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Howard Aronson’s contributions to the study of verbal categories represent some of the most important advances in this area of linguistic investigation since Jakobson’s (1932/1971, 1957/1971) seminal articles. Building on work by Golab (1964), Janakiev (1962), and Kurlyowicz (1956:26), Aronson’s (1977) discussion of aspect and mood in Bulgarian introduced a significant modification of Jakobson’s (1957/1971) system by defining mood as the qualification of the narrated event without reference to the speech event or participants and status as the relationship of the participant in the speech event (the speaker) to the narrated event, thus effectively replacing Jakobson’s category of evidential. Aronson, however, while adding Jakobson’s Bulgarian example of evidentiality in his redefinition of status, does not explicitly reject the notion of a separate category of evidentiality. In his subsequent comprehensive reworking of Jakobson’s scheme, Aronson (1991) defines status as the relation of the narrated event to the speech event and still leaves open the possibility of an evidential category defined as the qualification of the narrated event by participant in the speech event. In footnote 10 of that work, however, Aronson observes that I have adduced evidence from a number of languages in support of the argument that the notional meaning ‘evidential’ can be derived from the category of status (Friedman 1979, 1986, 1988a) and he states: “I agree with Friedman and know of no language that has evidential as its invariant meaning. Evidential is given in Table 1, but all the evidence indicates that it should not be.” (p. 130). Aronson’s ideas on the interrelationships of status, aspect, and mood have been crucial to my own work on grammatical categories (Friedman 1977, 1986), and it is therefore with respect, gratitude and affection that I dedicate this paper to Howard Aronson, who celebrated his sixtieth birthday on 5 March 1996.1

In earlier work, I have argued that the various uses of status categories in different languages form a range of semantic isoglosses (Friedman 1988a, 1988b, 1994) that comprises the Balkans and the Caucasus as well as the intervening Anatolian plateau (for Armenian, see Kozinec 1991). In this paper, I shall extend this research by examining the Romanian presumptive mood in a comparative Balkan context. In so doing, I shall show that status categories in Balkan Slavic (and Turkish) occupy a position midway between the paradigmatic indicative expression of non-confirmative status found in Albanian (and Vlah) and the analytic modalities of Romanian. This in turn suggests a gradation from modality to indicativity in the expression of non-confirmative status that is connected with the grammaticalization of the relationship of the participant in the speech event (P) to the narrated event (E).2 The central position of Balkan Slavic vis-à-vis Albanian and Romanian reflects both differences in the
Bulg. nako, Turk. yapısı—to an unmarked past with resultative, indefinite, and non-confirmative contextual variant meanings—e.g., Mac. nako, Bulg. nako—Turk. yapısı—which are semantic developments in already existing morphological material.

Examples (1–5) in Macedonian and (6) in Bulgarian illustrate the opposition. Example (1) illustrates the use of the confirmative past for a non-witnessed action; (2) illustrates both types of past used by speakers with the same sources of (indirect) information; (3) illustrates the speaker’s choice of emphasizing which information is vouched for despite the fact that all the information comes from the same source; (4) illustrates the speaker’s manipulation of confirmative and non-confirmative forms based on his sense of recollection; (5) shows the neutral, i.e., unmarked, use of the non-confirmative in a situation where the question of vouching for the information is irrelevant; (6) illustrates the fact that the presence versus absence of the third person auxiliary in the Bulgarian non-confirmative is not itself connected with the source of information (for detailed analysis and argumentation see Friedman 1982 and especially Fielder 1993, 1997, where auxiliary omission is analyzed as a pragmatically conditioned discourse function; see also Lindstedt 1993:47 and Gricket 1954).

1. Kazi kako lepše. [Said by a legitimate daughter to her mother, Dolneni, 28 September 1973]
   "Tell [the story of] how you eloped."

2. [Zaza] Bizle bahol vo Mokra. [Kosta] Da, he was [Skopje, 6 October 1986]
   "[Zaza] Bizle was in Skopje. [Kosta] Yes, I know he was."

   "I called my uncle. He was not home, apparently he was at the beach."

4. Bugarija od Sofia—žoto ne dohodo vo Ohrid? Të buh; ne se sakam točno...
   tie bile vo Ohrid porano. Beo vo maj mesec! I taka nemale pari. [conversation, Skopje, 12 December 1995]
   "The Bulgarians from Sofia, why didn’t they come to Ohrid? They were... I don’t remember exactly... they were in Ohrid earlier—they were there in May—and so there wasn’t [any more] money."

