgarian and some Macedonian linguists assume the priority of the Bulgarian development of the SDA (cf. Mladenov 1929, 247-248; Минчев 1978, 196; Гълъбов 1962, 108-113; Илиевски 1988, 116) considering the Rumanian development as a consequence of the Bulgarian and Macedonian influence (Гълъбов 1962, 117, 121-122; Илиевски 1988, 116). There are some hypotheses that claim the priority of the Prealbanian (or Illyrian or

Thracian) (cf. Miklosich, 1868-1874, 127) or the Eastern Vulgar Latine (Sandfeld 1930) but this interpretations differ from the above mentioned ones only through the difference in dating the change (the source languages are considered to be not Albanian or Rumanian but their predecessors Prealbanian (or Illyrian or Thrakian) or Prerumanian, that is Eastern Vulgar Latin).

But not only one of the languages of the Balkan *Sprachbund* or their predecessors (as e. g. hypothetical Illyrian or Eastern Vulgar Latin) were considered to have developed a SDA. Some of the old hypotheses tried to connect the development of the SDA in the Balkan languages with the language contacts with the other Indo-European languages spoken by the conquerors such as Goths or Normans (lit. in Пиотровский 1954). These hypotheses however have never been taken seriously and are now interesting only for historians of the Balkan studies. But not all of the old hypotheses which early seemed to be fantastic have deserved to be forgotten. I want to provide some arguments to show that one of the hypotheses which earlier seemed to be fantastic for the lack of the argumentation deserves a new discussion. In 1898 in the first volume of the *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* Moses Gaster assumed that several features of Rumanian which do not occur in the other Romance languages but is characteristic of Albanian and Bulgarian can be explained as result of a “Turanian”, namely Protobulgarian influence (Gaster 1988 (1898), 410). Among the features caused by the Protobulgarian influence he named the suffixation of the definite article (ibid. 405-406). The reaction of the scientific word was very negative. The founder of the Balkan linguistics Sandfeld called this idea fantastic (Sandfeld 1930, 166) and in the later publications it was always treated only as a curious thing. And this by right, because Gaster did not even try to argue the idea and to prove it. For him every Balkan feature that originally was not Romance, Slavic or Albanian was “Turanian”. He did not even try to find the concrete “Turanian” source for the Balkan definite article. The idea of Gaster about the “Turanian” influence on the development of the SDA in Rumanian (and in the other Balkan languages) can be compared with the idea of Kylstra, who assumed a possible Finno-Ugric influence on the development of a SDA in the Scandinavian language, whose only argument was that a SDA is an agglutinative feature (see above). The lack of argumentation has discredited both ideas, but it does not mean that they are not right.

By the development to analytism, that is characteristic both of the Germanic, Romance and the Balkan languages, the development of a prepositive analytical morpheme of definiteness, that is of a prepositive definite article seems to be more natural (and this development is in fact characteristic of the West Germanic and the West Romance languages). This circumstance testifies the possibility to look for an additional reason for the development of the suffixed article. I shall try to show that the connection of the article suffixation with the language shift Saami>Scandinavian and Turkic>Balkan languages can be proved both structurally and sociolinguistically. But to prove this assumption we must compare the semantics of the first examples of the suffixation in the Scandinavian and the Balkan language with the semantics of the possessive suffixes in the Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages on the one hand and to show the sociolinguistical possibility of the spreading of this interference feature on the other hand.

2. Form and semantics of the first examples of the suffixation

2.1 Form

Both in the Old Scandinavian languages and in the Balkan languages we can distinguish two steps in the development of the suffixation: 1. Pronouns become enclitics but neither substantives nor pronouns change their original form, both of them preserving case inflections. The enclitization reflects not only phonologically but first of all in the impossibility to insert a word between the substantive and the pronoun. This state can be testified in the manuscripts only through the spelling. 2. The enclitics become suffixes. This change is indicated by morphological changes which show us that the former word+enclitic begins to be interpreted as one word (cf. Modern Swedish gen. *fiskens* (< *fisksens*), where the suffix of definiteness is followed by the suffix of genitive).

The first step is indicated both in the Middle Bulgarian and in the Old Scandinavian language in together spelling with the forms of substantives and adjectives, but some of this form did not differ from the independent forms (cf. dat. sg. *рабоусемоу* (< *рабоу семоу*), *ностоутомоу* (< *ностоу томоу*) in *Hexameron* of Johannes Exarch - (Мирчев 1978 201) and such Old Icelandic forms as nom. masc. sg. *fiskrinn* (< *fiskr inn*), Old Swedish *fiskrin* (< *fiskr in*) and gen. sg. OIce, OSw *fisksins* (< *fisks ins*). But the spelling is not a reliable source in this case. Both in the Old Church Slavonic and even in the Middle Bulgarian manuscripts it was very inconsequent. The oldest Old Church Slavonic manuscripts do not have word division at all. The word division in the oldest Old Scandinavian manuscripts was also inconsequent. But both in the Middle Bulgarian and in the Old Scandinavian languages there are forms which testify the development of a clitic to a suffix. They indicate a morphological cohesion of the former enclitic and the substantive. These forms differ from the independent forms as in Middle Bulgarian nom. masc. sg. *работъ* (< *рабъ тъ*), *народосъ* (< *народъ съ*), *родотъ* (< *родъ тъ*) (Мирчев 1978 199) and Old Icelandic Dat. Pl. *fiskunum* (< *fiskum inum*); and Old Swedish *fiskumin* (< *fiskum inum*).

2.2 Semantics

The Scandinavian and the Balkan languages have very much in common not only as to the development of the form of the suffixation but also as to semantics of the first examples of the suffixation.

2.2.1 Scandinavian languages

The first examples of the suffixation in the Scandinavian languages has been considered already as forms with the SDA (Wessén 1970, Seip 1971). Haugen writes that the article was fully developed in the Old Scandinavian (Haugen 1984: 377). But the irregularity of the suffixation even in texts which were connected with the oral tradition (first of all in the Old Icelandic sagas), not to mention the manuscripts of the Old Scandinavian laws, testifies the lack of the grammaticalisation.

