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Weigand (1923) was the first to observe that the Bulgarian 'perfect', i.e. the past indefinite, can be used with a present meaning to express surprise in a manner reminiscent of the Albanian adm irative:

(1) Če tja bila xubava naštata Bulgarija, (Konstantinov 1973:94)
    ...po qenka e bukur kjo Bullgarija jonë, (Konstantinov 1975:104)
    Meğer bizim Bulgaristan’ımiz güzelmiş, (Konstantinov 1972:156)
    ...how beautiful our Bulgaria is.

As can be seen from the first example, this same usage occurs in Turkish with the mis-past, as was already observed by Conev (1910/1911:14-15), although he said nothing about the meaning of the usage. Since Weigand’s and Conev’s articles, there have been no comparative studies of these forms except for some observations such as those in articles by Fiedler (e.g. 1968) and Demiraj (1971). The major focus of scholars attempting to account for adm irative usage in Bul garian has been the demonstration that it is a use of the reported (e.g. Andrejčin 1944:311), despite the fact that the event described is witnessed, or a use of the perfect, i.e. the past definite, (e.g. Demina 1959:328), despite the fact that it refers to present time and lacks the third person auxiliary. This paper will study adm irative forms and usages in the three above-mentioned languages by means of a systematic comparison of the relevant verb form usage in Konstantinov’s Baj Ganjo in the Bulgarian original (1973), and in Albanian (1975) and Turkish (1972) translations, thus showing the relationship of Bulgarian adm irativity to that of Albanian and Turkish.

Despite the obvious difficulties connected with the use of translations, Baj Ganjo is an excellent source for this comparison, because the language is highly colloquial (the adm irative rarely occurs outside of dialogue [Schmaus 1966:105, 115]) and because the linguistic and sociocultural orientation of Baj Ganjo makes it readily translatable into the other languages of the Balkaria. In this paper, the Albanian translation rather than the Bulgarian original will function as the basis of comparison, due to the fact that the Albanian adm irative is a morphologically distinct and therefore unambiguously identifiable category, whereas the Bulgarian and Turkish adm iratives are merely specific uses of more general verb forms and are not independent grammatical categories. Since the present tense meaning of adm irative forms and usages constitutes a major part of their problematic nature, and since nonpresent adm irative forms in Albanian are clearly later and secondary, only present adm iratives will be considered here. In the 143 pages of the Albanian translation of Baj Ganjo there are 79 adm irative forms, 59 of which are present (17 perfect, 2 imperfect, 1 pluperfect).

The first point to be made in comparing Albanian present adm iratives with verb forms in the other languages is the fact that the overwhelming majority correspond to simple presents, and many of the remaining forms have no correspondences at all due to differences in the styles of translation. This can be seen clearly in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>present admirative</th>
<th>present tense</th>
<th>nothing</th>
<th>some form of past tense (Big. in 'l Turk. in 'miq')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following are typical:

(2) Vij alywem bez hjlab jadete! — aldeca, se baj Ganjo (p.58 of the 1973 edition)

(3) No civilizacijata kalkvi čudesna ne jànd (27)

(4) Ami že kakva stois na kafeneto. Latoge si svoboden? (30)

(5) Tuj li? (50)

Examples (2), (3) and (4) show a gradation from polite surprise to sarcasm (dubitativity). Example (5) is of the same type as example (2), but it has a verb form only in the Albanian translation for stylistic reasons. The difference between (2) and (5) on the one hand and (3) and (4) on the other can be said to be a matter of orientation: the former are positive and the latter are negative. Be that as it may, the chief characteristic of all these examples is the fact that the Albanian admiratives do not correspond to admiration usage in Bulgarian and Turkish.

The following examples show complete correspondence in admirative forms and usages in all three languages:

(6) Bravo, be Gunjo — provikna se baj Ganjo, — ti si bil cjal Bismark. (109)

(7) Prostì bìll bulgarite, a! (33)

(8) C...c...c...I čexite imat boshle, bravo! (49)

Example (1) also falls into this category; it expresses genuine surprise and delight at the beauty of the Bulgarian countryside. Example (6) expresses admiration, but with a humorous overtone. Example (7), however, is another matter. This usage is a type of reported-dubitative, as though Baj Ganjo were sarcastically quoting other people. On a positive-negative axis, (1), (2), (5), and (6) are on one side while (3), (4), and (7) are on the other.

