LINGUISTIC BEHAVIOUR IS GRADED RATHER THAN ABSOLUTE*

In linguistics, as in life in general, there is a tendency towards rigid polarization of phenomena. Many disputes will, however, be resolved and many misunderstandings cleared, if one adopts a relative attitude and treats linguistic behaviour as graded rather than absolute. I shall be arguing in favour of grading by considering two complexes of linguistic issues: markedness and Sprachbund membership.

Underlying "markedness" is undoubtedly the notion of "opposition". But the "opponents" have as yet not been defined clearly and unambiguously. Initially, Trubetzkoy (1931) distinguished "distinctive property" from "mark" and thus indicated the possibility of setting up two sets of oppositions [+marked]/[-marked] and [+feature]/[-feature], pertaining to the choice within a paradigm and among different paradigms, respectively. Had this possibility been realized, "markedness" could have been placed within a flexible, dynamic framework, in which the [-feature] member would not be automatically expected to be unmarked and show up in neutralization. Trubetzkoy's subsequent (1958) use of the term "unmarked" as a cover term for both

(a) a sign characterized by its form and its oppositive meaning, and

(b) a form which shows up in the position of neutralization, where the oppositive sign meaning, and hence the sign value connected with it, is omitted (cf. Gvozdenović 1988) blurred the distinction.

In post-Trubetzkoyan literature the oppositions [+marked]/[-marked] and [+feature]/[-feature] were conflated and the notion of "markedness" became inseparable from the contradictory relation coded in the terms "marked" and "unmarked".

While it was constrained to the domains of phonology and morphology and as long as it was interpretable and interpreted as a distinction between morphonologically simple and morphonologically complex forms, the all-embracing distinction marked/unmarked was operative. As the notion of markedness was being carried over from one metatheoretical paradigm to another and extended over the entire domain of linguistic analysis, the originally strictly formal opposition evolved into a set of correlations which, in addition to formal complexity, involved typological considerations, functional load, frequency of occurrence, learnability and interpretability. In general, it came to be assumed that the morphonologically simple forms, which, as a rule, qualify as "unmarked", have heavier functional load and a higher frequency of occurrence and are learned and interpreted relatively more easily. There have appeared, however, numerous counterexamples to this assumption, which cast doubt on the justifiability of the markedness hypothesis itself. It is my strong belief that these doubts are not due to the hypothesis per se, but rather to a conflation of oppositions and the indiscriminate application in different domains. I am arguing in favour of a markedness theory in which instead of the all-embracing opposition marked/unmarked, one assumes sets of more relative oppositions, which interrelate in a complex structure.  

My argument will be substantiated by a brief discussion of the markedness relationships holding in the domains and languages I know best - the grammatical systems of the Slavonic languages. Let us first look into the markedness relationships among the exponents of the Slavonic case system.

---

1. This theory is still nascent. Hopefully, my arguments, along with others, will contribute to its birth.
The semantically based Jakobsonian case theory (1971) set up the relationship marked/unmarked between the Dative, Instrumental and Locative, on the one hand, and the Nominative, Accusative and Genitive, on the other; the Nominative being the absolutely unmarked case. The original syntactically based Kuryłowiczian case theory (1949) made a similar partition, with the Accusative having the most neutral (i.e. unmarked) status. In Kuryłowicz’s last book (1977), however, the markedness relationships are reanalysed: the Dative is moved into the unmarked group and a pronounced distinction is drawn between the Nominative and the remaining, oblique cases. The variabilities are very indicative.

Examining the frequencies, syncretisms, functional variabilities and collocations of the Polish cases, Laskowski (1988) shows how not only different word classes but also different subclasses of Polish nouns exhibit different markedness relationships: While with animate nouns the Nominative can be juxtaposed to all other cases as "the unmarked case", with inanimate nouns the Accusative is more frequent, has heavier functional load and takes over the function of the "archimember".

His argument goes like this: In Proto-Slavonic, the masculine singular animate declensional subparadigm was characterised by the morphological opposition of the unmarked Nominal vs. the marked common Accusative - Genitive, while in the subparadigm of the masculine singular inanimate nouns the morphological opposition of the unmarked common Nominative - Accusative vs. the marked Genitive was observed. The plural subparadigms of both animate and inanimate nouns had distinct Nominative, Accusative and Genitive forms.

