

REMARKS ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION OF SOME DOUBLETS OF PLURAL OF NOUNS

Artan Xhaferaj

Universiteti “Ismail Qemali”, Sheshi “Pavarësia”, Skelë, Vlorë
artanxhaferaj@yahoo.com

Abstract

The book “Gjuha letrare shqipe për të gjithë” (1976) is the best document that analyses the formations of plural of nouns. In fact the book is not the ideal one where everything is said in a definitive way. There are some reasons, which are known in general, anyway the essential issue is that the theory suffers the lack of proved arguments about the testing practice. Also, this theory suffers the lack of an entire specific research (about the plural of nouns). This research was realized only in German language in 2007, by the well known German researcher of Albanian language W. Fiedler with the book titled “Die Pluralbildung im Albanischen”. This monographic research reflects completely and scrupulously not only the state of tool forms of plural of nouns in Albanian language, but also the classification, rapports, and tendencies of their future developments. Thoughts, discussions and specific articles are presented about this issue, especially in jubilee conferences about the Orthographic Congress. After a long period of time still a complete testing for the use or rapports of tendencies of future developments of plural forms is lacking. In this article we shall try to introduce the results of a partial testing for some doublets and some problematic forms that are faced with the students at University “Ismail Qemali” of Vlora. The plural noun forms that are noticed for the nouns *byrek*, *hendek*, *dyfek* 61% of students used them in plural forms *byrek-ë*, *hendek-ë*, *dyfek-ë*, while for the word *gardh* 77% of interviewed students used the plural form *gardh-e*. This article enriches data for developments tendency of plural forms, aiming at improvement of morphological norm of standard Albanian language.

Keywords: *doublet, tendency, plural formant, test, plural form.*

The Orthographic Congress of the Albanian language, in particular way, not only crowned a long stage of efforts to form an unique and a common language, but also opened the way to further improvement of the orthographic norm of this language in accordance with the further development of the language and our national culture (DGJSH, 1973). This expounded orientation on the general principles of this Congress spontaneously predict even the sociolinguistic investigation of prospective developments, because the trend towards the common language and the limitation of dialectism must be adapted to social needs. But, although the linguistic development is continuous, the linguistic determination is conditioned by convincing choice – sometimes intuitive – of the future.

The standard of Albanian language is scientifically achieved with maturity and is reflected in many theoretical and practical normative works, but is still far from practical application in our schools.

Difficulties of implementation are different and known; their dimension is not the same even within a plane. Therefore, the Orthographic Congress had to deal not only with the orthographic matter, but even with some matter of morphology and syntax. One of the specific issues of normative morphology was the problem of the formation of plural nouns. This problem was stressed even in the final document of the Congress. Due to a general morphological unreached state, about 50 plural forms were accepted as doublets. We can mention some of them: *lab*, *çam*, *gardh*, *çakall*, *hamall*, *gjysh*, *nip*, *pinjoll*, *kec* etc.

The best document of normative theory of the formation of plural nouns with the practice of applying this norm is the book “Gjuha letrare shqipe për të gjithë” appeared in 1976. But even there it is not said everything in a perfect way. There are several reasons, which are generally recognized, however the essential thing is that the direct studies through testing practice were lacking. Even a special study for the plural of nouns has lacked. This study was realized only in German in 2007 by the well-known German scholar W. Fiedler with “Die Pluralbildung im Albanischen”. This monograph fully and scrupulously reflects not only the state of medium of plural forms of nouns in Albanian language, but even the classification, relationships and their development trends. Thoughts, discussions and special articles are often given and written, especially in the jubilee conference of the Congress of Orthographic.

After a long period of time still a complete testing for the use or reports and tendencies of future developments of plural forms is lacking.

In this article we are trying to present the results of a partial test for some doublets and even for any problematic form that we have developed with the students of the first and second year of linguistic branch at the University “Ismail Qemali” of Vlora. The linguistic culture of these students is generally weak. So, for 140 students surveyed for the plural form of nouns *oficer*, *shofer*, *student*, *bilbil* etc., 22% used the form with the formant *-ë*, 54% used the formant *-a* and 24% of them were observed oscillations (one time they use the first formant, and next time the second one). The tendency of the formation of plural with the formant *-a* toward the formant *-ë* in the masculine nouns is present even in the southern dialects.

