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**Surprise! Surprise! Arumanian Has Had an Admirative!**

**Victor A. Friedman**

The development of marked status categories—i.e., verb forms and usages specifying the speaker’s level of commitment to the truth of the utterance and referred to by terms such as evidential, reported, dubitative, admiralitative, witnessed, etc.—has never figured in the catalogue of classic Balkanisms. This can be attributed largely to their apparent absence from Greek (but cf. Bseviev 1928) and Balkan Romance,¹ coupled with their elusive nature; unlike obvious phenomena such as definite articles, modal subordinators, future auxiliaries, and numeral formation, status categories are difficult to define—as seen in the voluminous literature that has evolved around them—and sometimes even to identify—as seen in the fact that they are not mentioned in the earliest grammars of the languages in which they are attested (cf. Párvev 1975, Ismajli 1982, Kasstrati 1980). Moreover, due to their expressive semantic nature, marked nonconfirmative status categories and usages are absent or rare in textual sources, especially ordinary narrative prose. In their studies of Balkan linguistics, Sandfeld (1930: 119–20), Feuillet (1986: 67), and Schaller (1975: 79, 94) all treat the Albanian and Balkan Slavic phenomena as a bilateral correspondence at best.² What is more, in the decades since Sandfeld’s epochal study, the various Balkan languages have achieved significant degrees of standardization, with the result that the surveys conducted in recent decades rely mainly on literary sources rather than the dialectal material that was the basis of earlier works.³ Thus, for example, recent investigations generally take standard Romanian as representative of Balkan Romance as a whole.

In this paper I examine a specific realization of the category of status—which for the sake of convenience and tradition I shall call admirativiti—namely, a verbal construction that occurs in an Arumanian dialect from the village of Gorna Belica (Beila di Sus), a village north of Struga in southwestern Macedonia near the Albanian border. This construction has not been noted in any previous description of Arumanian that I am aware of, and in fact stands in direct contradiction to Fiedler’s (1968) claim that Arumanian lacks marked status categories. It also significantly alters the position of status categories in the Balkan languages. Before discussing the Arumanian phenomenon, however, it will be useful to review the expression of admirativity in those Balkan languages (and languages of

¹ Research for this publication was supported in part by a grant from the International Researches and Exchanges Board, with funds provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Neither of these organizations is responsible for the views expressed. I am deeply indebted to Marjan Marković, who helped me immeasurably with the collection and translation of the data essential to this paper. My deepest thanks also to his uncle, Tomislav Manovski/Toma Mani, as well as Vasilj Bulksoki/Sîlja Buljak, Andon Grabovski/Ndoma Ljubro, and Kosta Panovski/Koči Pani who so generously and hospitably shared with me their knowledge of their native language. This article is dedicated to the memories of my teachers and mentors Zhigiew Golgb and Blaze Koneski, Večna im slava.

² In the context of living Balkan languages, the term Romanace serves as a cover term for Daco-Romanian (including the dialects of Eastern Serbia), Arumanian, and Megleno-Romanian. Arumanian and Megleno-Romanian can be referred to collectively as Vlach.

³ Asenova’s (1989: 144–50) treatment of dubitative and admiralitative meanings of dental modal subordinator (da-te-da-ma) constructions touches on some of the same concepts, but not on their grammaticalization.

¹ Asenova (1989: 215–19) does deal with some dialectal differentiation, but without giving any concrete examples.
the Balkans) for which it has heretofore been attested, since it is only in such a context that the significance of this Armmanian admirative construction can be properly understood.

The term ‘admirative’ was first used by Dozon (1879: 226) for Albanian, and first applied to Bulgarian by Weigand (1923/24), although the phenomenon was noted by Cionev (1910/11: 15–16), who compared it to Turkish; Golb (1960) first observed the same parallels between Macedonian and Turkish.4 Examples (1a–d) in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian and Turkish, respectively, are typical of the examples usually cited:

(1) a. Bravo, be Gunjo—provirka se baj Ganjo,—ti si bil cjal Bismark.
   [Konstantinov 1973: 109]

b. Bravo be Gunjo—vika baj Ganjo—ti si bil cel Bismark!
   [Konstantinov 1967: 119].

c. Bravo ore Guno—thirri baj Gana u entuziazma—ti genke një Bismark i vërtetë
   [Konstantinov 1975: 123].

d. Bravo be Guny! dedi. Sen maallah bështënn bir Bismark maqësët be.
   [Konstantinov 1972: 188].

