



Marjan Markovik`

Faculty of Philology "Blazhe Koneski"
University "Ss. Cyril and Methodius" of Skopje
Skopje

Macedonian Language from the Perspective of its Balkan Environment (Language Tendencies)

In the past fifteen years, Macedonian standard language and its dialects have been subject to various changes effected for the purpose of establishing clearer and simpler communication. At dialectal level, Macedonian speeches are dissolving and fewer differences can be noticed between city and rural speeches. Take Ohrid speech as an example which had many inherited Slavic features, especially at the lexical and phonetical level, and which, on the other hand, from a Balkan perspective, is the innovational core of the Balkan linguistic tendencies, on both the verb level and in the morphosyntactics domain. The specific features of the speech of the old part – Varoš, are slowly vanishing and nowadays we can speak of an Ohrid speech specific for the other parts of the town as well, which has spread even deeper into the region. Among those that use Ohrid speech nowadays are also those whose parents were native speakers of the Aromanian (Vlach), and sometimes even Turkish or Albanian language. In their everyday use of the language they introduce the features inherited from their "Balkan code" and in this manner they increase the tendencies originating from the period of convergent development of the Balkan linguistic community (Видоески 1999: 253).

On the other hand, Macedonian contemporary language is subject to various changes and accelerated development both due to the dissolving of dialects and to the need of adaptation of the influences of foreign languages. For example, the capital city, Skopje, with a population of almost half of the entire population in Macedonia, is losing part of its dialect features, the language spoken there is developing into a kind of sociolect and becomes carrier of what could be called contemporary Macedonian language. It absorbs

both the features of the dialects and the foreign languages and adapts them with a prospect of achieving clearer and more transparent communication.

Therefore, in this text, I shall attempt to portray two linguistic phenomena, that have not been researched much until now, but that have recently become more intense and which, in a way, show the tendencies in both dialects and contemporary Macedonian language. The first phenomenon that I shall portray is the increasingly present use of double prepositions in Ohrid speech, a phenomenon that has not yet been researched or initiated in the Balkan linguistic environment. The other phenomenon concerns contemporary language and portrays how language deals (in relation to the accommodation by type and tense) with the verbs of foreign origin.

I. Doubling of prepositions in Ohrid speech – a Balkan tendency

Human relationship with space and interpretation of space have always been of interest to science. “Space” has always been one of the most researched issues in mathematics, physics, psychology and linguistics. The most common question has been the relationship between the physical (the objective / the real) and the notional (philosophical/projected) understanding of space. Science has progressed from the “absolute” (Newton) to the “relative” understanding of space (Einstein). Precisely language is the medium that tries to link these two aspects of space and to convey (with linguistic means) the relations between the objects in space. The position of the human element (the speaker) in determining the spatial relationships is of course of key importance, especially in relation to common orientation of the participants in the communication.

In languages with synthetic declension, these relations are conveyed with prepositional – case constructions, while in those with analytical declension, the main conveyors of the spatial relations are the prepositions. In Macedonian language, which transited from synthetism towards analytism, prepositions (prepositional constructions) became the main conveyors of the case relations and “prepositive” grammatical indicators.

Aside from being burdened with case functions, i.e. the relations between the predicate and its arguments, with time, the prepositions also become burdened with another type of function. In this manner, several relationships with metaphorical meaning are established from the basic spatial (and temporal) relationships. On the other hand, the need for more precise spatial determination grew, and this is precisely where the role of

the (secondary) complex prepositions comes into play: *насред, накај, откај докај...* (In other Slavic languages: *испред, изнад, испод; wśród, spod, znad*). Beside them, Macedonian language also possesses the so-called double prepositions, the main function of which is a more precise spatial determination. Hence, in Koneski (Конески 1981) a whole series of such constructions with double prepositions can be found:

*Тој се скри зад врата. Тој излезе од зад врата.
Го зеде коритцето од под глава на Доста.
- до над село; до преку река
- за преку рид, за во кино, за под глава*

The monograph of T. Dimitrovski (Димитровски 1956) on the meaning and use of prepositions in Macedonian, also dedicates attention to the double prepositions (prepositional combinations); he says that this phenomenon is common in popular speech. He gives several examples:

Дојди до зад куќа; Лаѓата стаса до сред море; И одеднаш, од зад буките, свиќаа многу гласови.