In Old Polish the plural subparadigms underwent two simultaneous changes:
(a) with masculine personal nouns the Genitive extended to cover the function of the Accusative, while
(b) with inanimate nouns the Accusative extended to cover the Nominative. From this one may conclude that, in

2. As manifested in the majority of the Slavonic languages, where six case declensional systems are in operation.
the subsystems of impersonal (inanimate) nouns, the Accusative is the unmarked member of the Accusative vs. Nominative opposition. The statistical data support this claim: with inanimate nouns the Accusative is the most frequent case.

The Dative, which is very rare with inanimate nouns, shows with animate nouns a frequency higher than the Genitive. Marked among the prepositionless cases, the Genitive is the most unmarked member among the prepositional ones. Very marked within the overall case system, within the limited semantically defined subsystem of nouns denoting spatial objects the Locative turns out to be unmarked. Having shown that the markedness relations are to a large extent specific for syntactically and semantically defined subsystems of the Polish case system, Laskowski concludes that markedness theory should take these subsystems into consideration. Before turning to my next system I would like to point out that Jakobson differed from Kuryłowicz and Kuryłowicz differed from both Jakobson and himself because they did not consider the interrelationships of the subsystems in the complex structure of the system they analysed.

My next case is the system of deictics (pronouns, determiners and adverbs) in Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian i.e. the South Slavonic languages which grammaticalize triple spatial distinctions. Formalising their interrelationships through the oppositions [+present]/[-present] and [+proximate]/[-proximate], students of the Slavonic languages (e.g. Topolińska 1974) have been trying to fit the exponents of these systems into binary jackets. But the Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian y, t and n deictics are typically distinguished from each other by being proximate to the speaker, proximate to the addressee and distant from both the speaker and the addressee, respectively.

3. Mutatis mutandis Laskowski's (1988) contentions hold for all Slavonic languages that have cases.
Macedonian, but not Serbo-Croatian, grammaticalizes definiteness, and does so through the opposition between \( \nu \), \( t \) and \( n \) articles (which have developed from and are related to the respective \( \nu \), \( t \) and \( n \) deictics) on the one hand, and zero articles on the other. It is the \( t \) article that is used for anaphoric, i.e. unmarked reference. But this usage does not follow from its being [-present] and [-proximate], which it is not - the native speakers of the language have simply found it suitable to make precisely that choice.\(^4\) Much as some analysts would like to restrict definite reference to present persons and objects to the \( \nu \) and \( n \) articles, the \( t \) article is used with persons and objects proximate to the addressee just as much as the \( \nu \) and \( n \) articles are used with persons and objects proximate to the speaker and a third person, respectively (cf. Tomic 1981).

While the Macedonian determiner/pronoun counterpart of the \( t \) article is definitely the unmarked member of the pronominal demonstrative sub-system, with the adverbial demonstratives the state of affairs is not so clear.\(^5\) In Serbo-Croatian, however, the situation is reversed; for anaphoric reference - one most frequently uses the \( t \) adverbs but the \( n \) determiners/pronouns. These variabilities seem to favour a relative, multi-planar approach to markedness, and so do the changes in the scopes of the exponents of the grammatical categories operating in the Indo-European verb system, in general, and those in Bulgarian and Macedonian, to which I am now going to turn, in particular.

The Indo-European verb system has been assumed to have only two sets of forms - those of the Present and those of the Aorist. Very likely,

---

4. Selections like this one cannot be argued. For polite reference the speakers of the Slavonic languages choose the second person plural, whereas the speakers of German opt for the third person plural.

5. In chunk-oppositions the \( \nu \) adverbs appear most frequently. Cf. ovde-donde/*tuka 'here and there'; vamo-tamo/*onamo 'hither-thither'; i vaka i taka/ *onaka 'so so'.
the distinction between them had been aspectual - the forms of the Present representing imperfective actions, those of the Aorist featuring perfective ones and constituting the marked member of the opposition (cf. Comrie 1976). When time reference developed the Indo-European verb system was enriched by the forms of the Imperfect, and the Aorist was established as a Past Definite Tense, aspectually distinguished from the Imperfect, which referred to a past action lasting over a period of time. Subsequently, another set of forms was added - those of the Perfect, a category which originally denoted present states resulting from previous actions and later actions occurring prior to the moment of speaking, with effects in the present (cf. Kuryłowicz 1971).