‘Bravo Gunjo—exclaimed Baj Ganjo—you are a veritable Bismark.’

Although the Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian and Turkish phenomena are clearly similar and typologically if not actually related, the Albanian differs significantly from the other three. The term ‘admirative’ for Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Turkish applies simply to a marked usage of the nonconfirmative, or indefinite, past (i.e., the old perfect; in Balkan Slavic based on the resulting perfect participle in -l, in Turkish based on the perfect participle in -miş) to indicate surprise at a newly discovered but already existing state of affairs. In Albanian the term ‘admirative’ denotes a separate series of paradigmatic sets covering the whole range of marked nonconfirmative meanings (surprise, doubt/disbelief, report).

Moreover, the Albanian present admirative, although diachronically derived from an inverted perfect, as can be seen in Table 1 on the following page, nonetheless in synchronous terms has a genuinely present meaning (cf. Friedman 1981a, 1982b, 1986). Thus, for example, of 59 present admiratives used in the Albanian translation of the Bulgarian novel Baj Ganjo, only six correspond to Bulgarian admirative uses of the past indefinite, while 44 correspond to ordinary Albanian present tenses.5 This can be seen in examples (2a–d) in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian and Turkish, respectively:

(2) a. Viš sūsvem bez hlab jadete!—učudva se baj Ganjo.
   [Konstantinov 1973: 58].

b. Vie sosema bez leb jadete—se čudi baj Ganjo.
   [Konstantinov 1967: 50].

c. Čudi qysh e hëngërkeni ju gjellën, fare pa bukel!—tha baj Gana u qyditur.
   [Konstantinov 1975: 58].


‘You are eating’ [the soup] entirely without bread—Baj Ganjo said amazedly.’

Table 1. Third-Person Singular Indicative of ‘have’ in Albanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonadmirative</th>
<th>Admirative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>ka pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>kishë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td>kish pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double perfect</td>
<td>ka pasë pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double pluperfect</td>
<td>kish pasë pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorist</td>
<td>pati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pluperfect</td>
<td>pat pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd double pluperfect</td>
<td>pat pasë pasur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, Albanian can use past admirative forms with an apparently present meaning when the expression of surprise concerns a pre-existing state, as in (3b–d); the first two both occurred as translations of the Bulgarian (3a), while the third is a translation of a similar expression:

(3) a. Brej, hepten magare bil tozi çovek.
   [Konstantinov 1973: 88, 89].

b. Bre! gomar i madh paska genë [perf] ky njeri!
   [Konstantinov 1975: 99].

c. Ore, fare gomat paskësh genë [plup] ky njeri!
   [Konstantinov 1972: 98].

‘What an ass that guy is!’

d. Ama njerëzë fare pa mend genkëshin [impf] këta...
   [Konstantinov 1972: 24].

‘What fools these...’

The striking similarities in origins and meanings of the admirable paradigms in Albanian, and admirable usage in Balkan Slavic and Turkish has been noticed by many scholars, although the question of athouchthonous versus contact origin continues to be debated (e.g., Cionev 1910/11, Demiraj 1971, Friedman 1978, Golb 1960, Huntley 1979, Koneski 1965, Weigand 1923/24, to name just a few). I shall return to this point later. Be that as it may, until recently Balkan Romance appeared to represent an island (or rather, an archipelago) of non-evidentiality in the central Balkan zone that otherwise expresses this category and by it is connected, via Turkish, to a broader Eurasian linguistic area characterized by these types of status oppositions (cf. Friedman 1979, 1988a).