Both Koneski and Dimitrovski consider that the prepositional phrase is also some kind of meaningful unit (Dimitrovski – a cognitive whole) that interacts with the second preposition (from the end). The accent also has a helpful role because when the first preposition is combined with one-syllable or two-syllable words, an accent unit is created: *од пред_врата, за под_глава, од зад_грб.*

* * *

What can be concluded from the aforesaid is that the doubling of prepositions in Macedonian language is a recognised phenomenon which is most common for the dialects of the western region. These double preposition constructions are commonly found in the Ohrid speech which uses accent units: *Истај ги дрвана од под_скали Ми ја зеде книгата од пред_прсти.* Aside from accent units, the first preposition and the noun also create a “cognitive” whole and come closer to the meaning of adverbial determination of location.

1. Doubling with spatial adverbs of single meaning

(од под, од пред, до пред, за пред, за над, ...),
*Шпоретот го имаме под_скали.
Го истадов шпоретот од под_скали.
Истај ги парине од под_кревет.*

*Цепев дрва пред_куќи.
Некој ми ги зеде дрвата од пред_куќи.
Ко стигнав до пред_куќи, него го немаше.
Не ми го земај кибритот од пред_прсти.*

*Влегов в купатило. Излегов од в купатило.
Паднав во_вода. *Едни л’уѓе ме истадоа од во_вода.*

*Купив килим за пред_врата.
Чаршафов е за над_кревет.*

As evident from the examples, (with the exception of the two last ones) where we have sequences of prepositions of which the first one, aside from creating an accent unit, also creates a cognitive whole with the noun (according to T. Dimitrovski). In this case, we may speak of localisation, i.e. the prepositional phrase takes on the role of a localiser in the spatial relation created with the second preposition. In the sentence: *Истај ги парине од под кревет* - “под_кревет” is a localiser, “парине” are the localized object, while the preposition од with its ablative meaning is dominative. This actually specifies the location with the help of first preposition. In the above examples, even if there are no accent units, it is still a single-meaning location determination with the appropriate prepositions (пред, зад, под, над, сред, etc.).

* * *

Aside from the doubling of single-meaning spatial adverbs (од пред, од под, за над,...), there are some other constructions in Ohrid speech in which the first member is the preposition на (од на; до на; за на). This phenomenon has not yet been registered in the description of the speeches of the Ohrid and Struga region. This does not necessarily mean that it is a new process because in Ohrid it can also be found with the older generation and in Varoš (which is quite a conservative environment also from a linguistic point of view). This prepositional sequence (with на as the first item) appears not only in prepositional phrases with basic spatial meaning (на маса, на врата, на земја), but also in those with metaphorical meaning (на свадба, на риба, на лекар).

The basic spatial meaning of the preposition на (the localised object has contact with the localiser from the upper surface) must have contributed to its development into adverbial phrases such as (на свадба, на риба, на лекар, на визите), i.e. when combining the preposition на with the noun, this unit determinates localisation (delimitation in space). Here are some examples with “basic” spatial meaning:

2. Prepositional phrases with **на** as a constitutive item (localisation – delimitation in space)

a) basic spatial meaning (на маса, на земја, на врата)

Ја кладе чашиата на_маса. Земи ја чашиата од на_маса.

Ми требет салфеткиве за на_маса.

Детето падна на_земја. Крени го детено од на_земја.

Ја гледавме свадбана од на_тераса.

Ја кладов блузана на_мене. Ја извадов блузана од на_мене.

Тропнав на_врата. Не ме пуштија од на_врата.*

*(this is actually a metaphorical meaning derived from the basic spatial meaning: It has a secondary meaning - *стои (некој) на врата, на прозорец,..*

Example from Mali Vljaj – Struga region:

“Мене да-ми-постелете на_ношви, ме јадет ба̀лви”. Тој им-се-п’улит из-ра̀бот од гуната и скокнал од на_ношви.

*

But it is certainly most interesting when the preposition **на** constitutes a prepositional phrase with metaphorical meaning derived from the spatial:

Седам/Одам на школо, на работа, на пазар, на плажа, на банка, ...

Седам/Одам на риба, на лекар, на свадба, на визита, ...

In these cases, the prepositional phrases with **на** determinate locative and adlative relationships. It can also be mentioned that when expressing adlative relationships certain double prepositions may appear (prepositional sequences) of the type: *Одам до на пазар, до на лекар, до на свадба*; but here *до* may mean “in direction towards” and not mean “approaching to the goal “i.e. getting closer to the localiser.