In the following examples, the Albanian admirative corresponds to admiration usage in only one of the other two languages:

(9) Bulgarin! I tuj bilò bulgarin! Njama za pet pari patriotizùm! (84)

Bulgari! E ky na i theìka vetës bulgar. S'ke asnjë thrime patriotizmi në shpër! (92)

Bulgari! Bul-gari! Bu da bulgar geqìnëtor, baksanuz! Bej paralik jurtjasëk diuygusy yol adamda! (135)

Bulgarian! Some Bulgarian he is! He doesn't have a nickel's worth of patriotism (in him)!

(10) Rektora, kaj, ne go ostava. (79)

Rektori, gjoja, nuk e luajka! (86)

Rektòr, razi gelëmëtë. (124)

The rector, he says, won't let him

Example (8) is of the same type as (1) and (6), but the present tense of the Bulgarian original has been translated by an Albanian admirative and a Turkish mis-past. Similarly in example (9), which belongs in the same group as (4), (5), and especially (7), the Bulgarian-Albanian corres-
pensation does not appear in the Turkish translation, where the meaning is expressed by other, lexical, means. In (10), as in (8), the Bulgarian present tense has been translated by the Albanian adirmative and the Turkish mis-past, only here the meaning is simply one of reporting. It is clear from the context in which the example occurs that Baj Ganto is reporting the words of a student without any dubitative (sarcastic) overtones, although there may be a nuance of admirativity (surprise). These examples demonstrate the facultativity of such usages.

The following examples have no admirative forms or usages in them, although their mean-
ings would lead one to expect such:

(11) Strašen si djavol, baj Ganto! (112)
Djali i madh je, o baj Ganto! (125)
Şeytan gbi kurnaşin be, Bay Gano! (193)
What a devil you are, Baj Ganto!
(12) A be toj e onzi be... (89)
Ore, ai ̄eshtē... (99)
O, yahu. O ̄iste. (146)
Hey man, that's him!

Example (11) is an expression of surprise of the same type as in (6). Example (12) is especially important. Here is a genuine exclamation of surprise on the part of Baj Ganto when he unexpectedly spots the main villain of the story walking down the street. The significance of these last examples will be discussed below.

The twelve examples given here illustrate the main types of admirative usages and corre-

The second point follows from the first: in Bulgarian, admirative usage does not occur as an expression of surprise at an action which constitutes a single specific instance and/or actually takes place in the presence of the speaker. This is especially apparent in (12). Here is a sudden recognition presented as an action rather than as a state and which occurs in a single instant in the presence of the speaker and causes an exclamation of genuine, unpremeditated surprise. In this context, it would be grammatically incorrect to say "A be toj bil onzi be! Thus admirative usage in Bulgarian is not only limited to states and general truths, but it also is not an expression of surprise but rather a statement of surprise, as can be seen by comparing examples such as (1) and (6) with (12).

Since the situation in Turkish is more or less the same as in Bulgarian, Albanian will now be examined. The foregoing examples include two uses of the Albanian admirative which correspond to uses of the reported in Bulgarian and the mis-past in Turkish: ordinary reportedness (e.g. [10], although Bulgarian has an ordinary present here), and dubitative ([7] and [9], and to some extent [3] and [4]). The verb in (4) is of particular interest. Here, in contrast to the other dubitative examples, the action described by the verb ndëjë ‘you’re sitting’ (in the original Bulgarian stoës ‘you’re standing’) is not in doubt, rather it is the other clause in the sentence which is not believed. Nevertheless, the doubt is expressed by means of amazement at the observed action.
This leads to the connection between the three concepts: reportedness, dubitativity (doubt) and admirativity (surprise). According to Darden (1977), admirative usage in Bulgarian is derived from emotively marked, nonliteral dubitative usage which is itself an ironic or sarcastic use of the reported. Thus the forms *bili* and *bilo* in (7) and (9) can be understood as reports of some other person's words which the speaker does not believe. Hence admirative usage results from a description of an unexpectedly discovered fact the veracity of which the speaker is entirely convinced of, but the speaker expresses, or rather states, surprise by means of a nonliteral dubitative usage which has the effect of an exclamation of the type *I simply can't believe that* ...

If ordinary admirative examples such as (1) are considered, there are two possible explanations for Bulgarian admirative usage. On the one hand, based on the fact that this usage occurs almost exclusively with the verbs *bili* and *imai*, and always describes a state or general truth which is ordinarily observed by the speaker, it can be said that the admirative is a use of the perfect (i.e. the past indefinite) where the state or truth existed in the past, when the speaker was unaware of it, and continues into the present, when the speaker unexpectedly learns of it and says, in effect, *Az ne mislex, če bilo taka, a sega viždam, če e taka,* 'I didn’t think that it was so, but now I see that it is so'. In admirative usage, the verb can be said to agree with the pastness of the state or truth such that the *e* ‘is’ in the second clause is transformed into *bilo* ‘was’ as in the first clause (cf. Andrejčin 1938:68). On the other hand, since there is no auxiliary in the third person, and due to the meanings of surprise and presentness, and due to the fact that the surprise stated by admirative usage is not so serious as a genuine exclamation of surprise (cf. [6] and [12]: in [6] *si bili* can be replaced by *si* as in [11], whereas in [12] *e* cannot be replaced by *bili*), it can be said that the admirative is an emotive use of an ordinary cognitive form (cf. Stankiewicz 1964:240) in the following manner: The dubitative is an expression of genuine disbelief by means of the sarcastic use of a reported form which usually repeats the words of a real or hypothetical interlocutor as in (7) (v. also Maslov 1955:314, 2a). The admirative, then, is a marked dubitative which expresses insincere disbelief, i.e. surprise, as in (6) (v. also Maslov 1955: 314, 2a).

From this material it can be gathered that admirative usage in Bulgarian, like the position of Bulgarian admirativity in comparison with Albanian and Turkish, is something intermediate. The Albanian admirative is a form which is probably marked for some sort of noncommitment and which occurs with all verbs, since it is an independent grammatical category with a distinct set of forms. The Turkish admirative is a use of the *mîg*-past of ‘be’, 3 sg *imîg*, which is derived from the fact that the *mîg*-past is unmarked with respect to the *di*-past in much the same manner as in Bulgarian, i.e. the *di*-past, like the Bulgarian past definite, is marked for confirmation on the part of the speaker. From this it follows that the *mîg*-past is not so marked, and it acquires the chief contextual variant meaning of ‘nonconfirmative’, which gives rise to ‘reported’, whence ‘dubitative’, which produces ‘admirative’. But this occurs only with the principle verbs of state, *imîg*, perhaps because the *mîg*-past was originally a perfect (Menges 1868:130) and because *imîg* has far more auxiliary functions in Turkish than does *bili* in Bulgarian. Admirative usage in Bulgarian is restricted to verbs of state or general truth. Thus it cannot occur with any verb as in Albanian, but it can occur with more verbs than in Turkish. From a typological viewpoint, the Bulgarian admirative occupies a position between the Turkish and the Albanian.

Admirative usage also occupies an intermediate position within the Bulgarian verbal system, viz. between the reported and the perfect. In its stativity, the admirable appears to be a use of the perfect, but in its emotiveness it appears to be a nonliteral use of the dubitative. If it is acknowledged that the perfect can occur without an auxiliary and the reported can occur with one in the third person, as is indicated in examples in Andrejčin (1938:44-45) and Demina (1959:322, n.36, 324, n.40), then it is necessary to say that admirative usage is not a separate category as in Albanian, nor it is a single usage of a single verb within the framework of a single tense as in Turkish, but rather it is a facultative usage (cf. [6] and [11] as well as [8]) transitional between the perfect and the reported which cannot be assigned with certainty to either category.
NOTES

1 Expressions such as Vaýalo! ‘It is raining!’ can be explained in the following manner: such an expression cannot be used as it begins to rain but only after the raining has already begun, i.e. the form is used in relation to the action as an already existing state. In Turkish, imiş is used in this manner as both an independent and as an auxiliary verb, but there may be other difficulties (v. Başkan 1968:7).

2 This can be seen from examples such as the following:
(i) İnanimyorum kim o adam bunu yapmış/yaptı.
Ne var o če tozi čovek tova e napravi/napravi tova.
I don’t believe that that man did this.
It is not possible to enter this in the details in this paper (v. Friedman 1978)

3 For example:
(ii) Súbrali se bjaja ot devet sela xora da prazdnuvat denja... Naduli gajdi dvamata čobani ot Balkana, deto letuvat u nas (Andrejčin 1938:45).
People from nine villages gathered to celebrate the day... The two shepherds from the Balkan Mountains who were spending the summer with us inflated bagpipes.
(iii) ...srečinam se edna babička, nosi dva gulića... Kupixi ga – kazva... Momčeto mi e bolno... – Ti – kazva – kakva si, ne ti li e sram... Daj sam gulićite... A kato ti če bilo bolno deteto – kazva Xadži Petur – na ti pari da go ceris (Demina 1959:322, n.36).
...we met a little old woman, she is carrying two pigeons... I bought them – she says... My boy is ill...
– Vo – he says – what are you, aren’t you ashamed... Give the pigeons here... And since your child is ill (you say) – says Hadži Petur – here is money for you to cure him.

REFERENCES


Başkan, Özcan. 1968. “Interchangeability of Tenses in Colloquial Turkish.” Litera (Istanbul), 9, 4-8.