The function of a definite article - thematisation and individualisation – can only sporadically be expressed by the *inn*-form in the old Scandinavian languages. In many

cases this semantics remained unexpressed by the article. The lack of the grammaticalisation is especially clear when we compare the Old Scandinavian texts with their modern translations. Especially rare the suffixation occurs in the Old Scandinavian laws. After Hansen (1927), who compared the Schonen Law (*Skaanske lov*) with the modern Danish translation only 8% of the substantives with definite semantics have the suffixation. The rest of the semantically definite substantives has no articles. In the Jutland law (*Jyske lov*) the relation is 10% with suffixation vs. 90% without articles. Even in the Danish diploms from the 15th century the corresponding relation is 15% to 75% (Hansen 1927: 172). The same relation we find in the Old Swedish laws. In a text section from the older *Västgöotalag* (the beginning of the *þiuuæbolkaer*, 940 words) I have found only one suffixed form, in the modern Swedish translation of the same section there are 58 examples with the SDA. The relation of the suffixed form in a text from the *Upplandslagen* (preface and *Kyrkobalken*, cap. 1-11, 4600 words) to the modern translation is 1:10 (31 cases of the *inn*-form, and 308 cases of the SDA in the modern translation). Even in the texts of the Old Icelandic sagas, where the number of suffixation compared with the laws is big, the usage of the suffixation reaches only 80% of the usage of the SDA in a translation into a modern Scandinavian language (cf. Møller 1945: 37). Due to the irregularity of the *inn*-suffixation in the definite semantic Sprenger considers the *inn*-forms in the Old Icelandic to be not a definite article but only the marker of the emphasis (Sprenger 1977). Still less grammaticalised as a definite article the *inn*-form was in the other Old Scandinavian texts. However the sporadic usage of the suffixed form in the Old Scandinavian texts lets us to see the semantic groups of the suffixation, from where it spread into the other „definite“ positions and became a regular marker of definiteness. The first examples of the *inn*-suffixation could have emphatic or possessive semantics.

In the both first examples of the *inn*-suffixation in the Swedish runic inscription we find a clear possessive semantic of the suffixation. Cf. U 644 : **anuitr auk kiti auk...raistu stain þina aftiR kunlaif foþur sin han fil austr miþ ikuari kuþ hiabi ontini** ‘Andvettr and Kiti and... erected this stone after their father Gunleifr. He fell with Ingvarr. God help *the soul*’. U 669: **sterkar auk hioruaþr litu reisa þinsa stain eftR kisl broþur sin kuþ hialbi antini** ‘Sterkarr and Hjörvarðr let erect this Stone after his brother Gisl. God help *the soul*’ (Peterson 1994: 2). The form **andini (ontini)** (Dat. Sg.) corresponds to the form with the possessive pronoun (**ant hans - his soul**) in the other runic inscriptions.

The possessive semantic of the *inn*-suffixation is typical also of many Old Scandinavian manuscripts. Nygaard notes that the article suffixation in Old Icelandic can indicate the same relation as possessive pronouns or the genitive of the personal pronouns (Nygaard 1905: 31). Larm, who investigated the use of the suffixed article in the Old Swedish laws, stated that “the possessive function of the suffixation is very old and even the main function of the suffixed article” (Larm 1936: 175). The equality of the possessive pronouns and the *inn*-suffix is especially clear when we compare different manuscripts of the same text with facultative alternation of the suffixed and possessive forms (e. g. *liff sitt - liwit, lyus sitt - liuset, kost sin - kostenn, hans haar - harit, hans mun - munnen, hans haka - hakan* (ibid.: 109)).

In some examples we can find demonstrative, determinative and anaphoric semantics, which corresponds to the modern usage of the SDA in the Scandinavian language. But this usage concerns first of all the substantives which take the central place in the paragraph. The original emphatic character of the first examples of the *inn*-suffixation have been

already attested for the Old Scandinavian languages (vgl. Heger 1929; Sprenger 1977). In the Church law (*Kyrkobalken*) (Upplands law) for instance the substantives that most often have the *inn*-suffix are *bonden*, *præsten*, *kirkjan*, *soknin*. In this case we have to do with the emphasizing of the most important substantives. Sprenger considers, that the *inn*-suffix in the Old Icelandic does not have any grammatical or logic function but only emphasize the substantive. She calls the *inn*-form an emphasis article (Sprenger 1977: 215; 267-269).

The emphatic usage of the first examples of suffixed *-inn* in the Old Scandinavian languages corresponds to the emphatic usage of the „Frühartikel“ in the Old Germanic languages with a developing prepositive article: „Die altgermanischen Sprachen setzen vielfach einen Artikel, wo wir heute einen Nachdruck auf das Substantiv legen. Dieser Artikel drückt nicht irgendwelche „Bestimmtheit“ des Begriffes aus, sondern ist ein Zeichen der Emphase“ (Hodler 1954, 18). Sauvageot has shown that the pronoun *sa*, *so*, *þata* in the Gothic (the prototype of the article) do not be used in every anaphoric function. They are used only at the substantives which express the main idea of the story (Sauvageot, 1929). The emphatic function of the definite article is preserved in the "folk speech" up to now (Heinrichs, 1954). The emphatic usage of the protoarticles in the Germanic languages can lead to their occurrence with „indefinite substantives“ which however are „central figures in the culmination points of the text“ (Москальская 1977, 251)

That the suffixed *-inn* could be combined with such words as *hverr* (every), *sumr* (some), *einn* (one) in the Old Icelandic (cf. *hvern fuglinn*, *sum skipin*, *einn á sinn*), even if we interpret such constructions as partitiv, testifies the lack of the grammaticalisation of the definite article. Such constructions are impossible in all modern Scandinavian languages including Icelandic, where the definiteness is grammaticalised.

2.2.2 Old and Middle Bulgarian

The only Balkan languages where the development of a SDA can be traced in the manuscripts are Bulgarian and Macedonian. The oldest Albanian and Rumanian sources come from the 16th century, when the SDA has been already almost completely developed, though not all features of the modern usage has been established (as e.g. the rule of the marking only of the first element in a definite syntagm was not yet common in Rumanian). Though some linguists assumed that the SDA was completely developed in the 11th century in Bulgarian (see above) the irregular and rare occurrence of the suffixation in the latest Old Bulgarian and Middle Bulgarian manuscripts testifies the lack of the grammaticalisation. Even in the Middle Bulgarian manuscripts from the 13th century we find the suffixation very seldom (e. g. in *Dobreishovo* evangelium only six and in *Banishkoto* evangelium ten examples – Дограмаджиева 1973, 91).

When the original demonstrative pronoun was postpositive and even suffixed in the Old Bulgarian its semantics could differ from the semantics of the modern Bulgarian SDA (Курц 1958, 448; Мирчев 1978, 199). On the other hand the predominance of the forms, which are semantically «definite» but have no SDA speaks for the lack of the grammaticalisation. The lack of the grammaticalisation is especially clear by the comparison of the late Old Bulgarian and the earliest Middle Bulgarian texts with their translations into the Modern Bulgarian and Macedonian where the SDA is completely grammaticalised. This situation reminds us of the first examples of the suffixation in the Old Scandinavian languages.