5. Liceto koe podmilo baranje za nostriščanjo, odnodno priznavanje na evikalvazione na svidetelstvo skenat vo stranotvo, može uslovno da go postavka naredno oddeljene, dokolku postopaka ne e zavrela do istok na rokot za upis na učenici vo učiliste. [Zbornik za znanostno obrazovanje, člen 92, Slučjen vesnik na Republike Makedonija 20 September 1995, 5(44):1134]
   "A person who has submitted an application for the certification or recognition of equivalency of a diploma earned abroad may provisionally attend the appropriate class insofar as the process is not completed before the expiration of the deadline for the registration of students in the school."

6. vednik e putilal ot Burgas nadolom kâm granicata—selo Fakija—i putilal toj—
   sigurni e večerja do najskako selo s reja i sled tova njeabo da premine. [Roth 1979:117]
   "once he traveled from Burgas down toward the border—the village of Fakija—and so he traveled—in the evening he got to some village with bus service and then he was supposed to go on."
In contrast to the development of status categories involving the reinterpretation of already existing forms, Albanian and Vlah together with Balkan Slavic have in the course of the past few centuries developed new, markedly non-conformative paradigms each in its own way. The Balkan Slavic languages have expanded their inventory of auxiliaries—'have' in the case of Macedonian, 'be' in the case of Bulgarian—(Table 1), Megleno-Romanian shifted the order of its elements (Table 2), Albanian both shifted element order and then expanded its auxiliary inventory, while the Frascherio dialect of Arumanian from Beala di Supra borrowed and reinterpreted a shifted Albanian element (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Conformative</th>
<th>Unmarked Non-Conformative</th>
<th>Marked Non-Conformative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>napravi</td>
<td>napravi / ima napraveno</td>
<td>imal napraveno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>napravi</td>
<td>napravi [e]</td>
<td>bil napravil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Macedonian and Bulgarian Conformative/Non-conformative 3sg. 'do'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>vizit-ām</th>
<th>vizit-ām</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vizit-āj</td>
<td>vizit-āj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vizit-āg</td>
<td>vizit-āg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The Megleno-Romanian Inverted Perfect of 'see'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Arumanian</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>Arumanian</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>ari</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>avuska</td>
<td>paska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>ari avuti</td>
<td>ka pasur</td>
<td>avuska avută</td>
<td>paska pasur^4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: 3sg. Indicative of 'have' (Present & Perfect) in Albanian and Arumanian

Examples (7–9) are typical illustrations of the three types of marked non-conformative usage. Although they are all taken from Albanian, equivalent usages could be supplied from Vlah, Balkan Slavic, or Turkish. Example (7) is neutral, a usage most often encountered when the source of information is an objective report. Example (8) illustrates the type traditionally labeled dubitative, although the semantics of the usage are ironic disbelief or sarcastic repetition rather than doubt per se. Example (9) is admiring sensu stricto, i.e., an expression of genuine surprise.
Examples (16–20) contain constructions that can be interpreted as presumptive or non-presumptive depending on the context. In (16), the first sentence can be interpreted either as a presumptive or a future perfect and is disambiguated by the second. Example (17) by itself would be interpreted as presumptive with any of the three formants, and (18–20) show how the same clause, when part of a complex sentence, functions as a future, subjunctive, or conditional perfect, respectively.

(14) Iar doamna lui Dragos-vodă, așa povestescui oamenii acei de locu, de la târgul Sirietului, cum să fi fost de leagă sacră. [Moldavian chronicle, cited in Manoliu-Manea 1994:310]
   ‘But king Dragos’s lady, as the people of the place, the market town of the river Siriet, say, was of Saxon religion.’

(15) Zice că ar fi cai lecția [Dimitriu 1979:269]
   ‘He says that he has read the lesson’

(16) Va fi cîte el acest roman?
   (a) Mă indoiesc.
   (b) Vom sta de vorbă numai după ce-l vei fi citit și tu. [Irimia 1976:118]
   Will he have read this novel?