Regarding to the plural forms of nouns *lab* and *çam*, about 23% of students used the formant **-ë**, 58% used the formant **-ër** and in 19% of the respondents were observed oscillations. Certainly, the plural formant **-ër** has a wide spread, mainly to masculine animated nouns (Totoni, 1971), but it does not necessarily mean that this formant should be given priority. The same situation is presented to the plural of nouns *nip*, and *gjysh*, where 88% of respondents used the formant **-ër** and 12% used the formant **-a**. So that, for the above cases, seems more correct the argumentation that “priority toward the doublet must be placed not on the basis of density (quantity), but primarily on the basis of quality.” (E. Likaj 2002:133). In our opinion the plural forms *lab-ë*, *çam-ë* and *nip-a* are simpler and more qualificative. In the same way suggests even F. Raka (2004).

Birthplace of students	Number of students	<i>oficer, student, bilbil</i>			<i>lab, çam</i>			<i>nip, gjysh</i>	
		with -ë	with -a	oscillation	with -ë	with -ër	oscillation	with -a	with -ër
Vlorë	54	12	30	12	9	34	5	3	45
Fier	52	10	27	15	7	33	8	5	43
Berat	12	3	7	2	3	3	4	-	10
Lushnjë	9	1	5	3	4	2	2	2	6
Skrapar	2	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	2
Elbasan	2	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	2
Librazhd	3	2	1	-	1	-	2	1	2
Gramsh	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Tiranë	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
Durrës	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
Përmet	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
Tepelenë	2	-	1	1	-	1	1	-	2
St. in total	140	31	75	34	32	82	26	16	124
Totally in %	100	22.1	53.5	24.4	22.8	58.5	18.7	11.4	88.6

Table 1. Plural of nouns *oficer, shofer, student, bilbil, lab, çam, nip, gjysh*.

Some linguists have introduced the idea that there is a trend to extend the plurals with morpheme **-j** in instead of **-nj** in nouns such as *shkëmbinj, ullinj, barinj, arinj, minj, hunj, ftonj, lumenj* etc... These arguments that are brought by F. Raka (2002), E. Hysaj (2002), E. Likaj (2003), M. Çeliku (2009), K. Topalli (2011), A. Haxhi and T. Osmani (2011) etc... justify such a formation. However, Mimoza Kores's opinion (2011) is that in the southern dialects there is not a generalization of formant **-j** and especially the educated generation is one of the cases that made no errors in writing. Her opinion corresponds with our results. The tests showed that 100% of the students used as a plural formant **-nj** instead of **-j** in the nouns *bari, ari, mi, ulli, ftua, thua, hu, pe, lumë, shkop*. From the above cases, we shall distinguish as more problematic plural forms with **-j** in masculine nouns that end with stressed **-i**, as: *bari-j, ari-j, mi-j* etc..., because **[j]** is weaker than **[nj]** and the connection between **[i]** and **[j]**

would create difficulties in pronunciation, because of the viewpoint of articulatory and acoustic characteristic these sounds are close to each other. In our opinion, based on the results of the survey, the plural forms with **-nj**, are temporarily more acceptable.

Regarding to the plural noun *lot* 71% of respondents used the form *lot-ë* in contrary to normative form *lot*. The form *lot-ë*, seeing that discern the stem of plural from singular, may be more acceptable. This form was also supported by A. Dhrimo (2003), R. Memushaj (2007) and M. Kore (2011). From our tests with the highest percentage is presented even the plural form of *net-ë* (about 93%) toward the normative form *net*. While the formant **-ë** at the plural form *gju-një* seems excessive. 71.4% of the students used as a plural form *gjunj*, while 28.6% used the plural form *gjunj-ë*. The distinction between the singular and the plural form at this noun is clear even without the formant **-ë**, so that, we judge as fair argumentation the opinions that are given by R. Memushaj (2007, 2012), K. Topalli (2011), and M. Kore (2011).