But in sentences where the ablative relationship is depicted, which would be extended from the basic meaning (distancing from the localiser) to a broader meaning where **од** would mean “the source of action,” in that case, these prepositional sequences become more single-meaning ones:

b. metaphoric spatial meaning

Одам на работа. Се враќам од на работа.

Ми го дадоја са:тов од на работа.

Си дојдов од на_школо. Го познавам од на_школо.

Од на_пазар до_дома дојдов со трчање.

Зедов пари од на_банка.

Чера бев на_пат. Се вратив од на_пат.

*Многу се уморив од на_пат.
Се вратив празен од на_риба.
Те видов ко идав од на_лекар.
Заедно си ојдовме од на_свадба.
Уште сум пијан од на_визита.*

*Имам нова торба за на_пазар.
Ќе му се јавам за на_суд.*

The analysis of these and other examples, shows that with such doubling, “the cognitive whole” of the first preposition (**на**) and the noun, is mainly directed towards a kind of spatial delimitation that “localises” these prepositional phrases and takes on a spatial adverbial meaning. Hence, the phrase: *на лекар, на риба, на свадба, на визита*; actually becomes a localiser as a whole and we perceive it with its spatial determination. That is probably why the noun part does not appear with a determined article. If we try to interpret these sentences, we could say: *Се вратив од на свадба = се вратив од местото каде се одржуваше свадбата; Идав од на лекар = доаѓав од местото каде се лечам / каде е мојот доктор*. Therefore, this phenomenon is expanding its functional field of pure spatial meanings: *на маса, на земја*, to partially metaphorical ones: (institutions/static objects): *на пазар, на школо, на плажа*, and then to completely metaphorical ones: *на лекар, на риба, на свадба, на визита*. However, it should also be mentioned that the coalescence, i.e. forming of a prepositional phrase (localisation) causes such constructions to appear which have the same metaphorical dynamic meaning. So, another option for - *Се враќам од на работа / Се вратив од на пат*; is: - *Го добив саатот од на работа / Се уморив од на пат*.

That means that this doubling allows not only the forming of a prepositional phrase with spatial meaning (localisation), but also a broader understanding of space (*на свадба, на риба, на лекар*), while it also allows a broader understanding of the dynamic relation (not only a line of movement, but also a “source” of movement).

This phenomenon allows more accurate conveyance of the spatial relations with analytical means, but still, it needs to be said that not only the merging into an accent unit, but the localisation itself, i.e. the delimitation in space, is a new type of prepositive synthetism, i.e. a case indicator for locative (which resolves one huge issue in spatial relationships).

Where is the source of this phenomenon? In other western Macedonian peripheral dialects such constructions are very rare or are non-existent. But in Aromanian, this phenomenon is actually most common: *Neg la lukur = Одам на работа; Mi tor di la lukur = Се враќам од на работа*.

3. Balkan context / Aromanian – Macedonian parallels

U skosh shporetu di sum skär.
Го истадов шпоретот од под скали.

Tärku vär shä njä li l'o lemäli di daninte ali kasi.
Помина некој и ми ги зеде дрвата од пред куќи.

Mi tor di la jatur. Mi tor di la peshch.
Се враќам од на_лекар. Се враќам од на_риби.
Njä esti multu klorig shä ljä skosh stranjali di pi mini.
Многу ми е ладно и ги истадов алиштата од на_мене.

Kän mi turai di la pazari, arem mult akumat.
Кога се вратив од на пазар, бев многу уморен.

Di ju o ai pi sa:te? N'u d'edärä di la lukur.
Од кој го имаш (на) са:тот? Ми го дадоја од на работа.

Aist peshch njä l'äps`eshti ti la jatur.
Овие риби ми требаат за на_лекар.

Njä lipsesk pradz ti la nunta.
Ми требаат пари за на визита.

As can be seen from the examples, preposition sequences are common in Aromanian. This phenomenon is also frequent and standard in Daco-Romanian. Hence, the prepositions: *în, tu, = во* ; *pe, la, = на* ; *de = од*; come in fusion or sequences of two prepositions: *de + tu > dit*, *de + în > din*; *de pe, de la, pe la*; etc. (Mallinson 1986). As can be noticed, several Daco-Romanian prepositions (**la, pe, *al**) have their analogy in the preposition **на** (in Macedonian). This polysemy most probably made way for the sequences with **на** to take over the basic spatial meaning and to create localisations such as (на лекар, на визита, на свадба, на мајстор, ... and similar).