(17) Vă spun ar fi ajuns el pîna acolo? [Dimitriu 1979:271]
   ‘Has he gotten there?’ [presumptive]

(18) Cind ea va fi ascăză, el va fi ajuns pîna acolo [Dimitriu 1979:271]
   ‘When she gets home, he will have gotten there.’ [future perfect]

(19) În alte condiții nu ar fi fost posibil să fi ajuns el pîna acolo. [Dimitriu 1979:271]
   ‘Otherwise, it wouldn’t have been possible for him to have gotten there.’ [subjective perfect]

(20) Dacă ar fi ajuns el pîna acolo, alta ar fi fost situația [Dimitriu 1979:271]
   ‘If he had gotten there things would have been different.’ [conditional perfect]

As noted above, the past presumptive is always morphologically homonymous with a modal perfect. This situation is reminiscent of the multiply homonymous verbal paradigms of traditional Bulgarian grammar as codified by Andrejevin, e.g., Bulgarian bil pravil is described as belonging to three distinct and totally homonymous paradigms: the reported perfect of pravil e, as the reported pluperfect of bile pravil, and as the emphatic reported aorist of pravi (Andrejevin 1938:57). The debate over grammatical versus pragmatic motivations for the omission of the third person auxiliary in the Bulgarian past indefinite can also be mentioned (see the discussion at (9) above). Unlike Bulgarian and Romanian, Macedonian, especially in the southwest (like Albanian and Vlach), has a higher degree of clearly grammaticalized non-confirmativity and does not operate with multiply homonymous or pragmatically determined constructions.

In an attempt to compare the Romanian presumptive to forms and usages in other Balkan languages, I conducted a search the Romanian translation of Konstantinov’s Baj Ganjo, a work which I have used in the past to investigate Balkan incipient status categories (Friedman 1978). Owing to its extensive use of colloquial and expressive language, Baj Ganjo is particularly suitable for investigating these types of constructions, but in the entire text of some 200 pages I found...
Examples (22) and (23) express doubt and surprise, and yet only Romanian uses a non-confirmative form. In both cases, the voice is the narrator’s making an aside, which suggests a discourse function.

(22) [R] Orice fel de raporturi sau acțiuni care nu îi ar fi adus lui Botkov vreun folos ori chilipir erau lipsite de sens pentru el. (Or fi existat oare în limbiul europene cuvinte corespunzătoare în privința asta?)

[B] Nikakvi dejstvija i otonenja njihova mislili za Bolkova... ako ot tijeh ne provizirale nešto kosevno, najkraj, kelepti. (Dali ima u evropskezikski ećumi, skrivenjavajući na tijeh, vo toa im značenje?) (VII)

[M] Nikakvi dejstva i obeski nemaa smisla i za Bolkova... ako od niv ne isleguvaše nešto Kosovo, nekoj kelepti. (Dali ima u evropske izajsci zborevi što odgovara na ovje, vo toa nivo značenje?)

[K] Kshtišu ngjiste edhe me Bodokivin... Për të asti vëprim apo marreðëshie s'do të kishti kuptim, po të mësht dejpi tyre qeletërë. (Eziston valët në gishtë evropiane kjo pikë! Po zka rifëjui.)

[T] Sonuc olarak, kelepi çkmadocia, avanta dëmpëxëtka, Bodokiv için... hic bir davranışın, hic bir içkiinin anlama yoktu. (Kelepi ile avanta sözüklüklerinin karsılığı Arupav dillerinde nisminin mu bilmem?)

‘No actions or relations had any sense for Bodkov... unless they resulted in something kjoro [something for nothing] in some sort of kelepi [‘free ride/free lunch’].’ (Do the European languages have words that correspond to these in their meanings?)

(23)...

[8] De unde ior fi trecid prin minte asemenea năzăstri?

[B] Oude mu idat na um tija komedii. (XII)

[M] Otkade mu tekmevati le komedii?

[O] E ku i akro melnija le bujaj komedija ti jëta!

[T] [not translated]

‘Where does he get these comedies from?’

Examples (24–26) are all identical to past conditionals in forms, but clearly prescriptive in content. Example (24) has non-confirmative forms in both Balkan Slavic and Turkish, while (25) has such corresponding usage only in Balkan Slavic. Interestingly enough, example (24) is dubitative (ironic), whereas example (25) is a more neutral reported. Example (26) is a complex narrative that involves non-confirmativity in all the languages, but the category is expressed in different parts of the narrative in each language. The speaker is Baj Ganjo, relating a story told to him by a student. Baj Ganjo’s narrative carries a tone of surprise and indignation but not irony. Particularly striking in this example is the manner in which no two languages pattern identically. Albanian, Turkish, and Romanian each have unique occurrences, while Balkan Slavic forms always overlap with some other language. Here too, however, Albanian and Romanian are in complementary distribution.