In the Old and Middle Bulgarian manuscripts we can find examples of suffixation which corresponds to the first example of the suffixation in the Scandinavian language, that is demonstrative, possessive and anaphoric semantics especially by the emphasis of the most important word in the text. Cf. in *Banishkoto* evangelium demonstrative semantics in Mth 26. 71-72, 74 (*члкатого*), Joh. 18. 1-2 (*мѣстото*), Joh. 19. 41 (*мѣстѣтом*), anaphorish L. 14.9 (*мѣстото*), Joh. 5.14-15 (*члкътъ*), Joh. 7.10-11 (*празникътъ*) Joh. 18.10 (*работому*) and possessive in L. 14.21 (*работъ*) and Joh.20.10 (*оучениката*) - the examples from Дограмаджиева 1973, 90-93. The type of meaning of the suffixation in this case is clear not only from the context but also from the comparison with the translations into other languages (I have used the modern translation of the evangelium in Swedish, English, German, Russian, Bulgarian and Macedonian). We can see that the semantics of the suffixation in Middle Bulgarian in many cases corresponds to the semantics of the suffixed article in Modern Bulgarian and Macedonian. The difference consists only in the predominantly emphatic semantic of the demonstrative, anaphoric and possessive suffixation in Middle Bulgarian on the one hand and in the regular indication of this semantics (grammaticalisation) in the Modern Bulgarian and Macedonian.

The emphatic semantics of the suffixation we find also in *Hexameron* of Johannes the Exarch, where the suffixation is comparatively often. The earliest manuscript of *Hexameron* dated to 1263 but the bulgarists consider that the suffixation was characteristic also of the original manuscript of Johannes the Exarch, who was a contemporary of tsar Simeon (Мирчев 1978, 201). Cf. e.g. *Нъ добрыми дѣлы обрѣтаютъ путьтъ* «but through their good deeds they find the way» (that is «the right way, their way»). In this case we have a possessive meaning together with the emphasis of the important idea («their way, the right way»). The assumption of the emphasis is possible because the suffixation or the postposition of the pronoun is unregular and in many similar cases in the Middle Bulgarian we do not find any pronoun (suffixed, postpositive or prepositive at all) in contrast to the Modern Bulgarian, where article suffixation in this case is obligatory. Мирчев (1978 202-203) gives many clear examples of the anaphoric function of the in the Middle Bulgarian manuscripts from the 13th 14th century, which completely corresponds to the modern Bulgarian usage. But in contrast to the modern Bulgarian the usage of what later developed to a SDA was unregular and concerned only the most important substantive in the paragraph.

The thematic function of a SDA, the most important function of the Modern Bulgarian article, was not yet characteristic of the Middle Bulgarian suffixation (cf. *Hexameron* - *Приходитъ испоинь на место, где лежитъ...* «The giant comes to (the) place, where (he) lies». «The giant» has no article in *Hexameron* (*испоинь*) but he has it both in the Modern Bulgarian translation (*испоиньт*) (Мирчев *ibid.*, 204) and in the translations into German and English.

In some Old and Middle Bulgarian manuscripts Miletich found the prototype of the three-membered article (*рабъ ть, рабъ съ* more seldom *рабъ онъ* - Милетичъ 1933, 1-16), which indicated the place of the substantive in relation to the speaker (I-deixis), to the hearer (you-deixis) and to the third person (he-deixis). The three-membered article, which now has the form *-ov(-os), -ot, -on* is characteristic of the Modern Standard Macedonian and of some Modern Bulgarian dialects (see below). It represents the more archaic form of determination than the single definite article, which is considered to have developed as result of the simplification of the three-membered model (Гълъбов 1962). The process of

the ousting of the three-membered article through the one-membered one is continuing even now. In the Modern Macedonian the *ot*-form is often used without regard to its distance relationship and is the usual form for the article (Naylor 1989/1990, 384).

3. Development of the suffixation in the Scandinavian and Balkan languages

The semantic connection between the grammatical categories of possessivity and definiteness has already been attested many times (cf. Николаева 1989). Possessive pronouns have the same individualising semantics as definite article, that is every substantive with a possessive qualifier is definite. On the other hand the definite article express very often a possessive semantics. Possessives as substantive determinators have paradigmatic relation with the other substantive determinators (such e.g. definite articles) on the other side they have the same function in text as other markers of text relations with an anaphoric and definite semantics. The semantic connection between these two grammatical categories is especially clear when we compare texts with a definite article with its translation into a language without a definite article or vice versa (as e. g. Swedish or Albanian texts with Russian or Turkish translations or vice versa). Substantives with definite articles with possessive semantics are translated as substantives either with possessive pronouns (as e.g. in Russian) or as substantives with possessive suffixes (as e. g. in Turkish). Correspondingly the possessive forms (with pronouns or suffixes) are translated often as forms with a definite article. Even languages with definite articles can differ as to the distribution of the possessive pronouns and definite articles. The comparison of German and French usage shows that it is valid both for free syntagmas, collocations and idioms, cf. *il poussa sa valise dans le couloir – er schob den Koffer auf den Gang hinaus; mettre ses doigts dans son nez – in der Nase bohren; prendre ses jambes à son cou – die Beine unter den Arm nehmen* (Heinz 1998, 34 -35). The same relation characterize English, that in essence follows French (cf.G. *Ich stecke die Hand in die Tasche – Sw. jag stoppar handen i fickan – Eng. I put my hand in my pocket*. The same relation is characteristic of Albanian on the one hand and Rumanian and Bulgarian on the other hand (cf. Alb. *Anna përçollli nënën tek autobusi*; Bul. *Anna изпрати майка-си до автобуса*. „Anna has accompanied her mother to the bus“. Cf. Rum. *Anna petrecut mama* (with SDA) *până la autobus* or *Anna condus mama-sa* („her (the) mother“) *până la autobus*, where either the form with a SDA or the form with a pronoun is possible.

Common semantic features characterising the possessivity and definiteness show us that the marker of possessivity in one language can be interpreted at the language contact as a marker of definiteness in another and vice versa. It seems very likely that the suffixation of the definite article in one group of languages could be connected with the possessive suffixes in another. The suffixation of the original demonstrative pronouns in postposition in the Scandinavian and Balkan languages could be caused by the contact with the languages with a possessive declination, namely with the reinterpretation of the postpositive demonstrative pronouns as suffixes in the Scandinavian languages of the scandinavised Saami and in the Bulgarian, Rumanian and Albanian languages of the “balcanalised” Turks in accordance with the form and semantics of the possessive suffixes in the corresponding Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages.

To prove a possible connection between the Finno-Ugric and Turkic possessive declination and the article suffixation in the Balkan and the Scandinavian languages we must compare

the semantic of the first examples of suffixation in one language group with the semantics of the possessive declination in another.

We have attested that the earliest examples of the suffixation of the original demonstrative pronoun both in the Old Scandinavian and in the Old Bulgarian can not be considered to be a grammaticalised definite article because of its irregularity on the one hand and of a possibility of an “indefinite” semantics on the other hand. In both cases possessive and emphatic semantics of the suffixation prevail. A semantics which is characteristic of the possessive suffixes in the Finno-Ugrian and Turkic languages.