Adam Weinsberg (Weinsberg 1971) in his monograph on spatial prepositions in Polish, German and Romanian language claims that it is exclusively a Romanian feature and aside from Aromanian, it does not appear in any other Romance language, nor in other European languages. In his opinion, this feature makes the Romanian language unique in Europe. It can be found only in some Eastern Caucasian languages, but as postpositive. However, the influence of Turkish on Macedonian language should not be ignored and should be further researched.

Regarding the above, I believe that it can be said that Macedonian language, through Ohrid speech, has become familiar with this phenomenon. Although it is known that a certain analogy can be drawn between the basic spatial sequences (*од пред врата, од под скали*) and the Romanian sequence of prepositions (*di pi masa, di sum skar*), (Solecka 1979), still, until now, the sequences such as (*од на пазар, од на лекар, од на работа, од на школо, од на мене*) were neither recorded nor analysed in linguistic works. Those sequences in particular completely show the analogy that can be drawn between this unique Romanian (and Aromanian) phenomenon and Macedonian Ohrid speech.

Hence, from this perspective it can be said that Romanian is not the only language in Europe that uses such prepositional sequences. Macedonian language (in its Ohrid speech) has also embedded this particularity in its (spatial-case) system.

This certainly sheds a new light on Slavic/Latino/Roman relations, mainly regarding the place and role of Macedonian language in the Balkan language environment. Namely, the Balkanised (Romanised) structure of Macedonian language allows for certain tendencies to develop in directions much broader than in the source language/languages.

Precisely such a microsystem, as in Ohrid speech, a kind of innovation centre and one of the cores of the Balkan linguistic community, shows how those tendencies can be integrated into the system and help create a clearer and more precise communication and conveyance of the perception of the world around us.

II. Aspectual and temporal accommodation of the verbs with *-ira* in contemporary Macedonian language

In contemporary Macedonian language, especially in conversational language and in the language used in the media, it is more common to come across new prefixations in foreign verb forms formed with the suffix *-ira*. For example, it is becoming increasingly common to come across verb formations such as: *исконтактира, изреагира, изреализира, изорганизира, исконтролира, изреволтира, изиритира, искоординира, испартизира, исполитизира, испрезентира, изанализира, издизајнира, излобира, избрифира, изменаџира, искомбинира, испромовира*, etc. The fact that this is a more recent process is witnessed by verbs formed with this prefix that have originated directly under the influence of the English language: *менаџер, лоби, брифинг, револт, принт (испринта)* etc.

Even in the previous stages of development of contemporary Macedonian language, the suffix *-upa* appears as the most productive one in forming verbs of foreign origin.

Namely, the accelerated infiltration of new *-upa* verbs was first recorded by Blagoja Korubin in 1955 in one of his articles (Korubin 1955). He lists the following verbs: *абонира, базира, вегетира, гарнира, ...* etc., and his opinion is that this disturbs Macedonian language accentual system because of the penultima accent in these verbs. In his opinion, such forms would more easily integrate into Macedonian language, if they were formed with the suffixes *-uva* or *-uca* (*агитува, бојкотува, организува, деморалиса, концентриса...*). The problem of the *-upa* verbs was also analysed by Minova (Minova-Gjurkova 1966); she gives a comprehensive overview of the features of these verbs not only in Macedonian language, but also in Russian, Serbo/Croatian and in Bulgarian. In that text, Minova gives examples supporting the fact that, unlike the case in certain other Slavic languages, the suffixes *-uva* or *-uca* have not squeezed out the suffix *-upa*. She successfully depicts another issue typical for the *-upa* ending verbs which is their bi-aspectuality. She goes on saying that: „*The aspect of these verbs comes to light from the context, i.e. the context reveals whether they are perfective or imperfective*” (Minova-Gjurkova 1966). On the prefixation of these verbs, Minova mentions that the most commonly used prefix is *no-* (*подиктира, понервира, потренира,...*), followed by the prefix *pro-* (*продискутира, проконтролира, проанализира,...*). Further, she lists other prefixes of less productivity. Using prefixation, Minova puts all this into the context of categorisation of these verbs by aspect. Already in 1967, in the Reverse Dictionary of Macedonian Language, issued by the Macedonian Language Institute, over 800 forms of *-upa* ending verbs are listed. Minova-Gjurkova readressed these verbs in an article from 1984 (Minova-Gjurkova 1984), this time she analyses past actions expressed with the *-upa* verbs. She lists several sentences where imperfect formations somehow solve the aspect issue with these verbs. For example: «(3) *На почетокот на седницата претседавачот ги информираше присутните за некои промени во дневниот ред*». If the aorist form is used in these examples (*информира*) the tense information (present versus aorist) will be unclear. In such cases, only a precise context or synonym replacement for the *-upa* verb can convey the correct information. In 1993, provoked by the increasing use of new *-upa* verb forms registered in the “Ortography of Macedonian Language” (*Pravopisot na makedonskiot jazik*) and in the audio-visual media, Simon Sazdov (Sazdov 1993) revisits the *-upa* verb issue. He lists several verbs which were unregistered until then in both the “Ortography of Macedonian Language” or the “Dictionary of Macedonian Language”