(24) [R] Baj Ganjo imi ceru sá-i fac cinste, deoarse de drum a fi fumat din tutunul lui.

[B] Baj Ganjo poiska az da poterija, poncje iz pajaša zm u pušil ot negovija tijajmi. (IX)

[M] Baj Ganjo pobarja jas da čestam oti po pat zm pušil od negoviot tutun.

[A] Baj Ganju deshte ta girsdna un, sepse rurgles kisha pir nga duhansi i tij.
In Aronson’s (1977, 1991) modifications and extensions of Jakobson (1957/1971) (see also Fielder 1996), mood and aspect are linked as manifestations of a single category of manner by the fact that both are absolute characterizations of the narrated event. Fielder (1996:216) links taxis, tense, and status by means of a feature distance relative to the speech event, and introduces an “implied temporal orientation point of E” into the definition of taxis, which allows her to account for the Bulgarian facts she is analyzing. Status and Mood are linked as qualifiers of the narrated event, with the presence of speaker’s attitude (P) being the distinguishing characteristic of Mood in Jakobson (1957/1971) and of Status in Aronson (1977). The data I have adduced linking Albanian, Balkan Romance, Balkan Slavic, and Turkish suggests that status categories result from the grammaticalization of the relationship of P to E, whereas when that relationship is not a discourse function than a grammatical category, non-confidence meanings will be limited to the manipulation of modal markers.16 I would propose that there exists a Balkan areal tendency to grammaticalize the concept of non-confirmative alone a continuum from the non-modal paradigmatic forms of Albanian and the non-modal semi-paradigmatic forms of Vlah through the grammatico-pragmatic formations of Slavic and Turkish to the modal pragmatic/paradigmatic forms of Romanian.

As Golab (1970) has shown, there are striking bilateral Macedonian-Vlah similarities on the one hand and Bulgarian-Romanian congruences on the other—the former based on a Balkan Romance model, the latter based on a Common Slavic model (as represented by Old Church Slavonic). Looking at Romanian presumpactivity and expressions of non-confirmative in the Balkans general, we find a similar type of bipartition insofar as Romanian patterns closer to Bulgarian than to any of the other languages and is essentially in complementary distribution with Albanian with respect to the choices of context for expressing the category. As with other phenomena described by Golab, Romanian goes with Bulgarian (more pragmatic) while Vlah goes with Macedonian (and Albanian) (more grammaticalized), but in general Balkan terms there seems to be a continuum of marked non-confirmative status categories interacting with both modal and pragmatic factors that requires further elucidation. Golab’s concept of the isogramatisms, I would suggest, can be expanded to the concept of an isogramatisms.17
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NOTES

1 An earlier version of this work was read at the Tenth Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore (University of Chicago, 2-4 May 1996), which was dedicated to Professor Aronson’s sixtieth birthday. I am grateful to the participants in the conference whose comments have helped improve this work.

2 Cf. Aronson’s (1977) category of manner, which explains intersections of aspect and mood, or Fielder’s (1996) use of distance as a cover term for the similarities among tense, taxis, and status.
This is consistent with Romanian native speaker feelings that the presumptive is more appropriate with the colloquial future marker e (Dorin Uțurescu and Emil Vrabie, p.c.).

4. The order of presentation in the examples is the following: Romanian-Bulgarian—Macedonian-Albanian—Turkish. Languages names are indicated by the first letter in square brackets. English glosses use the Bulgarian original. Minor differences among the translations have been ignored. Roman numerals after the Bulgarian examples refer to the chapters in which the sentences occur.

5. In this example, the superscript capital letters indicate that languages in which the verb form carries a marking or contextual variant meaning of non-confirmative status. Moreover, reportative-substitutive particles have been italicized.

6. There are a number of other intersections of modality and non-confirmativity that are highly suggestive and worthy of future research but beyond the scope of the present analysis. By way of illustration we can mention examples such as the use of modal particles with aorists in the various Balkan languages, such as the use of the future marker with the aorist in Greek to express uncertainty, e.g., tha kagrapo, glossed in Bulgarian with a future subjunctive perfect stis da sun napisal 'I must have written [it]' (Asenova 1989: 145), as well as the presumptive modal use of the future in Aromanian reported by Caragea-Mariotanu (1968:110–11) er-i Cosmopol (1987:165–6) but not found by Golaș (1984:107).