3.1 Semantics of the possessive suffixes in the Finno-Ugric and the Turkic languages

In the Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages there is a possessive declination of nouns with the same function as the possessive pronouns in the Indo-European languages. The oldest case of it in the Turkic languages can be traced in a loan *Hunnu* word in the Chinese from the 4th century (Тенишев 1988, 23). It is possible that this feature was characteristic of the Proto Uralo-Altaiic.

In many cases the possessive semantics of the possessive suffix is followed by the emphatic semantics. The anaphoric or determinative semantics of a possessive suffix followed the possessive semantic always (see above). But both in the Turkic and in the Finno-Ugric languages the possessive suffixes can have no possessive semantics at all. In this case the suffixes of the third and the second person serve only “to point out, emphasize, concretise and individualize an object which is at that point known to the speech participants” (Leinonen 85; see also Киекбаев 1965, 238-239 Феоктистов 1963, 126; Серебренников 1963, 133).

The emphatic and individualizing function of the possessive suffixes is characteristic of all the Finno-Ugric, Turkic and Samody languages. Grønbeck compared the possessive suffix of the third person in the Osman Turkish with the definite article (Grønbeck 1936, 92-96). The individualizing and emphatic function is especially developed in Komi, Udmurt, Mari, and Chuvash (Leinonen 1998: 84; Серебренников 1963, 129; Серебренников, Гаджиева 1979, 101; Benzig, 1993, 6, 16; Жилина 1985, 39; Павлов, 1985, 6-7; Прокушева 1990, 80-84)

The possessive suffix can be attached not only to the nouns but even to adjectives and to the other parts of speech, loosing completely the possessive semantics. The loss of the possessive semantic can be traced by the substantivation of adjectives (cf. Chuvash *усал* - “silly” – *усалли* “the silly one”).

Pavlov speaks about a special category of emphasizing in Chuvash, which is indicated by the possessive suffix of the third person (Павлов, *ibid.*, 15). This category „serves for the identification of the above mentioned objects (*ibid.*, 16). The suffix emphasize the substantial object, which has been mentioned earlier or is definite through its property in the context or in the situation (*ibid.*, 13).

The Chuvash is considered to be the last living language of the Protobulgarian language branch. The Protobulgarian inscriptions on Volga have forms with possessive suffixes and nothing prevents us to assume the same suffixes in the Protobulgarian on the Balkan.

For the only Nonosman Turkic language that has survived from the Middle ages on the Balkan (Gagauzian) a possessive declination with the same semantics can be attested. Here we can also find the usage of the possessive suffix in the function corresponding to the

function of a definite article and by the substantivation of the adjectives (Покровская 1964).

In both Gagauz and Chuvash there are forms which indicate that the possessive semantics of the possessive suffixes can fade out, cf. the double possession in Chuvash forms as *унӑн увӑлӑ* or the incorporation of the original possessive suffixes into the root in the Gagauz (cf. *оолу* (<*ogul+u*) "sun" (originally „his, her sun“) - *оолусу* ("his, her sun") with a new possessive suffix (ibid.,).

Though the Saami and the other Baltic-Finnish languages have undergone a radical simplification of the possessive declination (Суханова 1954: 112-120; Sammallahti 1998: 73), which has concerned both morphology and semantics, the possessive suffixes are used even here, especially in the 3rd person. In some cases the possessive function of the suffixes is weak as e.g. in the combination with the possessive pronouns (cf. Northern Saami *sin mánáideaset* "her children+her", *du dálkasat!* "your medicine+your" – examples from Bartens 1989).

If the determinative function of the possessive declination was typical of the Saami language in the Common Scandinavian time as it is typical of a number of Finno-Ugric languages now, there were two types of affinities between the Sami possessive suffixes and the *inn*-suffix in the Old Scandinavian languages. To the possessive function of the Saami possessive declination corresponded the Old Scandinavian *inn*-suffixation with possessive semantics, to the emphatic and determinative function of the *inn*-suffixation corresponded the emphatic and determinative usage of the possessive declination in the Finno-Ugric languages.

The similarity between the possessive declination in Turkic languages and the suffixed article in the Balkan languages is still larger. The “definite” semantics of the possessive suffixes in Gagauz and in particular in Chuvash is much more clear than in Saami.

3.2 Borrowing modell

The development of the article suffixation in the Scandinavian and in the Balkan languages can be reconstructed than as follows. Both Common Scandinavian and the Balkan languages before the article suffixation were characterised by free word order in the noun group, the demonstrative pronoun was possible both before and after the noun, cf. Old Icelandic *maðr (h)inn* “*man that”, *(h)inn maðr* “that man”; Eastern Latin *homo ille, ille homo*; Old Church Slavonic *тъ чловѣкъ, чловѣкъ тъ* (you-deixis), *съ чловѣкъ, чловѣкъ съ* (I-deixis) *онъ чловѣкъ, чловѣкъ онъ* (he/she-deixis). The original demonstrative pronouns in postposition in both language groups was interpreted as suffixes by the language shift Saami>Scandinavian, Turkic> Bulgarian, Rumanian, Albanian in accordance with the semantics of the possessive suffixes in Saami and Turkic languages. The reinterpretation occurred first of all by the emphasizing of the possessive and anaphoric semantics. The possessive and emphatic semantics of the first cases of the suffixed article in the Scandinavian languages and in the Middle Bulgarian on the one hand and the definite semantic of the possessive suffixes in the Finno-Ugric and Turkic languages on the other hand testifies the possibility of the development.

The original demonstrative pronoun *(h)inn* in postposition was interpreted in the Scandinavian language of the Saamis as a suffix corresponding to the Saami possessive suffixes which had the same (possessive, determinative and emphatic) semantics (*maðr*

inn>maðrinn in correspondence with the Saami *ollmáis* “her, his man, the man”). In the Balkan languages the prototypes of the SDA were first of all the possessive suffixes of the third person which correspond to the Modern Chuvash (-*ši*, -*i(ě)*) and to the Modern Gagauz (-*si*, -*i*). That the suffix -*i(ě)* was characteristic of the Protobulgarian show us two Protobulgarian inscriptions. In two Protobulgarian inscriptions in the Greek alphabet we can find a formant, which could be interpreted as a possessive suffix. It is possible that the inflexion written with the Greek letter -ε (as in βουλε „boil’s“, κανε „khan’s“) in inscriptions N 53 and 54 from the 11th century does not reflect the Greek genitive inflexion as Beshevliev assumes (Бешевлиев 1979, 186-190), but corresponds to the possessive construction with a possessive suffix, that is κανε „khan-his = khan’s“. This possessive suffix corresponds completely to the possessive suffix -*i* (-*ě*) with the same meaning in the Modern Chuvash.

In the Balkan languages we can find some more arguments which can support the idea about the connection of the article suffixation in the Balkan languages with the possessive declination in the Turkic languages.