Birthplace of students	Number of students	<i>bari, ari, ftua</i> etc.		<i>lot</i>		<i>net</i>		<i>gjunj</i>	
		with -nj	with -j	with -ë	without -ë	with -ë	without -ë	with -ë	without -ë
Vlorë	54	54	-	38	16	52	2	14	40
Fier	52	52	-	40	12	48	4	15	37
Berat	12	12	-	8	4	10	2	1	11
Lushnjë	9	9	-	5	4	8	1	4	5
Skrapar	2	2	-	2	-	2	-	1	1
Elbasan	2	2	-	1	1	2	-	-	2
Librazhd	3	3	-	1	2	3	-	3	-
Gramsh	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
Tiranë	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
Durrës	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
Përmet	1	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
Tepelenë	2	2	-	1	1	2	-	-	2
St.in total	140	140	-	100	40	131	9	40	100
Totally in %	100	100	-	71.4	28.6	93.5	6.5	28.6	71.4

Tabela 2. Plural of nouns *bari, ari, mi, ulli, ftua, thua, hu, pe, lumë, shkop, lot, natë* and *gju*.

Regarding to the developments that are observed in the doublet plural forms of nouns *byrek, hendek, dyfek*, as the professor E. Likaj has stressed “for practical and generalizing reasons, should go after a complete protection of the stems of respective nouns, shortening simultaneously even the medium of plural.”(2011:138), So that, the plural form of *byrek-ë, hendek-ë, dyfek-ë* are more acceptable, which is also confirmed by the results of the survey: 61% of students used in the plural the above forms. The same argument applies to the word

gardh where 77% of respondents used as the plural form *gardh-e*. Also, the word *kec*, the plural form with wider use, according to our tests, results *kec-a* (about 69%) in accordance with the recent views of linguists (Table 3).

Birthplace of students	Number of students	<i>kec</i>		<i>byrek, dyfek</i> etc...		<i>gardh</i>	
		with -a	with -ër	with -ë	with -qe	with -e	gjerdhe
Vlorë	54	32	22	30	24	38	16
Fier	52	40	12	34	18	42	10
Berat	12	8	4	7	5	10	2
Lushnjë	9	7	2	6	3	8	1
Skrapar	2	2	-	1	1	-	2
Elbasan	2	2	-	1	1	1	1
Librazhd	3	1	2	3	-	3	-
Gramsh	1	1	-	1	-	1	-
Tiranë	1	1	-	1	-	1	-
Durrës	1	1	-	-	1	1	-
Përmet	1	1	-	1	-	1	-
Tepelenë	2	1	1	1	1	2	-
St. in total	140	97	43	86	54	108	32
Totally in %	100	69.3	30.7	61	39	77.2	22.8

Table 3. Plural of nouns *kec*, *byrek*, *dyfek*, *hendek* and *gardh*.

An unclear situation is seen in the unanimated nouns ending with **-on**. In the book *Gjuha letrare shqipe për të gjithë* (1976:22) as normative plural forms are presented: *bidon-ë*, *kamion-ë*, *timon-ë*, *vagon-ë*, but *kupon-a*. These forms also gives R. Memushaj in his definitions (2005:61), while in the Vocabulary of 1984 the plural form of *kupon* is given with formant **-ë**. In *Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe I* (2002:98-99) for the noun *kamion* is given the plural form *kamion-ë* with the formant **-ë**, but for the noun *vagon* is given the form *vagon-a* with the formant **-a**. According to the results of our testing, for this type of nouns, the formant **-a** prevailed against the formant **-ë**; 86% of students used the plural forms as *kamion-a*, *vagon-a*, *kupon-a*, *limon-a* etc.. But it can not happen to all the masculine nouns, unanimated, that end with **-on**, such as *aksion-e*, *zakon-e*, *ballkon-e*, *sallon-e* etc., whom form the plural with the formant **-e**, because the semantic, meaning of the word, exercises the influence over the choice of suffix and over productivity of medium of the plural formation (Fiedler, W. 2011:154)

Likewise, the noun *xham* appears with two-versions of plural forms: *xham-a* and *xham-e*. About 88% of students used the plural form with the formant **-a**. Even F. Sulejmani (2003), and A. Haxhi and T. Osmani (2011) and E. Pema (2012), support the form *xham-a*. Also, with a high percentage (about 68%) with the formant **-a** appears even the plural form of noun *grusht*, in contrary to the normative form *grusht-e*. The noun *grusht* at Bogdani in a plural form appears *grusht-a*. In this form is used even today, says M. Kore (2011). While E.