7. Although some realizations of the opposition confirmative/non-confirmative are clearly of contact origin, as is the case in the Aromanian dialect of Beala di Supră, others may be the result of a combination of internal motivations and external catalysis, as in the cases of Albanian and Balkan Slavic in contact with Turkish. On the basis of the fact that the use of ‘be’ as transitive auxiliary is characteristic of Slavic rather than Romance, Seidell (1958) has suggested a Bulgarian origin for the Romanian presumptive. Manolache-Manea (1994:273–17) makes arguments for internal motivation but as in so many contact phenomena, both internal and external factors were probably involved.

REFERENCES
3. The literature is too vast to cite—virtually every scholar who has devoted serious attention to the relevant languages has written on this topic at least once—and to date there exists no comprehensive bibliography of it. For a survey of the basic relevant literature pertaining to Balkan Slavic, Albanian, and Turkish up to 1977 see Friedman (1980). For more recent treatments of Balkan Slavic, see Foulon-Hristova (1995), Gerdzikov (1984), Gunchev (1990), and Kusarov (1994).
4. Asenova's (1989:144–50) treatment of stubative and adverbial meanings of constructions using the Balkan modal subordinators do-it-ida-n (Slavic-Albanian-Romanian-Greek, respectively), touches on some of the same concepts, but not on their grammaticalization.
5. The term South Balkan Romance refers to Megleno–Romanian and Arumanian together. The term Vlah is also used here as a cover term that includes these two languages (but not the Daco–Romanian dialects of Eastern Serbia).
6. Although Caragiu-Mariotanu (1975:282) had already noted the inverted perfect of Megleno–Romanian based on data from Capidan (1925), she treated it as the ordinary realization of the perfect. Friedler (1968:131) stated that Vlah lacks marked status categories (Ad-misim-Kommentatieheit in his terminology), but he later corrected this (Friedler 1989) on the basis of Atanassov's data. Atanassov (1990:119–220) discusses the Megleno–Romanian plain and inverted perfect in greater detail.
7. In the case of Balkans Lslavic this process is textually documented, in the case of Albanian it can be deduced from the situation in the earliest major texts, e.g. Buzzu's sixteenth-century missal (Cabej 1968) and the dialectal situation, in the case of Vlah, the isolated nature of the phenomena points to their relatively recent development.
8. Already at the end of the last century, the Vlah villages of Upper and Lower Belica represented an Aromanian speech island between Albanian and Macedonian linguistic territory (Weisgall 1895). Moreover, the villages had come there from two different parts of Albania. Those from Fraschită, the Făsăloși, have the Aromanian admittive, but the other group, the Mbaljë, do not. Moreover, my recent work in Albania (summer 1995) with informants from Korçë indicates that they do not have these admittive forms. Because the Vlah dialects of Albania are as yet so little investigated, however, it may yet be found there. Another possibility is that the Aromanian admittive of the Făsăloși of Upper Belica (Beala di Supră) represents an archaic innovation that developed while their ancestors were in Albania and was subsequently lost by those who stayed behind.
9. In modern Standard Albanian, the long form of the participle, in this case past, is the preferred form in the perfect, and the short form, here past, is marginal. Historically, however, both participles could be used to form the perfect and both served as the base for the admittive, depending on the dialect (see Pekmez 1908:198, Lambertz 1948:48–49). The Standard Albanian admittive is based on the short participle, which also occurs in compound auxiliary constructions.

For the sake of completeness, I shall use the term formant when referring to the first element in the presumptive regardless of whether it is an auxiliary or particle.

10. The future auxiliary in n is literary, that in o is colloquial. The persons of the future and conditional auxiliaries are separated by hyphens and the order of presentation is 1s-g. 2s-g. 3s-1pL-2pL-3pL. The future can also be marked by an invariant particle, o or i. The different sets of future markers are separated by dashes. Moreover, in the colloquial future auxiliary the variants do, li occur in the 2s-g., a in the 3s-g., and api, ej, ili in the 2pL.

11. Henceforth, we shall use the term modal perfects to refer to the future, conditional, and subjunctive perfects as a group of distinct paradigms. We shall use the term past presumptive to refer to the homonymous constructions in which the formants can be used interchangeably.