The suffixed definite article in the modern Balkan languages can have not only syntagmatic possessive semantics, what is characteristic of the definite article in every language (cf Alb. *Anna përcolli nënën tek autobusi* Rum. *Anna petrecut mama* (with SDA) *până la autobus* „Anna has accompanied her (the) mother to the bus“, but even a paradigmatic possessive semantics. The forms *babata*, *dedoto* in the Macedonian dialects can mean “father or mother in law for the husband” (Foulon 1997, 16) that is “her father or her mother”. In Albanian we find a clear possessive semantics in the forms as *i ati* “his, her father”, literally “the father-the”, *e ëma* „his, her mother“, lit. „the mother-the“.

The connection with the possessive semantics is especially clear in the Balkan languages with the three-membered definite article. The three membered article is characteristic both of the Standard Macedonian and of Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects. Earlier such an article was spread on the much greater area and not only in Bulgarian and Macedonian but possibly even in Albanian. The Early Albanian pronominal forms **is*, **ouos*, **tos*, *kis*, which later have developed to the suffixed definite article considered to be connected with the personality - **ouos* and **kis* referring to the first person, **tos* to the second person and **is* to the third person (Stölting 1970, 76-75).

The three-membered article implies the location in relation to the speaker and to the hearer: the form *-ov* (*-os*) in Macedonian implies close proximity to the speaker (I-deixis), the form *-ot* the proximity to the hearer (you-deixis), the form *-on* indicates the object located most distant from the speaker and the hearer at the third person (he-deixis). The connection between a spatial and a possessive semantics is clear. In many cases possessive pronouns and possessive declination do not indicate possession but only spatial relations or pure definiteness (your chair and book can signify not only possession but the book you are speaking about or a chair at you). On the other hand the definite article often has a possessive semantics (see above). The Macedonian form *stolov* can mean “the chair at me”, *stolot* “the chair at you”, *stolon* “the chair at him”. The three membered possessive declination in the Turkic languages (first of all in the Protobulgarian and Coman) has reflected as a three-membered definite article in the Macedonian and some Bulgarian dialects and possibly in Albanian (cf. Chuvash *çyptăm* «my house, the house at me, the house here», *çypty* “your house, the house at your, the house there”, *çyptě* «his house, her

house, their house: the house at him, her, them, the house over there» and Macedonian *домов, домот, домон*.

Another parallel between Turkic possessive suffixes of the third person and the suffixed article in the Balkan languages is the use both at the substantivation of the adjectives. In Rumanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian the parallel with the Turkic possessive suffixes is complete (cf. Ruman. *răul* »das Böse“, *lașul* »der Feigling“ (Beyrer et al. 1987, 95, 129), Bulg. *белите* (the white (ones)), *лудият* the mad (one)).

In the Balkan languages there was another candidate both for the suffixation and for the definite article. In all the Balkan languages there are also constructions with original dative forms of pronoun with a possessive semantics, cf. Old Bulgarian *-ми, -ти, -си*, which are also considered to be enclitics (Минчева, 1987, 51). The possessive usage of such enclitic pronouns is characteristic of the Modern Bulgarian (*Тя изпрати майка-си до автобуса*. „She has accompanied her mother to the bus“). Enclitic forms with postpositional pronouns (originally dative of possession) are characteristic of Rumanian (sg. *-mi, -ți, -i*, pl. *-ne, -vă, -le*), especially of Arumanian (Молошная 1989, 120-121). The substantives before this enclitic pronouns can have a definite article or be used without it, the later form is considered to be original (ibid., 121). By the substantives for relatives the enclitic form of a possessive pronoun is used (*-sa, -so, -su*, cf., *maică-sa, fică-sa, tatu-so*) and “they build such a close unity that often are perceived by the native speakers as one word” (ibid., 122).

As in the Turkic languages the formes with double possession markers are possible in Rumanian as *frasu-lui* (“his brother-his”) and *măsa băiatului* (“his mother of the boy”)

But though this usage also can be connected with the Turkic possessive declination, we do not have in this case the completed development to suffixation.

Only postpositive original demonstrative pronouns have developed into the suffixed article. Such suffixation had occurred before the grammaticalisation and was characteristic at first only for the most emphatic possessive and anaphoric usage. Only on that first stage of the SDA development we can speak about the influence of a language contact. A gradually extension of the suffixed protoarticle into new „definite“ positions, the development which can be observed both in the Old Scandinavian and in the Middle Bulgarian manuscripts, was connected with the grammaticalisation of the definite article as the tool of the so called actual division of the sentence (thema-rhema).

Both assumed connection of the development of the article suffixation in the Scandinavian and the Balkan languages with the language shift Saami>Scandinavian and Turkic>Bulgarian, Rumanian, Albanian and the following spreading of that feature into the other Scandinavian and Balkan areas raises the problem of the geographical spreading of the contact zone and of the sociocultural conditions that have permitted acceptance and diffusion of the new phenomenon. It is clear that it is impossible to assume a spreading of a substrat borrowing in case of a stigmatization of a group, where the innovation took place.

4. Sociolinguistic possibility of the borrowing

4.1 Scandinavia

The archaeologists and historians give evidence of a Saami population that possibly reached as far south as to the Mälardal-region in present central Sweden and eastern Norway (Zachrisson, 1997). One would expect therefore that some central Scandinavian

features could be borrowed from the Saami substrat. But the proposed social dominance of the Scandinavians has been always considered by the Scandinavian linguists as an obstacle to the penetration and spreading of Saami interference features in the Scandinavian languages (cf. Jahr 1997). Archaeology, Old Icelandic literature and onomastics show however that the relation between the Saami and Scandinavians in the time of the Common Scandinavian (550-1050) was far from stigmatisation of the Saami.

The relations between the Scandinavian and the Saami in heathen times were much closer than scientists have earlier assumed. The Swedish historian and archaeologist Inger Zachrisson writes that the Saami and the Scandinavians lived “in a certain symbiosis” (Zachrisson 1997, 131). The archaeology shows that representatives of the both cultures could marry each other (ibid). The mediaeval Western Scandinavian sources confirm the archaeological findings (cf. the marriage of the Norwegian king Harald Fairhair with a Saami woman). Not only the Saamis learned from the Scandinavians but also the Scandinavians learned from the Saamis in those fields where the Saamis had better knowledge. The Saami considered to be good skiers, hunters, fishers, archers and especially good magicians and healers. The usual adjectives characterising the Saami in the Old Icelandic sagas *margfróðr*, *fjölkunigr*, mean not only “much knowing” but also “knowing how to perform magic”. To perform magic and to prophesy was not a negative capability before christianisation. On the contrary, it played a very important role in the heathen life of the Scandinavians.

The magic performance and the healing of the Saamis have influenced the Scandinavians to a very large degree. In 1877 Fritzner assumed that “*sejd*”, the special kind of Nordic shamanism, had been borrowed from the Saami (Fritzner 1877, 170-171, 180, 195-197) and this assumption has been confirmed by later researchers. The tradition of the Saami magic can be found even in a Icelandic (or possibly Norwegian) rune inscription from the 12th century **boattiat mik inkialtr kærþi** “come back (when stolen or lost) Ingjaldr made me” consisting a Saami word **boattiat** (North Saami *boahiti*) - (Olsen, Bergsland 1943: 5-7).

A very important feature of the Saamis which attracted the Scandinavians even after christianisation was their capability to prophesy. A practice to learn magic and to ask for the prophesy of the Saamis was preserved until the 13th century (Fritzner 1877, 160-161). The prosaic preface to the *Völundarkviða* indicates that even the ability to be a wonder smith could be connected with the Saami magic power. The preface in prose informs us that the father of the wonder-smith *Völundr* was a „finish (that is Saami) king“ (*finnakonungr*) and the name of one of *Völundr*'s brother was *Slagfinnr* and all the brothers had a typical Saami occupation: „they skied and hunted for animals“.

The Saamis who earlier were called *finnar*, a name with absolutely no negative connotations (see below), have got another name in the 12th -13th century - *lappar* “Lapps”, with a clear negative connotation. Even if the earlier etymologies of this word did not proved true (*lappar* < *lapp* “lap” or < Middle Low German *lappe* “fool”, it is obvious that in the folk etymology the connection with the word “lap” and the negative connotation was present.

The absence of the stigmatisation of the Saami people in heathen Scandinavia is testified by the spread of the personal name *Finnr* and of a lot of composed personal names with *finn-* as the first or the second component. The name *Finnr* was not only etymologically related with the people name *finnar*, but the association *Finnr* – *finnar* was alive in the Old Icelandic sagas. A very typical case we can find in *Heimskringla* where Snorri tells us

about an archer (!) in the army of Einar the Belly-shaker who “either was a *finnr* (Saami) or was called *Finnr*” (Snorri 1941, kap. 57).

The first record of the personal name of this kind occurs in the elder runic inscription from Berga (Östergötland) from the beginning of the 6th century. The inscription consists of two personal names **saligastiR fino**. The name *SaligastiR* is a name of a man, the name *Fino* (nom. sg. fem.) is interpreted as a female name corresponding to the OI *Finna*, “which is originally a feminine motivation to the personal name OI *Finnr* „Finn, Lapp“ (Krause 1966, 193).

The name *Finnr* and composed names with the component *finn-* (*Guðfinnr*, *Hróðfinnr*, *Finnulfr*, *Arnfinnr*, *Gullfinnr* (eller *Kolfinnr*), *Þórfinna*, *þórfinnr* etc.) was typical of the younger runic inscriptions and of the Old Icelandic literature (*Finnr*, *Finni*, *Finna*, *Finnbjörn*, *Finnbjörg*, *Þorfinnr*, *Þorfinna* osv.). Names with the component *finn-* occurs also in the Old West Germanic languages (OE *Merefin*, OFrank *Fingast*, *Finn*). There are also a lot of place names formed from the personal names with *finn-* not only in Sweden and Norway but also in Denmark.

It is obvious that the spreading of the personal and of the place names with *finn-* can not tell us about the spreading of the Saamis. But it can testify the attitude of the Scandinavians to the Saamis which strongly differed from the attitude of the time after the christianisation.

The archaeology, the onomastics, the Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian literary sources tell us that in the period of the Common Nordic (550-1050) and which historically coincided with the period of the Scandinavian paganism, there were no sociolinguistic obstacles which could prevent the Scandinavians from borrowing the language features developed at first in the Scandinavian language of the Saamis. The central Scandinavia (Eastern Norway and Central Sweden), approximately the area that is marked on the Zachrisson’s map (Zachrisson 1997) as an area of the contact between two archaeological cultures must be regarded as the historical centre of the Saami-Scandinavian language contact. From this area the Saami interference features have spread into the genuine Scandinavian dialects even in Denmark. The less spreading of some of these features in Denmark show us that they have come there from the Scandinavian peninsula.

The Scandinavian article suffixation has developed in central Scandinavia, in the main zone of the Saami-Scandinavian contact and from there it expanded into the southern Scandinavian area, but the suffixation has not reached the southern and western Danish dialects, where the definite article is prepositive (in detail about the rise of the Scandinavian suffixed article see Kusmenko 2001b). Two other Scandinavian agglutinative features that differ the Scandinavian languages from the other Germanic languages the suffixed *s-* passiv and the suffixed negation can also be treated as the consequence of the Saami-Scandinavian language contact (Kusmenko 2001a, 2002)

4.2 The Balkan

For the first time the Turks came to the Balkan in the 5th century. From that time on, year in, year out, these raids were repeated in the 6th and 7th centuries. The Protobulgars began to settle in the second half of the 7th century. In this time two big groups of the Protobulgars invaded the Balkan, the one under the leadership of Asparuch came from the northern Black sea to the region of the modern northern Bulgaria the other under leadership of Kuber came from Pannonien to the modern Macedonia and Albania (История 1981, 115).

Especially close contacts between the Protobulgars and the Slaves can be attested after the formation of the Bulgarian state in 681. Possible cultural and numeral superiority of the slaves and the christianisation in 865 have led to the language shift Protobulgaran > Slavic. It is assumed that the language shift was completed in the 10th century, but archeology and the Protobulgarian runic inscriptions and Protobulgarian inscriptions in Greek alphabet which dated from the 9th-11th century from a territory that stretches from Murfatlar in Rumania to Adrianopol in Greece (Бешевлиев 1979; Сефтерски 1999) indicate that Protobulgars preserved their language until the 11th century. But the Turkic invasion was not finished with the balkanisation of the Protobulgars. Among the next Turkic people that invaded Rumania and the Balkan peninsula were the Pechenegs, the Uzhi and the Comans. They settled in Dacia and on the Balkan peninsula, adopted Christianity and shifted the language. The region of the Coman settlement was much bigger than that of the Pechenegs and covered the territory of modern Rumania, Bulgaria and Macedonia and northern Albania. The Coman population has maintained their identity much longer and have left much more traces in the toponymy (see below). But even they were balkanised and shifted the languages.

Thus we see that from the 8th till the 13th centuries there was a permanent language shift Turkic > Balkan (Rumanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian). Traditionally the Balkanists do not find any Turkic traces in the grammatical and phonological structure. They assume that no one of the traditional Balcanisms can be interpreted as a borrowing from one of the Preosmanturkic languages. The Preosmanturkic influence on the Balkan languages is limited to some loan words in Rumanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian and Albanian, suffix *-çi* in Bulgarian and Macedonian, some proper names in Bulgarian and the name *Bulgaria*. However both archeology (Михайлов 1973) toponimics (see in particular Conea, Donat 1958; Diaconu 1970, 1978) and Protobulgarian inscriptions give us a clear evidence of a massive Turkic presence on the Balkan. One of the most usual Balkan place names of the Turkic origin are place names a tribe name Comans (Cf. in Romania *Comana, Comanca, Cîmpia Comanca, Valea Comancei, Comanii Vechi, Comănița, Comanul, Comăneanca, Comăneanul, Comăneasa, Vadul Cumanilor* in Romania (Diaconu 1978, 26), und in Bulgaria and Macedonia *Кумановци, Куманити, Куманица, Куманова Чулка, Куманово, Куманичево, Куманич, Коман* (Jireček 1889, 3-30; Mladenov 1931, 130-131). In several places which is called *Comana, Cumanovo* etc the people do not speak now Cumanian but Rumanian in Rumania, Bulgarian in Bulgaria, Macedonian and Albanian in Macedonia. The tribe name Coman has reflected in very frequent Rumanian family name *Coman*.

The geographical spreading and the political position of the Turks on the Balkan both in the first Bulgarian state and than under the Coman rule do not prevent the features of the Turkic-Bulgarian, Rumanian, Albanian interference to spread into the areas where the Turkic presence was not so strong.

The suffixation in the Balkan languages has developed at first in the areas of the language shift Preosmanturkic>Bulgarian, Macedonian, Rumanian, Albanian. From there it has spread into the other regions. It is clear that not only the language shift Turkic>Balkan languages has contributed to the suffixation, but also the shift of the one of the Balkan language dialects, that has already been affected by the Turkic influence, to another Balkan languages could have the same effect.

5. Summary

It follows that the article suffixation in the Scandinavian and the Balkan languages, a feature that traditionally was regarded only as a typological parallel, appears to have a common origin. The similar development of suffixed definite articles in the territorially non-connected Indo-European languages is due to the same type of substratum languages which had possessive declination. By the language shift Saami>Scandinavian, Turkic>Bulgarian, Rumanian, Albanian, the language change consisted in the reinterpretation of the postpositional demonstrative pronouns in the Scandinavian and in the Balkan language as suffixes in accordance with the form and meaning of the possessive suffixes in the Saami and in the Preosmanturkic languages. This change includes the borrowing of a grammatical model (suffixation of the "definite formant") rather than borrowing of a morphological formant. The similar development of the article suffixation in the two distant areas allows us to assume a diachronic frequentalia: if during the formation of the category of definiteness the language has a contact with a language with possessive declination the developing definite article tend to be suffixed. This frequentalia can be confirmed by the development in the other Indo-European languages either with a grammaticalised suffixed article (Armenian) or with a developing definite article (Northern Russian dialects, Western Iranian and Eastern Indian languages). In all these cases we have to do with a language contact with the languages with the possessive declination (in detail see Kusmenko 2001b).

6. References

- Bartens, H.-H. (1989): *Lehrbuch der saamischen (lappischen) Sprache*. Hamburg.
- Behagel, O. (1923): *Deutsche Syntax. Eine geschichtliche Darstellung Bd. I*. Heidelberg.
- Benzig, J. (1993): *Bulgarisch-tschuwassische Studien*. Herausgegeben von Claus Schönig. Wiesbaden.
- Beyrer, A., Bochmann, K., Bronsert, S. (1987): *Grammatik der rumänischen Sprache der Gegenwart*. Leipzig.
- Conea, I., Donat, I. (1958): Contribution à l'étude de la toponymie petchenègue-comane de la plaine roumaine du Bas-Danube. *Contributions onomastique publiées à l'occasion du Vie Congrès international des Sciences onomastiques à Munich, 24-28 août 1958*. Bucarest. 139-168.
- Delbrück, B. (1916): *Der altisländische Artikel. Germanische Syntax III*. Leipzig.
- Demiraj, Sh. (1993): *Historische Grammatik der albanischen Sprache*. Wien.
- Diaconu, P. (1970): *Les Petchénègues au Bas-Danube* (Bibliotheca historica romaniae. Études 27). Bucarest.
- Diaconu, P. (1978): *Les Coumans au Bas-Danube aux XIe et XIIe siècles* (Bibliotheca historica romaniae. Études 56). Bucarest.
- Foulon, J. (1997): Les articles définis en macédonien. *Cahiers Balkaniques* N 23, Linguistique. 7-30.
- Fritzner, J. (1877): Lappernes hedenskap og troldomskunst sammenholdt med andre folks, især nordmændenes, tro og overtro. *Historisk tidskrift*. Bd 4. 135-217.
- Gaster, M. 1988 (1898): Die nichtlateinische Elemente im Rumänischen. Gustav Gröber (Hrsg.) *Grundriß der romanischen Philologie. Bd. I*. Straßburg. 406-414.
- Gaur, A. (1929): Questions latino-romanes (a propos de l' article postposé). *Romania* 40. Paris.
- Gaur A. (1967): De nouveau sur l'article postposé en roumain. *RRL T 12 N 1* . 3-18.
- Grimm, J. (1898): *Deutsche Grammatik Bd. IV*. Gütersloh.
- Grønbeck, K. (1936): *Der türkische Sprachbau I*. Kopenhagen.

- Haugen, E. (1984): *Die skandinavischen Sprachen*. Hamburg.
- Heger, L. (1929): Ein Beitrag zu dem sogenannten bestimmten Artikel im Altisländischen. *Xenia Pragensia. Ernesto Kraus septuagenario et Josepho Janko sexagenario ab amicis collegis discipulis oblata*. Pragae. 365 - 374.
- Heinrichs, H. M. (1954): *Studien zum bestimmten Artikel in den germanischen Sprachen*. Giessen.
- Heinz M. (1998): Die Possessiva im deutsch-französischen Sprachvergleich. W. Börner, K. Vogel (Hrsg.) *Kontrast und Äquivalenz*. Tübingen. 30-61.
- Hodler, W. (1954): *Grundzüge einer germanischen Artikellehre*. Heidelberg.
- Jahr, E. H. (1997): Norway. In: H. Goebel, P. H. Nelde, Z. Starý, W. Wölck (Hgg.) *Kontaktlinguistik*. Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft. Vol. 12.2. Berlin/New York. 937-948.
- Jireček, K. J. (1889): Einige Bemerkungen über die Überreste der Petschenegen und Kumanen, sowie und die Völkerschaften der sogenannten Gagauzi und Sarguči im heutigen Bulgarien. *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*. Prag. 3-30.
- Krause, W., mit Beiträgen von Herbert Jankuhn (1966): *Die Runenschriften im älteren Futhark*. Göttingen.
- Kusmenko, Ju. (2001a): Den nordiska *s(k)*-formens uppkomst. In: Jurij Kusmenko und Sven Lange (Hrsg.) *Nordiska språk – insikter och utsikter*. Föredrag från det 5:e studentkollokviet i nordisk språkvetskap. Berlin. 127-139.
- Kusmenko, Ju. (2001b): Die Ursachen der Suffigierung des bestimmten Artikels in den skandinavischen Sprachen. *Language and language behavior*. St.-Petersburg. 4 N 1.
- Kusmenko, Ju. (2002): Utvecklingen av suffigerad negation i umordiskan. In: Jurij Kusmenko und Sven Lange (Hrsg.) *Strövtåg i nordisk språkvetskap*. Föredrag från det 6:e studentkollokviet i nordisk språkvetskap. Berlin. 102-118.
- Kylstra, A. D. (1967): Zur Substratforschung. *Orbis* 16 N 1. 101-121.
- Larm K. (1936): *Den bestämda artikeln i äldre fornsvenska. En historisk-semologisk studie*. Stockholm.
- Leinonen, M. (1998): The postpositive particle *-to* of Northern Russian dialects, compared with Permic languages (Komi Zyrian). *Studia Slavica Finlandensia*. Tom. XV, Helsinki. 74-89
- Mayer, G. L. (1988): *The Definite Article in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian*. Berlin.
- Møller, K. (1945): *Nordiske artikelproblemer*. København.
- Miklosich, F. (1868-1874): *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen IV. Syntax*. Wien.
- Mladenov, S. (1929): *Geschichte der bulgarischen Sprache*. Berlin, Leipzig.
- Naylor K. E. (1989/1990): On the Form of the Macedonian Article. *Македонски јазик*. N 40-41. 381-387.
- Olsen, M., Bergsland, K. (1943): *Lappisk i en islandsk runeinskrift*. (Avhandlingar utg. av det Norske Videnskapsakademi i Oslo, II kl., N 3). Oslo.
- Peterson, L. (1994): *Svensk runordregister*. Stockholm.
- Riza, S. (1959): Pronorët e shqipës (punim hist.-kritic). *Bull. univ. Ser. shk. shoq.* 2, 3. 43-104; 3-71.
- Sammallahti, P. (1998): *The Saami languages. An Introduction*. Karasjok.
- Samuels M.L. (1951): The suffixed article in North Germanic. *Archivum linguisticum*, v 3. 23-37
- Sandfeld, K. (1930): *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*. Paris.
- Sauvageot, A. (1929): *L'emploi de l'article en gotique*. Paris.
- Snorri Sturluson (1941): *Noregs konungasögur*. Bd 1. Bjarni Aðalbjarnason bjó til prentunar. Reykjavík.
- Sokolova, B. (1983): *Die albanische Mundart von Mandrica*. Berlin.
- Stöltzing, W. (1970): *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Artikels im Bulgarischen und Rumänischen*. Sofia.
- Seip, D. A. (1958): Den etterhengte artikkel i nordisk. *Norsk tidsskrift for sprogvidenskap*. Bd. 18. 231-261.
- Seip, D. A. (1971): *Norwegische Sprachgeschichte*. Berlin.
- Sprenger, U. (1977): *Untersuchungen zum Gebrauch von sá und nachgestelltem imm in der altisländischen Prosa*. Basel und Stuttgart.
- Wessén, E. (1970): *Schwedische Sprachgeschichte*. Berlin.

- Zachrisson, I. (Red.) (1997): *Möten i gränsland: samer och germaner i Mellanskandinavien*. Stockholm.
- Ангелов, Д., (ред.) (1981): История на България. Т. 2. София.
- Бешевлиев В. (1979): *Първобългарски надписи*. София.
- Гълъбов, И. (1962): *Проблемът на члена на българския и румънския език*. София.
- Дограмаджиева, Е. (1973): Членни форми в Банишкото евангелие, среднебългарски паметник от края на XIII век. *Български език*. Год. 23, N 1-2. 90-93.
- Илиевски, Р. (1988): *Балканолошки тудии, со посебен осврт кон историскиот развој на македонскиот јазик*. Скопје.
- Киекбаев, Дж. (1965): О грамматической атегории оределенности в урало-алтаских языках. *оветское финно-угроведение*. Т. 1, N. 4. 237-244.
- Кондраатьев, В. Г. (1981): *Грамматический строй языка древнетюркской письменности VIII-XI вв.*, Ленинград.
- Курц Й. (1958): Към въпроса за възникването на члена в български език. *Известия на института за български език*. Кн. 5. София. 437- 448.
- Минчева А. (1987): *Старобългарският език в светлината на балканистиката*. София.
- Милетичъ Л. (1933): Към историята на тройния членъ въ българския език. *Български прегледъ*. Год. 2. Кн. 1. 1-16
- Мирчев, К. (1978): *Историческа граматика на българския език*. София.
- Михайлов С. et. al. (ред.) 1973: *Славяните и средиземноморският свят VI-XI век*. София.
- Младенов, Ст. 1931: Печенеги и узи-кумани в българската история. *Българска историческа библиотека*. 4 N 1. 130-131.
- Молошная, Т. Н. (1989): План выражения категории поссессивности. *Вяч. В. Иванов (Red.) Категория поссессивности в славянских и балканских языках*. Москва. 112-125.
- Москальская О. И. (1977): Становление категории определенности/ неопределенности. Артиклъ. *Историко-типологическая морфология германских языков. Фономорфология, парадигматика, категория имени*. (Red. М. М. Гухман). Москва. 238-286
- Николаева, Т. М. (1989): Поссессивность и другие содержательные категории. *Вяч. В. Иванов (Red.) Категория поссессивности в славянских и балканских языках*. Москва. 216-246.
- Павлов, И. П. (1985): Категория выделения в современном чувашском языке. *Исследования по фонетике, морфологии и фразеологии современного чувашского языка*. Чебоксары. 3-15.
- Пиотровский, Р. Г. (1954): Славянские элементы в румынском языке (постпозиция артикля). *Ученые записки ЛГПИ им. Герцена*. Т. 93. Ленинград.
- Пиотровский, Р. Г. (1960): *Формирование артикля в романских языках*. Москва, Ленинград.
- Покровская, Л. А. (1964): *Грамматика гагаузского языка*. Москва.
- Репина Т. А. (2002): *История румынского языка*. С.-Петербург.
- Серебрянников, Б. А.. (1963): *Историческая морфология пермских языков*. Москва.
- Серебрянников, Б. А.; Гаджиева, Н. (1979): *Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков*. Баку.
- Сефтерски, Р. (1999) Два новооткрити надписи в София тип Runica Bulgarica. *Palaeobulgarica*. 23 N 2. 89-103.
- Стоянов, С., Янакиев, М. (1960) *Старобългарски език*. София.
- Тенишев, М. (red.) 1988: *Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков*. Москва.
- Тираспольский Г. И. (1980): К вопросу об условиях и причинах утраты болгарского субстантивного склонения. *Советское славяноведение* N 4. 68-74.
- Федотов, М. Р. (1970): Формы принадлежности 1го и 3го лица ед. числа в тюркских и финно-угорских языках в свете урало-алтайской общности. *Ученые записки Научно-исследовательского института при Совете министров Чувашской АССР*. Вып. 49. Филология. Чебоксары. 177-183.