Pema (2012), supporting this form, stresses as the function of this (*grusht-a*) serves even the analogy with nouns *rreshhta*, *vreshhta*. Regarding to the plural form of the noun *gisht* 27% of students used the form *gisht-a* and 73% of them used the form *gisht-ërinj*. M Çeliku (1972, 2009) has said that the form *gishta* prevails. Even F. Sulejmani (2003), A. Haxhi and T. Osmani (2011) and A. Hamiti and A. Qamili (2011) propose the plural form *gisht-a*.

Despite of the test results for the word *gisht*, we think that the plural forms *limon-a*, *vagon-a*, *kamion-a*, *xham-a*, *grusht-a* and *gisht-a* are simpler, more qualitative and easier to be used.

Birthplace of students	Number of students	<i>limon, vagon, kamion</i>		<i>xham</i>		<i>grusht</i>		<i>gisht</i>	
		with - ë	with - a	with -a	with -e	with -a	with -e	with -a	with -ërinj
Vlorë	54	8	46	48	6	38	16	17	37
Fier	52	6	46	45	7	34	18	13	39
Berat	12	2	10	10	2	8	4	3	9
Lushnjë	9	-	9	8	1	6	3	2	7
Skrapar	2	1	1	1	1	2	-	-	2
Elbasan	2	1	1	2	-	1	1	-	2
Librazhd	3	-	3	3	-	2	1	2	1
Gramsh	1	1	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
Tiranë	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1
Durrës	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1
Përmet	1	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	1
Tepelenë	2	-	2	2	-	1	1	1	1
St. in total	140	19	121	123	17	95	45	38	102
Totally in %	100	13.6	86.4	87.8	12.2	67.8	32.2	27.2	72.8

Table 4. Plural of nouns *limon, vagon, kamion, xham, grusht* and *gisht*.

In this article we tried to present the development trends for some morphological doublets and even any problematic form. We stress that is necessary to develop direct studies for such issues, because they help to reach the right solutions, selecting the correct and easier form to be acquired, making the standard of Albanian language more constant, and more appropriate to the needs and demands of the new millennium.

References:

- Bajçinca, I. (2002). Çështje të shqipës së sotme letrare vështruar në aspektin teorik e të zbatimit në praktikë. *Konferenca shkencore: Gjuha letrare kombëtare dhe bota shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 103.
- Çeliku, M. (2009). Shmangiet kryesore në sistemin emëror. *Çështje të shqipes standarde*. Tiranë, f. 226.
- DGjSh. (1973). *Drejtshkrimi i gjuhës shqipe*. Tiranë, f. 36.
- Dhrimo, A. (1992). Lidhje fonetiko-morfologjike në drejtshkrimin e gjuhës shqipe. *Konferenca shkencore: Gjuha letrare kombëtare dhe bota shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 266-272.
- Dhrimo, A. (2003). Çështje morfologjike të normës drejtshkrimore. *Konferenca shkencore: Shqipja standarde dhe shoqëria shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 211.
- Dodi, A. (2004). *Fonetika dhe fonologjia e gjuhës shqipe*. Tiranë.
- Fiedler, W. (2007). *Die Pluralbildung im Albanischen*, Prishtinë.
- Fiedler, W. (2011). Tendencat e formimit të shumësit në shqipen e sotme. *Shqipja në etapën e sotme: Politikat e përmirësimit dhe të pasurimit të standardit*. Tiranë, f. 154.
- FShS. (1984). *Fjalor i shqipes së sotme*, Tiranë.
- GGjSh. (2002). *Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe I*. Tiranë. f. 98-98.
- Halimi, M. (1992). Rreth shumësit të disa emrave mashkullorë. *Konferenca shkencore: Gjuha letrare kombëtare dhe bota shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 137-144.
- Hamiti, A dhe Qamili, A. (2011). Shtrirja dialektore e fjalës dhe përzgjedhja e formës normative. *Shqipja në etapën e sotme: Politikat e përmirësimit dhe të pasurimit të standardit*. Tiranë, f. 479-480.
- Haxhi, A dhe Osmani, T. (2011). Forma të shumësit në rrafshin e planifikimit gjuhësor të shqipes. *Shqipja në etapën e sotme: Politikat e përmirësimit dhe të pasurimit të standardit*. Tiranë, f. 167-172.
- Hysaj, E. (2002). Rreth prirjeve në formimin e shumësit të disa emrave. *Seminari XX për gjuhën letësinë dhe kulturën shqiptare*. Prishtinë.
- Kore, M. (2011). Për një përmirësim të normës morfologjike në standard. *Shqipja në etapën e sotme: Politikat e përmirësimit dhe të pasurimit të standardit*. Tiranë, f. 205- 215.
- Kryeziu, B. (2011). Shqipja mes globalizimit dhe variantizimit. *Shqipja në etapën e sotme: Politikat e përmirësimit dhe të pasurimit të standardit*. Tiranë, f. 92.
- E. Likaj. (2002). Çështje të normës morfologjike në sistemin foljor. *Konferenca shkencore: Gjuha letrare kombëtare dhe bota shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 133.
- Likaj, E. (2011). Morfologjia e shqipes standarde dhe zhvillimet e reja. *Shqipja në etapën e sotme: Politikat e përmirësimit dhe të pasurimit të standardit*. Tiranë, f. 138.
- Memushaj, R. (2005). Norma gramatikore. *Shqipja standarde*. Tiranë, f. 68.
- Memushaj, R. (2012). Çështje të normës morfologjike. *Për shqipen standarde*. Tiranë, f. 64.
- Mulaku, L. (2003). Për ndryshimin e shkrimit të trajtave të disa fjalëve dhe për pasurimin e leksikut të shqipes standarde. *Konferenca shkencore: Shqipja standarde dhe shoqëria shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 205.

- Nesimi, V. (2002). Për një thjeshtim të disa formave të shumësit të emrave mashkullorë. *Konferenca shkencore: Gjuha letrare kombëtare dhe bota shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 146.
- Osmani, T. (2003). Përsosja e standardit gjuhësor në fushën e morfologjisë dhe të drejtshkrimit. *Konferenca shkencore: Shqipja standarde dhe shoqëria shqiptare sot*, Tiranë. f. 215.
- Pema, E. (2012). Norma morfologjike në përdorimin e formave të shumësit të emrave dhe zbatimi i saj në shkollë. *Mikrotezë për MND në gjuhësi*. Tiranë. f. 50-53.
- Raka, F. (2004). Përsosja e mëtejme e normës së shqipes standarde. *Normëzimi i shqipes ndër shekuj*. Prishtinë, f. 274.
- Sulejmani, F. (2000). Fjalët me forma dyvariantëshe. *Konferenca shkencore kushtuar 25-vjetorit të Kongresit të Drejtshkrimit të gjuhës shqipe*. Tiranë, f. 45-49.
- Sulejmani, F. (2003). Më pak përjashtime e më shumë përgjithësime. *Konferenca shkencore: Shqipja standarde dhe shoqëria shqiptare sot*. Tiranë, f. 185-197.
- Topalli, K. (2011). Drejtshkrimi i shqipes si sistem. *Shqipja në etapën e sotme: Politikat e përmirësimit dhe të pasurimit të standardit*. Tiranë, f. 138.
- Totoni M. (1971). *Vëzhgime rreth të folmeve të Kurveleshit*, në *Dialektologjia shqiptare I*, Tiranë, f. 61.