For some time, the Aorist was aspectually opposed both to the Imperfect and to the Perfect. In the course of time, however, the descendants of the forms of the Indo-European Aorist and Imperfect receded, while those of the Perfect took over their functions. But the recession and take-over have not spread uniformly; in languages which are in intensive contact with genetically remote or totally alien languages, such as the two South Slavonic languages which are typical members of the Balkan Sprachbund - Bulgarian and Macedonian - the Perfect develops independently (cf. Tomić 1983b). In both Bulgarian and Macedonian the Aorist and the Imperfect coexist with the Perfect, though the form/function correspondences have shifted. In the former language, the exponents of the Perfect, in addition to the function of denoting an action that has occurred at some indefinite period prior to the moment of speaking have typically acquired the function of denoting reported actions or states. In the latter, the function of the Perfect is completely taken over by the marked exponents of the category of Perfective Aspect, while the descendants of the exponents of the Indo-European Perfect have turned into exponents of the newly formed category of Reporting Modality (cf. Tomić 1988a,b).

In endeavouring to reestablish the "disturbed" binary order, Friedman (1978) claims that the Macedonian and Bulgarian descendants of the Indo-European Perfect (equivalents of the auxiliary be plus the active
Participles), along with the Turkish definite di past, are marked for affirmativity and this marking is responsible for the non-affirmative chief contextual variant meaning of the other pasts, which must then be treated as unmarked. But the Bulgarian forms could in no way be marked—they have a higher frequency of occurrence and much wider functional scope than the forms of either the Aorist or the Imperfect. In Macedonian, on the other hand, the forms or the Perfect are marked; however, they do not denote affirmativity but reportedness (cf. Tomic 1983b). In direct contrast with their absence, these forms also contrast with exponents of the grammatical categories of other types of modality as well as with those of tense (the Present and the nascent uniform Past, in which the forms and the functions of the Aorist and the Imperfect are gradually being amalgamated) and those of the Durative and Resultative Aspect. While within each of the verbal categories we have one marked and one unmarked member (the latter being characterized by the absence of morphological marking), in the verbal system as a whole there is a network of markedness relationships of different degrees, which cannot without unnatural simplification be analysed as a hierarchy of dichotomies, built on the basis of the branching of the marked member.

Our discussion so far did not offer even a tentative outline of the network of graded relationships in the theory of markedness. But that was not our aim. All we wanted to do and hope to have done is make a case for a new relative attitude in the treatment of linguistic phenomena. The re-analysis of the criteria for Sprachbund (language union) membership, which follows, will, hopefully, strengthen this case.

6. Armstrong (1981) argues that both the usage and the morphology of the Present and the Aorist in Ancient Greek support the view that the former is unmarked and the latter marked.

7. In addition to the basic function of denoting an action prior to the moment of speaking with effects to the present, they denote reportedness.
While membership in a language family is inherited, membership in a language union develops as a result of the acquisition of sets of common underlying typological properties which contribute to the shaping of a uniform overall typological profile. The number, the extent and the limit of those properties is specified from case to case. For the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund, five crucial properties have been put forward:

(a) substitution of synthetic by analytic means in the declension, leading to a breakdown or a complete disintegration of the case system;

(b) grammaticalization of the category of definiteness through postpositive definite articles;

(c) periphrastic expression of futurity - often with the aid of ossified particles;

(d) loss of the infinitive and its substitution by subordinate nominal clauses;

(e) pronominal reduplication of the object.

Four of the Balkan languages - Albanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian - and a group of dialects of Serbo-Croatian - the Torlak dialects - are said to qualify for full membership in the Balkan Sprachbund, since they have the properties (a) to (e). Modern Greek and Romanian are treated as peripheral members, Serbo-Croatian as a whole is not included at all, whereas Turkish is considered to be "the donor language". Neither the determination of crucial properties nor the distinction between full and peripheral membership are, however, unquestionable. In addition to the five properties listed above, there are a number of others which contribute to the adaptation and leveling of the overall typological profile of the Sprachbund. Furthermore, not only the peripheral Sprachbund members but also the "full-scale" ones have variable attitudes towards both the well established properties and any additional ones. I shall first give sets of examples illustrating the latter and then discuss the variable attitude of individual Balkan languages towards the former.
My first set (or rather sets) of examples illustrate the triple spatial differentiation of the deictics (close to the speaker, close to the addressee and close to a third person), which was discussed above in a different context. This differentiation occurs only in three languages: Turkish, Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian, but is so deeply rooted in all of them that no discussion on the characteristic properties of the Balkan Sprachbund should circumvent it. While in Turkish the triple distinction is made in one determiner/pronoun and four adverbial sets, in Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian it has spread over at least three determiner/pronoun sets and four to six adverbial ones. The sets are given in (1) and (2).