such as: *актуелизира, модернизира, приватизира, анимира, аплицира, дистанцира, ескалира, интегрира, форсира* etc. He, unlike Minova in 1984, writes that the most common group of prefixedated *-ира* verbs in his research are those with the prefix *из-(ис-)* and lists verbs such as: *истренира, изреагира, исконструира, издизајнира*, etc. Other prefixes such as *пре-* (*преаранжира, предимензионира, преструктурира*) may even have no effect on the aspect of *-ира* verbs, unlike those with the prefix *из-(ис-)*. Szdov locates the greatest problem with the new *-ира* verbs in the accent (penultima) and in the aspect (bi-aspectual). In 2006 Aleksandra Gjurkova, in her text on the sociolinguistic aspects of Macedonian language (Gjurkova 2006), in the part in which she describes the effects of foreign languages on Macedonian language, especially of the influences of English, lists the following examples of new verb forms: *администрира, акцентира, апдејтира, брифира, форматира, конектира, лобира, мониторира, процесира, таргетира*, etc. Among other things, she refers to Minova-Gjurkova's article (Minova-Gjurkova 2002) in which it is stated that in order to solve the issue with the aspect of *-ира* verbs, they should be prefixedated and linguists should look for an adequate solution.

Considering most of the researches of these verbs carried out thus far in the period of development of Macedonian contemporary language, and the monographs on word formation by K. Koneski (K. Koneski 2003) and S. Veleva (Veleva 2006), it can be concluded that the number of *-ира* verbs in Macedonian language is increasing, they are entering via several languages and are a powerful derivative core for the forming of various types of foreign words. The increased infiltration of new words contributed to the speeding up of the process of prefixation of the newly formed *-ира* verbs.

Namely, as I mentioned earlier, *-ира* verbs are increasingly infiltrating the Macedonian language and now the greatest problem is not the penultima accenting, but rather their bi-aspectual nature and their classification under the *a*-verb group. These features contribute, in many situations, to an identification of a verb as perfective or imperfective only from the context, the same goes for determining present tense or aorist (in the third person singular) or imperfect-aorist (in the first person singular). For example:

Ќе се реализира енергетскиот проект „Вардарска долина“
(perfective or imperfective)?
„Тим Македонија“ го реализира второто road show во Соединетите
Американски Држави.
(present – aorist)?
Старо-новиот градоначалник на Охрид, Александар Петрески, ги
реализира изборните ветувања.
(present – aorist)?
..., а првата студиска снимка ја реализирав во студиото ДНС,..
(imperfect – aorist)?

*Ваквата постапка ги револтира и фармерите и млекарницата, ...
Отштетата на 700.000 евра отштета за бачилото на Иснифарис
Џемаили дополнително ги револтира сите што не можат да
наплатат ниту неколку илјади за изгубените ...*

As can be concluded, the only factor for determining the aspect and the tense is the context. However, in some examples, not even the context is enough to determine these categories.

That is why language, i.e. its speakers, used the least marked prefix, the *из-(ис-)* prefix, the main meaning of which is completing the action, i.e. its rounding up, which is closest to the perception of the perfective.

The prefix *из-(ис-)* introduces only a difference in aspect; foreign words do not carry information on the categorical meaning regarding the category of aspect; with this, *из-(ис-)* becomes an aspectual marker. Examples:

1. *Vo emisijata ќе ги isprezentiram site modeli*
2. *Ќе iskomuniciram so niv za na sud*
3. *Nemam vreme da gi izdemantiram site navodi*

In this manner, the *-ира* verbs transit into perfective and more easily enter into aspectual and temporal oppositions. By the means of this prefixation, the present tense and the aorist can be distinguished (in the third person singular).

Examples:

1. *Неефикасноста на судството ги револтира цариниците.*
2. *Одлуката на обвинителството ги изреволтира семејствата.*
3. *Владата ја реализира својата одлука.*
4. *Direct Media целосно го осмисли и изреализира проектот.*

One of the reasons why these verbs need to be accommodated in respect of the aspect and the tense is that these verbs are from the *a-group* which have same endings in different tenses.

Examples:

present: *револтирам, револтираш, револтира*
imperfect: *револтирав, револтираше, револтираше*
aorist: *револтирав, револтира, револтира.*

The first person singular of the imperfect and the aorist are homonyms, so there is no information on the tense in the form *–revoltirav* (imp. – aor.). But the prefix solves this problem:

*Многу се изреволтирав. Одлучив веќе да не стапнам во Грција! - вели
скопјанката Д.А.*

Се изреволтирав од изјавата на Саркози дека Скопје, како што тој

ја нарече Македонија, треба да се потруди да го смени името ако сака да влезе во НАТО.

The case is similar to the forms of the third person singular of present tense and aorist: -реализира - there is no information regarding the tense (present – aorist)

The prefix *из-*(*ис-*) not only regulates the aspect:

револтира - изреволтира

револтирав - изреволтирав,

it also specifies the tense information, which is no longer contextual. Also, this confirms the tendency that imperfective verbs use imperfect and perfective use aorist.

Therefore, the following shall, of course, be in aorist:

1. Отсекогаш ми се допаѓал спојот човек-природа, а посебно кога тоа ќе се **изреализира** низ призмата на уметноста. ...
2. ..., г-дин Сашо Петрески којшто максимално добро ја **изорганизира** оваа дводневна обука.
3. Ниту Тео Вајгел не им **излобира** директен влез на Германците.
4. Таа направи една несекојдневна промоција, покажувајќи им на останатите како треба да се **испромовира** еден нов албум.
5. ..., МВР завчера ургентно и забрвтану побрза да ја **избрифира** јавноста...
6. Ги **исконтактирав** денес па во понеделник ќе одам да си ја земам налепницата.
7. Одлуката на обвинителството ги **изреволтира** семејствата.
Бирото за лекови **исконтролира** 40, а затвори 3 аптеки во Скопје.

Having in mind the above said and the majority of the researches of these verbs conducted thus far in the period of development of Macedonian contemporary language, it can be concluded that the *-ира* verbs in Macedonian language are increasing in number, and that this accelerated their prefixation process. The most productive prefix is the *из-*(*ис-*), prefix which solves many issues: a large group of bi-aspectual verbs can be categorised by aspect without an indicator of part, beginning, end, etc. of the action with *из-*(*ис-*) as a kind of aspectual marker; it solves the problem of homonymy of the unprefixed forms of *-ира* (due to the *a*-group) with regard to the tense category (present tense – past tense in the third person singular) (*контактира-исконтактира*), and it also solves the problem of distinction between the imperfect and the aorist (first person singular).

In conclusion, it can be said that languages, including Macedonian language, often, during their development discover inner-language means

to facilitate communication. Those means can be inherited Slavic features or a reflection of the contacts within the Balkan language environment. In respect of the dialects, in particular the Western peripheral speeches, it can be said that the Balkanised structure of Macedonian language allows certain Balkan tendencies to develop in much broader directions and still retain the primary goal – more transparent and clearer communication among the speakers of the language.