As mentioned earlier, Fiedler (1968: 131) states that Armmanian lacks the type of what he calls ‘Admirativ-Kommentativsystem’ found in Macedonian, Albanian, and Bulgarian. It was Atanasov (1984) who first observed that Megleno-Romanian (at present

4 A measure of the difficulty in grasping these categories can be seen in the fact that Dozon (1879: 226) describes only the synthetic admiratives, present and imperfect, which he labels imperfect and present, respectively, although one of his examples is a perfect:

(i) Shpirlje im pasëka qenurë shumë i ndeshim sot ndë syt të tu.
   [Dozon 1879: 227].

‘My life has been very honored today in your eyes.’ = ‘You have saved my life.’

5 The remainder did not have direct correspondences due to stylistic differences in the translations. The figures were almost exactly the same for Turkish and Macedonian as for Bulgarian. See Friedman (1982a).
spoken in a few villages near Gvegeli in Macedonia and across the border in Greece) has an inverted perfect that behaves, according to him, just like the specifically nonconfirmative uses of the Macedonian I-form, i.e., reported, admiring, and dubitative. This datum was noted by Fiedler (1989) and discussed in greater detail in Atanasov (1990: 220). Table 2 above gives the Megleno-Romanian inverted perfect (i.e., participle + auxiliary) using the verb meaning 'see', and examples (4–6) illustrates the usage with Atanasov's Macedonian and French translations.

(4) à bră, tu fost-ă jărăi om! a be, ti si bil golem čovek! mais je viens d'apprendre que tu es une personne importante! [Atanasov 1990: 221]
(5) nu vut-ă bu gijt nema dobar život on dit que leur vie conjugale n'est pas réussie [Atanasov 1990: 220]
(6) je rost-ă ăn cătăn včera si bil na selo j'ai entendu parler (on m'a dit) que hier tu étais (as été) au village/à la campagne [Atanasov 1990: 220]

During fieldwork in Ohrid, Republic of Macedonia, in 1992, however, I discovered that an Arumanian dialect from the now-deserted village of Gorna Belica (Arumanian: Beala de Sus) does have a marked nonconfirmative form that functions like the Albanian admiring or the marked uses of the Macedonian I-form. There are two groups of Arumanians who came to Gorna Belica from different parts of Albania: the Mbiati and the Frashejoti (Fărșăloți). The dialect described here is that of the Frashejoti. The following examples, with Macedonian and English translations, illustrate various uses of this Arumanian admiring. Example (7) is a typical expression of surprise involving 'be'; (8) shows dubitative usage; (9) shows the admiring of 'be' and 'have' functioning as auxiliaries with an intransitive past participle; (10) illustrates an admiring perfect of a transitive verb; (11) shows future admiring constructions; (12) demonstrates that present and past stative admiratives can both function with apparent present meaning (cf. example 3); and (13) shows that Arumanian and Albanian admiratives, like admiring usage in Macedonian, are incompatible with the expression of confirmative personal opinion. Example (14a) is from a text collected from a Mbiati speaker from Gorna Belica, while (14b) is the Frashejoti version. Example (14a) uses an ordinary imperfect in the subordinate clause, whereas (14b) has an admiring in reported usage.

7 It should be noted that Caragiu (1975: 282) already observed the inverted perfect of Megleno-Romanian based on Capidan (1925), but she treated it as the ordinary realization of the perfect. According to Atanasov (1990: 119–220), Megleno-Romanian has both inverted and un inverted perfects.
This participial form is problematic. While some verbs use the expected aorist base that forms the perfect participle for all Arumanian compound tenses, most verbs apparently use an imperfect base, despite the fact that Vlah lacks an imperfect participle. No verb uses both bases. Moreover, the form of the participle to which the suffix is added appears to be masculine plural—as opposed to the invariant feminine singular (functioning as a neuter) that is used for the perfect—so that the final consonant of the base appears as /l/ (in /cl/ before morphophonemic -(i) of the masculine plural) or /sl/ (cl/ before /kt/ elsewhere, the change of affricates to spirants before /l/ is well attested in Krusevo [Golbah 1984: 42]).8 Thus, for example, the perfect participle (feminine singular) of 'be' is futã, and the base for the imperative appears to be the masculine plural, which would be fuc.9 Although a few other verbs use the aorist (perfect) base, e.g., avaut- > avuska 'have', vëgut- > vëguska 'see', the majority of verbs form their imperative from an imperfect base, as in the following examples, where the asterisked form illustrates the non-occurring aorist-based form: nãguska (*neska) 'walk'; dusecka (*duska) 'go'; vanecka (*vëncika) 'come', kunusëska (*këndëskusa) 'know', beccka (*bicika) 'drink'.