(1) Determiner/pronoun sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T.</th>
<th>M.</th>
<th>SC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deictic</td>
<td>bu/su/o</td>
<td>ovoj/toj/onoj</td>
<td>ovaj/taj/onaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deictic quantit.</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>volkav/tolkav/onolkav</td>
<td>ovoliki/toliki/onoliki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deictic qualit.</td>
<td>-/-</td>
<td>vakov/takov/onakov</td>
<td>ovakov/takav/onakav</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Adverbial sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T.</th>
<th>M.</th>
<th>SC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>böyle/šöyle/šyle</td>
<td>vaka/taka/onaka</td>
<td>ovako/tako/onako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>bukad/šukad/okad</td>
<td>olku/tolku/onolku</td>
<td>ovoliko/toliko/onoliko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sega^8 togaš/</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>burad/šurad/orad</td>
<td>ovde/tuka/onde</td>
<td>ovde/tu/onde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction</td>
<td>buray/šuray/oray</td>
<td>vamu/tamu/onamu</td>
<td>ovamo/tamo/onamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>path</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Macedonian, to boot, as already mentioned, the triple spatial differentiation is reflected in the definite article.

8. The Serbo-Croatian and Macedonian temporal deictic adverbs referring to persons/objects close to the speaker are derived from the Old Church Slavonic root s.
With the second set of examples, given in (3), I would like to draw attention to the remarkable uniformity of perfect formation, clitic placement and word order in general in four of the Balkan Sprachbund languages - Albanian, Aromanian, Greek and Macedonian:

(3) Al. E  
    (clit) have(1st sg pres)  
    lexuar  
    librin.  

Ar. U  
    (clit) have(1st sg pres)  
    güvusitā  
    karta.  

Gr. To  
    (clit) have(1st sg pres)  
    Ξιατασι  
    to βιβλιο

M. ja  
    (clit) have(1st sg pres)  
    pročitano  
    knigata.  

'I've read the book'.

The structural uniformity of the sentences in (3) is even more striking if one compares them to their counterparts in Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian, two Balkan languages with which one of the languages illustrated in (3), Macedonian, is genetically related, one of which is granted full Sprachbund membership, while the other is not considered at all:

(4) B. Pročetoh  
    read(perf simple past 1st sg)  
    knigata.  

SC. Pročitao  
    read(perf act partic masc)  
    am knjigu.

Neither in the Bulgarian nor in the Serbo-Croatian example is there a clitic. The Bulgarian verb is in the simple past tense (the earlier Aorist), while the Serbo-Croatian one is in the typical Slavonic be-Perfect, with the auxiliary following an (inflected) participle, in contrast to the have-Perfектs in Albanian, Aromanian, Greek and Macedonian,

9. The examples from the languages that do not use the Latin alphabet are transcribed.

10. The clitics are actually pronominal reduplications of objects. Such reduplications do not occur in Serbo-Croatian while in Bulgarian they occur (post-verbally) only in communicatively marked sentences.
with the auxiliary preceding the (noninflected) participle. The preparticipial (actually preverbal) clitic and the preparticipial auxiliary are also "crucial" properties of the Balkan Sprachbund, and so is the have-perfect. 11

Even those properties that are attested in all the languages that (on the basis of these attestations) qualify for full Balkan Sprachbund membership, are actually attested through variable sets of exponents with variable morphological and semantic values. Thus, all the languages illustrated in (3) have definiteness markers; their morphonological statuses are, however, different. In Modern Greek we have an independent morpheme, a word; in Macedonian - a solid affix; whereas in Albanian and Aromanian the definiteness signals integrate with other signals and, rather than articles, one gets inflections that (among other things) take care of the feature of definiteness.