References

- Caragiu-Marioteanu M., Saramandu N.
(2005) *Manual de aromână*, București.
- Cienki A.
(1989) *Spatial Cognition and the Semantics of Prepositions in English, Polish, and Russian*, München.
- Mallinson G.
(1986) *Rumanian*, London.
- Grochowski Maciej (red.)
(2005) *Przysłówki i przyimki. Studia ze składni i semantyki języka polskiego*, Toruń.
- Solecka K. M.
Удвојување на предлозите во македонскиот јазик од гледна точка на нормата на литературниот јазик (во споредба со другите балкански јазици), Зборник на трудовите на V научна дискусија, Скопје, pp. 53-58.
- Weinsberg A.
(1971) *Przyimki przestrzenne w języku polskim, niemieckim i rumińskim*, PAN, Warszawa.
- Велева С.
(2006) *Тенденции во зборообразувањето во македонскиот јазик*, Скопје.
- Видоески Б.
(1999) *Дијалектите на македонскиот јазик*, Том 1, МАНУ, Скопје.
- Ѓуркова А.
(2008) *Социolingвистски аспекти на македонскиот јазик: од стандардизација до актуелните тенденции*, Филолошки студии, том 2, Скопје, Загреб, Перм, Љубљана.
- Димитровски Т.
(1956) *Значења и употреба на предлозите во македонскиот литературен јазик*, Скопје.
- Конески Б.
(1981) *Грамматика на македонскиот јазик*, Скопје.
(1982) *Историја на македонскиот јазик*, Скопје.
- Конески К.
(2003) *Зборообразувањето во современиот македонски јазик*, Универзитет «Св. Кирил и Методиј», Скопје.

Корубин Б.

(1955) *За глаголите со наставката -ира во нашиот јазик*, "Литературен збор", II бр. 2, Скопје, pp. 96-98.

Минова-Ѓуркова Л.

(1966) *Некои карактеристики на глаголите на -(из)ира во македонскиот литературен јазик*, "Македонски јазик", год. XVII, Скопје, pp. 117-126.

(1984) *Минати дејства изразени со глаголите на -ира*, "Литературен збор", год. XXXI, кн. 3, Скопје, pp. 105-108.

(2002) *Лексиката, нормата и јазичното планирање, Норма и речник*, Зборник на трудови од научен собир, "Институт за македонски јазик" «Крсте Мисирков», Скопје.

(1967) *Обратен речник на македонскиот јазик*, "Институт за македонски јазик" «Крсте Мисирков», Скопје.

Саздов С.

(1993) *Белешки кон статусот на глаголите на -(из)ира во македонскиот јазик денес*, "Литературен збор", год. XL, Скопје, pp. 41-45.

Чундева Н.

(1992) *Двојните предлози и нивната лексикографска интерпретација*, Зборник на трудовите на XVIII научна дискусија, Скопје, pp. 123-128.

Македонскиот јазик во балканското јазично опкружување (јазичните тенденции)

Во последниве петнаесетина години, македонскиот стандарден и дијалектен јазик е подложен на низа промени во правец на појасна и поеднозначна комуникација. На дијалектно ниво, македонските говори се раслојуваат и се губат разликите меѓу градските и селските говори. Од друга страна пак, македонскиот современ јазик е подложен на низа промени и забрзан развој и поради раслојување на дијалектите и поради потребата за адаптација на туѓојазичните влијанија

Затоа, во овој текст се обидувам да покажам две јазични појави, досега малку проучувани, кои во последниот период земаат сè поголем замав, и на одреден начин ги покажуваат тенденциите и во дијалектниот и во современиот македонски јазик. Првата појава која ја претставувам се однесува на сè позачестеното удвојување на предлозите во охридскиот говор, појава досега непроучувана и поттикната од балканското јазично опкружување. Другата појава се однесува на современиот македонски јазик и покажува како јазикот се справува (во однос на видската и временската акомодација) со глаголите од туѓо потекло.

Język macedoński w bałkańskim kontekście językowym (tendencje językowe)

W ostatnim piętnastoleciu zarówno macedoński standard, jak i dialekty podlegają zmianom, których kierunek wyznacza jasność i jednoznaczność procesu komunikacji.

Na poziomie dialektów, język macedoński dzieli się i traci różnicę między miejskim i wiejskim wariantem. Z drugiej strony język macedoński podlega przemianom związanym z przyspieszonym rozwojem i dialektalną dyferencją z powodu konieczności adaptacji obcych wpływów.

Z tego powodu w moim artykule staram się zaprezentować dwie tendencje językowe, mało dotąd zbadane, które są coraz bardziej widoczne zarówno na poziomie dialektów, jak i na poziomie współczesnego macedońskiego standardu.

Pierwsza z nich, słabo zbadana i będąca wynikiem bałkańskiego kontekstu językowego, jest związana z coraz częstszym podwajaniem przyimków w ochrydzkiej odmianie języka macedońskiego.

Druga widoczna jest jako tendencja, która unaocznia akomodacyjne procesy (obejmujące system czasów i rodzajów) we współczesnym macedońskim standardzie w odniesieniu do czasowników obcego pochodzenia

*Przekład z języka macedońskiego
Jolanta Sujecka*