Although the problem of the base requires further investigation, Elson's arguments (this volume) that the Romanian preterit was restructured under the influence of the Bulgarian l-participle is suggestive here. As Golbah [1970] has shown, Slavic-Romance bilingualism in southwestern Macedonian is the most likely source of the restructuring of both the Macedonian and the Arumanian perfect systems. Macedonian calqued a perfect using the auxiliary 'have' with an invariant neuter verbal adjective (the old past passive participle) on the model of the perfect participle, which, lacking a neuter, generalizes the feminine form of the perfect participle. Moreover, Arumanian calqued the Slavic perfect using 'be' and the perfect participle (cf. Golbah 1984: 135). In view of the fact that the Common Slavic resultative participle was based only on the aorist stem, whereas Macedonian (and Bulgarian) created an innovation of a parallel resultative participle based on the imperfect stem, it is at least possible that in its creation of an imperative, Arumanian calqued an imperfect participial base from Slavic. The fact that it is precisely in the aorist that there is a gap in the Albanian imperative system (cf. Table 1) and that it is precisely the (imperfective) imperfect l-participle that functions as the imperative with present meaning in Slavic may also have affected the tendency to use an imperfect base.10 The choice of an apparently masculine plural form of the participle could have been influenced by the fact that Tosk (South Albanian, which is the relevant dialect region) participles usually end in schwa (orthographic -ë), which is also the adjectival marker of the masculine plural. It is possible that just as the Arumanian feminine perfect participle was calqued as a neuter verbal adjective in Macedonian by Slavic-Romance bilinguals (Golbah 1970: 13–14), so the Arumanian speakers calqued a masculine plural participial base on a model reanalyzed from Albanian.

With regard to the shape of the suffix, I would suggest that the Albanian third-person singular imperative marker, -ka, which is by far the most common and least marked imperative indicator, was interpreted as a particle. The suffix itself also shows variation: -ka, -kã, -krã, and -kãrã, and moreover is uninflected, i.e., the same regardless of person. Thus, for example, the imperative of 'be' can be formulated as fâç(eglë)ð(ð)rã/ãl, i.e., fucka.11

8 I am indebted to Zbigniew Golbah for this observation. I had hoped to discuss this data with him at greater length, but his unexpected and untimely passing prevented me from doing so.

9 The neutralization of the aorist/imperfect opposition in verbs such as 'be' and 'have' in Slavic (hence only one t-participle) may have contributed to the preservation of the aorist base for these verbs in Arumanian.