Let us give another example: Both Bulgarian and Macedonian express futurity analytically, through descendants of verbs of volition, \( \text{k}\)e and \( \text{št}\)e, respectively. Nevertheless, while \( \text{k}\)e is a completely ossified particle which cooccurs with both present and past tense forms, \( \text{št}\)e has preserved some of its original meaning, occurs only with present tense forms and has a past tense counterpart, fully inflected for person and number. Compare the following two paradigms:

(5) M. \( \text{k}\)e dojdev
    will came (1st sg)

\( \text{k}\)e dojdeše
    will came (2nd sg)

\( \text{k}\)e dojdeše
    will came (3rd sg)

\( \text{k}\)e dojdevme
    will came (1st pl)

\( \text{k}\)e dojdevte
    will came (2nd pl)

\( \text{k}\)e dojdea
    will came (3rd pl)

'would have come'

B. \( \text{št}\)jax
    would (1st sg) to come (1st sg)

\( \text{št}\)eše
    would (2nd sg) to come (2nd sg)

\( \text{št}\)eše
    would (3rd sg) to come (3rd sg)

\( \text{št}\)jaxme
    would (1st pl) to come (1st pl)

\( \text{št}\)jxte
    would (2nd pl) to come (2nd pl)

\( \text{št}\)jxa
    would (3rd pl) to come (3rd pl)

'would have come'
Whereas M. ke cooccurs with the Imperfect of M. dojde, B. štjah, šteše, štjahme, štjahte and štjahha are in construction with the infinitive particle plus the present tense of B. dojde. The Macedonian ossified particle ke can also occur in da 'to' plus present verb form constructions; the meaning of those constructions is not comparable to that of the paradigms in (5), however. Thus:

(6) M. ke da dojdov
    will to came (1st sg)

has one of the following meanings:

(7) (a) I seem to have come/arrived (where I was meant to).
    (b) By all appearances I have come/arrived (where I was meant to).
    (c) It seems/appears that I have come (where I was meant to).

In Macedonian the ossification of ke can be matched by that of the conditional particle bi, whose Bulgarian counterparts, as well as the Serbo-Croatian ones, inflect - at least for first person singular. Compare:

(8) M. Jas bi došol.
    I would come (pass partic m)
B. Az bix doš-l.
    I would come (pass partic m)
Sc. Ja bix došao.
    I would come (pass partic m)
'I would come'.

11. The fact that "the presents" of perfective verbs are never used with present meaning is here irrelevant.
12. While in (5) M. we had an Imperfect here we have an Aorist.
13. I have argued elsewhere (Tomić forthcoming) that in languages which have intensive contacts with genetically remote languages the have-Perf ects are very much alive.
At this point it may be useful to discuss the glossing of the Bulgarian and Macedonian da's in (5) and (6), respectively, by means of the particle to rather than the conjunction that. This may be objectionable to native speakers of Serbo-Croatian, who set up correlations between the Macedonian (and/or Bulgarian) da's and the Serbo-Croatian one. 14

But while in Serbo-Croatian da introduces more than one type of subordinate constructions, in Macedonian and Bulgarian (as well as in some other Balkan languages - in Modern Greek, for example) there is a clear, formal and functional distinction between the conjunction introducing subordinate clauses: M. deka or oti 15, B. če - and the particle da, which actually correlates with infinitival signals in other languages. Consider the following Macedonian - Serbo-Croatian sentence pairs:

(9) M. Znam deka/oti/*da me vidoa.
    know(1st sg) that me(clit) saw(3rd pl)
    SC. Znam da su me videli.
    know(1st sg) that are(3rd pl) me(clit) see(act partic pl)
    'I know that they saw me'.

(10) M. Sakam da/*deka/*oti te vidam.
    want(1st sg) to you(clit) see(1st sg)
    SC. Želim da te vidim.
    want(1st sg) ?that/?to you(clit) see(1st sg)
    te videti
    you(clit) see(infin)
    'I want to see you'.

The Serbo-Croatian da correlates with da in Macedonian only when the SC. da + finite verb construction alternates with an infinitive; otherwise the Macedonian equivalent for SC. da is deka or oti.

14. As a matter of fact, I have had some arguments concerning the glossing of da with native speakers of Serbo-Croatian who have only superfluous knowledge of Macedonian.

15. Deka and oti are in free variation for the language as a whole; the speakers of Macedonian use one or the other depending on their dialectal heritage.
The conjunction/particle distinction, which actually is another Sprachbund feature, shows up in the deletability of M. deka/oti as against the obligatoriness of M. da:

(11) M. Znam me vidoa.
    know(1st sg) me(clit) saw(3rd pl)
    'I know they saw me'.

(12) M. *Sakam te vidam.
    want(1st sg) you(clit) see(1st sg)
    '*I want see you'.

It is, of course, justified to object to the attachment of the label "infinitival particle" to an element which is in construction with a finite verb. But, by glossing M. da with E. to I do not claim that M. da is an infinitival particle. For lack of a better specification, we shall call it "a particle that correlates with infinitival signals in other languages".

It goes without saying that the introduction of the Sprachbund features is not a fait accompli of the Balkan languages, but rather the result of a lasting process, whose intensity differs from language to language and is an argument in favour of grading language union membership, rather than making a distinction between members and non-members. The grading could come as a result of the combination of the functional loads of all the properties that individual languages share with at least two other languages with which they are not in close genetic relationship, but it may be done for one property and then modified with data about the others. The independence of the exponents of individual features and the possibility of their cooccurring with exponents of others may be a good starting point. Since the examination of the data presented in (5) to (8) shows that the Macedonian particles ke and bi are more inde-

16. As for Serbo-Croatian, one may make a distinction between a conjunction and a particle with the same phonological form or else refer to SC.
ependent and have greater freedom of cooccurrence with other elements than their Bulgarian correlates which, in their turn, are more independent and have greater freedom of cooccurrence with other elements than their Serbo-Croatian counterparts, one may tentatively place Macedonian higher than Bulgarian and the latter higher than Serbo-Croatian on the scale of Sprachbund membership and then proceed testing this tentative scale by examining other data and extending it by introducing other languages.

The granting of the status of "a donor language" is also in need of reexamination. In our case, we cannot overlook the fact that Balkan Turkish does differ from the Ottoman (literary) standard - sometimes very perspicuously. For example, the respective translations of the Macedonian sentence (9) into Ottoman (literary) Turkish and the Ohrid dialect of the language, given in (10) and (11), are very distinct:

(13) M. Mi se doağa.
     me(Dat clitic) (impers clitic) come(impers)
     'I would like to come'.

(14) LitT. Celmek istiyorum.
     come(infin) want(contin 1st sg)

(15) OhT. Var geleceğim.
     have come(fut 1st sg)

Since no structural similarity between (13) and (14) is observed, one may be led to assume that the differences between (14) and (15) have nothing to do with the contact between Turkish and Macedonian. Yet, the usage of var "have" as an auxiliary and its placement before the finite verb are most likely contact reflexes.¹⁷

¹⁷. Most of the languages of the Balkan Sprachbund are have-languages (cf. Isačenko 1974); so the choice of the "auxiliary" is in line with the choices of the other Sprachbund members.
Due to the fact that alien notions integrate in a given language more readily if form and function are not in a one to many relationship, Sprachbund languages develop a tendency towards analyticty. The changes through which this tendency is materialized may make some aspects of two genetically unrelated languages look very much alike. Thus, the Common Slavonic preposition bez 'without' has developed a particle function in the Balkan Slavonic languages, which in Macedonian has a very wide scope, strongly resembling that of the Turkish particle me. Compare the scope of bez in the Macedonian sentence (16) to that of me in its Turkish counterpart (17):

(16) M. Dojdov bez da sakam.
    came(1st sg) without to want(1st sg)
    'I came without wanting to (come)'.

(17) T. Istemeyerek geldim.
    want without(nominalization) came(1st sg)
    'I came without wanting to (come)'.

But resemblances like the one between the scopes of M. bez and T. me come as a result of the tendency to use exponents which can be added to a structure as ready-made entities, without adjustments, and thus facilitate the integration of novel notions, whose grammaticalization has been made necessary by language contact.

Much as one tries to make the structures of genetically remote languages of a Sprachbund close, those of (even remotely) genetically related ones will always be closer. Let us compare the structure of the Albanian sentence:

(18) Al. Ertha pa dashur.
    came(1st sg) not want(adverb)
    'I came without wanting to (come)'.

to the structures of the Macedonian sentence in (16) and the Turkish one in (17). Though in (18) the negative particle is the equivalent of 'not', while in (16) and (17) it is the equivalent of 'without', the
structure of the Albanian sentence is much more like the structure of the Macedonian sentence than like the structure of the Turkish one. But the degree of Sprachbund membership is not assessed on the basis of the closeness of the overall structures and vocabularies of the respective languages; what counts are the features which a Sprachbund language shares with other Sprachbund members but does not share with the non-Sprachbund members of the language family to which it belongs.

The Sprachbund membership and markedness issues which I have considered do not result in any theoretical or methodological proposals. My aim was not so ambitious. All I wanted to do and hope to have done is motivate thinking in the direction of grading linguistic behaviour.
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