10 The lack of inflection is accounted for by the interpretation of the suffix as a particle. The variation in the quality of the final vowel (la/ - ãl) could be due either to Albanian or Arumanian dialectal vowel reduction; the reduction of the unstressed auxiliary in Albanian is seen, e.g., even in the shape of the literary Albanian imperative perfective. The extra syllable (lar/ or irã) could also be the result of Albanian dialectal influence. The dialectal morphology of the Albanian imperative has yet to be adequately documented, but in the dialect of Permet, which is less than twenty kilometers south of Frashëri, both long and short participles occur as the base of the imperative; the long participle typically ends in -(u)ë, which is reduced to -ë. Moreover, the -k of the auxiliary 'have' is sometimes interpreted as a separate marker coming between the stem and participial formant, to which the suffixes derived from 'have' are then added or, according to Lambertz (1948: 48–49), this /k/ is simply antecipatorily reduplicated. Thus, for example, Fekmezi (1908: 198) cites the following 3 sg participles: ubëkam > ubërkam > ubëkerkam, hüpam > hüpërkam > hüpërkarom and Lambertz (1948: 48) gives these 3 sg and 2 sg participles: kjenërkam, pasërke and paskërke, dhenërkë, dikërke, kuptokërke, dushërka, etc. (cf. Buchholz and Fiedler 1987: 120). The modern literary Albanian equivalents of the participles and 3 sg participles are the following: u bërëlu bëka 'become', hipur/hipika 'mount', qenëqëka 'be', pasur/paska 'have', dhenë/dëhërkë 'give', ditur/dikë 'know', kuptok/kuptukaka 'understand', dushur/dashka 'love, want'. In view of this dialectal variation in a region of Albania where Arumanian is also spoken, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the variation in the Arumanian particle is due to the same type of variation in dialectal Albanian.

11 The precise meaning and function of each of these tense forms is the subject of research in progress by Marjan Markovik.
Slavic (Friedman 1978), a conclusion recently supported by Fielder (1993). This in turn relates to the broader question of the natural tendency of perfects to evolve into marked status categories.

I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1994) that at least some Balkanisms arose when speakers of different languages attempted to communicate more effectively. The place of these Balkanisms in the systems of the various languages can be described in terms of a continuum from pragmatic to grammaticalized, which in turn suggests that discourse functions are not merely subject to borrowing but actually serve as entry points for the development of structural change (cf. Prince 1988). The grammaticalization of discourse functions tends to occur in those regions where multilingualism is most complex. Moreover, grammaticalization of pragmatic devices is itself a dialectal function, and thus an additional category of isoglosses, i.e. degree of grammaticalization, is worthy of study in a Balkan context (cf. Friedman 1988a).

The new evidence from the Frasheriot Arumanian dialect of Gorna Belica is more than an interesting instance of a borrowed grammatical morpheme (the Albanian third person affirmative marker) and a calqued construction (the use of the participial base), as well as a counterexample to the claim that Arumanian lacks evidential categories. It is also a completely unambiguous example of a borrowed evidential and stands both in close relationship to and stark contrast with the status categories and usages of Albanian, Balkan Slavic and Turkish. Thus, the form and function of the Arumanian imperative gives us a better understanding of the category of marked nonconfirmative status in general in terms of both its meanings and its potential origins.13

Considerable debate has surrounded the subclassification of Balkan languages, e.g. periphery-core distinction, the position of Serbo-Croatian, the relationship of the Carpathian area, Hungarian and Slovenian, etc. The Arumanian imperative demonstrates the fact that there is still basic research to be done in Balkan linguistics. It not only points to the need for more dialect studies but to the need to pay more attention to the dialects, especially the northern Greek. If it turns out that the overt expression of status also occurs in northern Greek dialects, I would suggest that the presence of status categories or usage can be used to define a West Central Balkan core (cf. Hamp 1979) that includes all the classic Balkan languages.12
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13 A similar phenomenon has been reported for Romani. According to Kostov (1973: 108) the dialect of Romani spoken in Sliven in eastern Bulgaria has developed a reported marker under the influence of Bulgarian, viz. the particle -li added to the Romani imperfect and pluperfect. According to Kostov, this particle is derived from the -i of the Bulgarian past active participle. The following two examples with imperfects in Romani and their Bulgarian equivalents are cited by Kostov (1973: 108).
(i) Ti kanatu naknine-li mana fi prgajat. / Yuqetes-li racjasa: Pavlo, Pavlo!
   i kogato minovadi xora po mesta, tavelo se niza noita: Pavlo, Pavlo!
   'And as people passed over the bridge, through the night was heard: Pavlo, Pavlo!'
(ii) Oda vakergas mangi, ci tu phiras-li
   'He told me that you were going'.

12 The Arumanian phenomenon also modifies the map given in Friedman (1988a) to the following:


