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1. Evidentiality

Although the explicit formulation of a grammatical category of the type that is labeled evidential goes back at least as far as the eleventh century (see below), the use of the term evidential has its origins in descriptions of verbal affixes of American Indian languages that quite literally specified the evidence for a statement (e.g., a dream, a sound, a sight, a report, cf. BOAS 1911:124, 247-48, 348-49, 496). It was JAKOBSON 1957/1971, however, who initiated the current popular use of the term, and he illustrated his point with two Balkan languages, viz. Bulgarian and Macedonian. The infelicity of JAKOBSON’s original formulation (the relationship of a speech event to a narrated event and a narrated speech event [“the alleged source of information about the narrated event”]) for describing the relevant Balkan and other linguistic phenomena has often been observed (FRIEDMAN 1977:53, JACOBSEN 1986, ARONSON 1991, GUENTEYVA 1996a). This is because the phenomena in question are not literally tied to the source of the information, but rather to the speaker’s attitude toward the source or toward the information itself. Among the many other terms that have been proposed as alternatives are the French médiatif and English inferential, distance, mode of indirect narration, opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative, and status. Insofar as the French médiatif is understood as denoting the grammatical mediation of the speaker in transmitting the information, it is much like the use of English status as explicitly redefined from JAKOBSON 1957/1971 by ARONSON 1977, i.e. the relationship between the narrated event and the participant in the speech event. ARONSON 1967 uses JAKOBSON’s definition of status (the qualification of
the narrated event) for both the so-called witnessed (confirmative) and emphatic reported (dubitative) of Bulgarian, comparing them with the affirmative status of the English auxiliary do as in *I do believe in ghosts*. It is not until Aronson 1977, however, that following Golab’s (1964) definition of mood as the ontological evaluation of the narrated event, i.e. the qualification of the narrated event without reference to participants - Aronson redefines status as qualifying the participant’s attitude to the narrated event. The problem with terms such as *inferential, distance,* and *mode of indirect narration* is that, like *evidential*, they do not capture the entire range of phenomena, although *distance*, insofar as it means something like ‘not personally vouched for’, does capture one half of the range of meanings (the other half being ‘personally vouched for’). The expression *opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative*, while it does capture the essence of the grammatical category in question, is unwieldy, and therefore I shall use the term *status* as defined in Aronson 1977 and Friedman 1977 for the rest of this article.

Aside from the question of terminology, the question of status as a Balkanism is also a source of controversy. It is often cited as an example of the influence of Turkish on the grammatical structure of Balkan Slavic and/or of Albanian (Conev 1910/11, Golab 1960, Koneski 1965:148) although accounts imputing native origin also exist (Demitraj 1971, cf. also Friedman 1978 as well as Van Wijk 1933, Huntley 1979). However, various general works on Balkan linguistics either fail to mention this category or, at best, treat it as a bilateral correspondence between Balkan Slavic and Albanian, as in Sandfeld 1930:119–20; Schaller 1975:79, 94; Feuillet 1986:67; Atenova 1989:203–04; and Demiraj 1994:169–71. In fact, however, it also occurs in South Balkan Romance (Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, cf. Atanasov 1990:220–21, Friedman 1994).

There is also a controversy over whether status is an independent grammatical category or a type of mood. In strictly theoretical terms, we accept the above stated definition of mood as the ontological (objective) evaluation of the narrated event and of status as the speaker’s (subjective) qualification of the narrated event, and therefore we treat status as a grammatical category distinct from mood (see Aronson 1977, 1991 for detailed arguments and additional references). Thus, for example, in Albanian the marked status category (admiring) takes the indicative negator *nuk* rather than the modal negator *mos,* and in Albanian, Turkish and Balkan Slavic forms marked for status can also take various modal markers (e.g. subjunctive particles or affixes; cf. Fiedler 1966, Sytov 1979, and Friedman 1983) Some Balkan languages, however, e.g. Greek and Romanian, lack indicative status categories but have modal paradigms or constructions which perform the same functions and are distinct from the type of deontic and epistemic modal constructions of West European languages that contextually convey similar meanings of evaluation. These modal types of status will also be considered here.

In the survey of both traditional and more recent approaches to Balkan status categories that follows, it will be impossible to cite all those who have worked on these problems. The partial bibliography relevant to this topic that I have accumulated already exceeds 25 pages of entries. After a language by language survey, I shall consider the question of how these phenomena relate to the concept of a Balkan linguistic league.

2. Turkish

I shall begin with the situation in Turkish for a variety of reasons. While the relationship of Turkish to the Balkan Sprachbund is an adstratal one, it is of potentially seminal importance to the category in question. Moreover, regardless of the origins of the category in the Indo-European Balkan languages, its presence in Turkish is demonstrably older and was therefore in place at the time of contact. Attested in the oldest known Turkic inscriptions (eighth century A.D., see Tekin 1968:192-93), the distinction was given its first explicit formulation in the oldest known Turkic grammar, al-Kašwar’s eleventh century Dîwân Lûqat at-Turk. Al-Kašwar’s formulation corresponds exactly to the traditional explanation for modern Turkish and merits citing here. “The difference between these two forms [in -di and -miş] is that D Y [-di] on preterite verbs indicate that the action occurred in the presence of the speaker. The action was verified by its occurrence in his presence. For example, if someone says bardı the meaning is ‘He went and I saw him go with my own eyes.’ M S [-miş] on the other hand, indicate that the action occurred in the absence of the speaker. Thus ol barmış ‘He went but I did not see him go’; ol kalmış ‘He came but I did not see him.’ This is a general rule holding good for all preterite verbs ...” (Dankoff 1982:412). In traditional Turkish grammar, the -di-past is known as mazî yu\-di ‘witnessed past’, the -miş-past is termed mazî nakli ‘reported past’, and, as
noted above, the basic presentation is much the same as we find it in al-Kăşărī nine centuries ago. The same holds for Gagauz (Pokrovskaja 1964:224-25).

In addition to the basic opposition between the di-past and the mis-past, the copulative auxiliary verbs idi and imis can be added to various verbal bases (aorist, progressive, future, perfect, conditional, necessitative, and subjunctive, e.g. gelir, geliyor, gelecek, gelmiş, gelse, gelmeli, gelsey) to add either a confirmative (di-) or nonconfirmative (mis-) nuance. The auxiliary idi always and the auxiliary imiş usually add an additional nuance of pastness, which can result in modal (e.g. irrealis), tactic (e.g. pluperfect), or other additional grammatical effects, but these are not essential to this exposition. The auxiliary idi can also be added to the di-past to form a pluperfect. Furthermore, the copulative particle -dir can be added to any noun or verb (except the di-past, conditional, subjunctive, and imperative) to indicate either supposition or emphasis, depending on the context. Thus, for example, the form gelmiş can function both as the perfect participle and as the 3 sg. mis-past of gel- ‘come’, so that gelmiş adam means ‘the man who has come’ while adam gelmiş will ordinarily be interpreted as meaning ‘apparently/so they say, the man came/has come’. When -dir is added to the third person mis-past, it results in a definite past tense, whereas when added to other persons the effect is one of supposition, e.g. gelmişdir, means ‘he/she/it came’. [literally ‘is having come’], whereas gelmişidir means ‘I must have come/Surely I have come’ (see Lewis 1967:106-41 and Johanson 1971:299). Marked nonconfirmative meanings (admirative and dubitative, to be discussed below), are also conveyed by imiş. More recent analyses of the Turkish situation have emphasized the interaction of tense, aspect, and mood in producing effects of evidentiality and certainty (see Akasu-Koç 1995).

3. Albanian

Unlike the case of Turkish, the grammatical traditions of Balkan Slavic and Albanian do not contain observations on status categories in their earliest records (Ismajli 1982, Kastrati 1980, Parvev 1975:218-26), and until recently such categories were considered to be absent from Balkan Romance (Fiedler 1968). The earliest published attestation for Albanian is Dozon (1879:226-27), who introduced the French admiratif (Albanian habitore) on the basis of Kristoforidhi’s ėpærobëçët ‘unexpected’. He defines the paradigms as expressing admiration or surprise, sometimes ironic. Dozon adduces only the two synthetic admirative paradigms (the present and the imperfect in modern terminology), which he labels imperfect and preterite, respectively. He defines the so-called imperfect as denoting a past whose effects last into the present and “sometimes even the near future”.

In modern traditional Albanian grammar, the admirative is classed as a mood (mënyrë) and contains four paradigms, two synthetic (present and imperfect) and two analytic (perfect and pluperfect). Occasionally two other paradigms, based on the double perfect and pluperfect characteristic of Gëg dialects, are also noted, and these can be found in actual usage. Table 1 illustrates the present and past admirative and nonadmirative forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Nonadmirative</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>paskam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>kam pasur</td>
<td>paskam pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect (impf.)</td>
<td>kisha</td>
<td>paskësha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Perfect</td>
<td>kisha pasur</td>
<td>paskësha pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Pluperfect</td>
<td>kam pasë pasur</td>
<td>paskam pasë pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>kisha pasë pasur</td>
<td>paskësha pasë pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pluperfect (aor.)</td>
<td>pata</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Double Pluperfect (aor.)</td>
<td>pata pasur</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 1: ALBANIAN 1 SG ‘HAVE’**

The base is usually the short participle, and the suffix is based on the present or reduced imperfect of the auxiliary verb kam ‘have’. Although diachronically derived from an inverted perfect and an inverted pluperfect, the admirative has evolved into an entirely separate set of paradigms that includes a true present tense, and even future and modal forms (Lafe 1977). The Albanian admirative can be described as a marked nonconfirmative (Friedman 1981), i.e. it expresses the speaker’s present or past unwillingness to vouch for the truth of the event (cf. the concept of new information in Akatsuka 1985 or unprepared mind in Akasu-Koç and Slobin 1986). In the case of past unwillingness contradicted by present realization of willingness, the effect is surprise. In the case of ironic or emphatic unwillingness the effect is sarcasm or doubt, whereas in the case of neutral unwillingness, the effect is that of reportedness or some other
evidential (sensu stricto) or suppositional type of meaning. The precise interpretation will depend on contextual and pragmatic factors. Thus, for example, the admistrative sentence *Ai qenka në shtëpi* 'He is at home' can be interpreted as an expression of surprise at the discovery, as a sarcastic rejection of a previous statement (*Ai është në shtëpi* - same meaning but with the nonadministrative indicative present), or as a supposition or rendition of second-hand or otherwise unvouched-for information, much like the effect of English *apparently*. YLLI 1989, however, makes the point that unlike the Bulgarian nonconfirmative (*reported*), the Albanian admistrative always contains some subjective nuance of doubt or surprise, even at its most neutral. We shall return to the comparison of Albanian and Balkan Slavic below.

4. Bulgarian

In the Bulgarian, an analysis of the verb system that included a status category - in the case of Bulgarian the so-called *preizkazno naklonenie* *reported mood* - took quite some time to reach its current state, which is itself the subject of continued debate. An apparently anonymous book review published in 1860 contains the first formulation clearly linked to the expression of status in the Bulgarian verb: "... the past indefinite [synthetic imperfect] always signifies an action that undoubtedly took place or was seen or heard by the speaker, e.g. az pišeh, ti pišeše, toj pišeše ['I was writing/wrote, you were writing/wrote, he was writing/wrote'], and that tense which he [D.G.V. MIRKOVIĆ in his *Kratak i metodična bālgarska gramatika*] calls the relative past, indicates that the speaker is not completely convinced of the undoubted reality of the action that has taken place, because he was not present when the action occurred or was in some unconscious relation to that action: az sâm pejal ['I sang/was singing/have been singing (apparently)']" (cited in KUCAROV 1979:84, my translation with explanations in brackets).

Space does not permit me to review the entire history of the formulation of status in Bulgarian (see KUCAROV 1979, cf. also FRIEDMAN 1982a), and so I shall move directly to the more or less current traditional presentation given in Table Two, which is based on GUEANTCHEVA (1996b), which in turn is descended from a table first published in ANDREJČIN (1938:57). The asterisked forms occur in ANDREJČIN (1938) and in some later studies (e.g. GERDŽIKOV 1984), but are excluded from other studies (e.g. DEMINA 1959), as well as the standard grammars, and they are not actually attested in usage. Although GUEN'TCHEVA (1996b) leaves box [4c/5c] blank indicating that there are no forms here "for formal reasons," ANDREJČIN (1938:57) uses the same form as in [3c], with an additional *bil* in parentheses, e.g. *pravil (bil) bil*, hence the use of [*"] in Table Two here. It is worth noting that the concept of a separate 'inferential' set of paradigms (column [d]) dates from DEMINA (1959) but is treated as a subset of the perfect in the Academy grammar (STOJANOVA et al. 1983:324). Both ARONSON (1967) and PENČEV (1967) have demonstrated that these forms should actually be integrated into column [a]. Thus, for example, ARONSON (1967:91) cites the following example used by ANDREJČIN himself in Bālgarski ezik (1963 (XIII), p. 348): "Polučili sa razprostranenje ... i prilagatelnih imena s nastav- kata -im, -em (kojato njakoga e služila za obrazuvane na segašni stradatelni pričastija...) ... Adjectives with the suffix -im, -em (which at one time used to serve for the formation of the present passive participle) also have acquired distribution". The auxiliary + imperfect 1-participle - e služila 'served' - clearly does not refer to an inference but rather to an established fact. It is on the basis of such examples that Aronson argues that while imperfect 1-participle plus 3rd person auxiliary may be used for deductions, it is not invariably so marked, but rather constitutes the imperfect equivalent of the aorist-based perfect of the type, e.g. e služila. The example *Ami za pomnja majka mu, bre, učela me e pesni de peja* (STANKOV 1967:341) 'Well, but I remember his mother, man, ... she used to teach me songs to sing' is another clear example of imperfect 1-participle + 3rd person auxiliary that is clearly not inferential.
Although the intersection of status and modality (marked by forms of šte, rows 6-9) is an important and fascinating topic, for reasons of space I shall limit my discussion to the indicative (present and past). In traditional descriptions, the aorist and imperfect indicative (2a, 3a) are said to marked as denoting witnessed action, the perfect (4a) is said to be based only on the aorist stem, and the reported, which differs from the indicative only by the absence of the auxiliary in the third person (the auxiliary is never absent in the first two persons), is said to constitute a separate set of paradigms. Moreover, the opposition imperfect/present (or past/present) is traditionally described as neutralized in the "reported". This situation is illustrated in Table 2. An alternative analysis of the preterite system is given in Table 3 (cf. FRIEDMAN 1986). In this analysis the omission of the third person auxiliary is viewed as a discourse phenomenon, i.e. it is pragmatically conditioned (as in Serbian/Croatian), rather than constituting the basis of forming a separate paradigm that is always homonymous with the indefinite past or perfect in two persons out of three (see FRIEDMAN 1982a and FIELDER 1995, 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future anterior [8]</td>
<td>šte e pravil</td>
<td>štjel da e pravil</td>
<td>*štjel bil da e pravil</td>
<td>*štjel e da e pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future anterior preterit [9]</td>
<td>šteša da e pravil</td>
<td>štjel da e pravil</td>
<td>*štjel bil da e pravil</td>
<td>*štjel e da e pravil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2: BULGARIAN 3 SG (MASC) ‘DO’**

The apparent neutralization of the opposition present/past in the so-called reported (nonconfirmative aorist/imperfect without auxiliary in the third person) has three basic types of realization that can be given the traditional labels of admiring usage, dubitative usage, and reported usage. Admiring usage is the expression of surprise at a newly discovered fact, most often with the verbs ‘be’ or ‘have’, e.g. *Tju ne bilo zlatu! Nikakvo zlato ne e.* (ANDREJCEN 1938:68) ‘Why, it’s not gold! It’s not gold at all!’ Dubitative usage always involves the sarcastic repetition of a previous or implied statement, e.g. --*Ti si star! –Bil sim star!* (Conversation June 1978) ‘You’re old! –I’m old, indeed!’ Reported usage is emotionally neutral, but always refers to some sort of previous statement, e.g. *V Sofiji vrmeto bilo hubavo* [‘They have said that] in Sofia the weather is nice’ (Conversation September 1988). In each case, although the translation into English is with a present tense verb form, and although the appa-

**TABLE 3: BULGARIAN 3 SG (MASC) ‘DO’ PAST**

The meaning ‘witnessed’ can easily be disposed of, as ARONSON 1967 did for Bulgarian, citing DEMINA (1959). *Edna zvezda padna -- kaza Marin -- Umrija njako!... "A star fell", said Marin. “Somebody died.”* Here the confirmative umrija clearly refers to an act of which the speaker is convinced but did not
rent meaning is a present one, there is in fact always a past reference, either to a pre-existing state of affairs that the speaker has just discovered (admiring), a previous statement that the speaker is rejecting (dubitative), or a previous report that the speaker is conveying (reported). The effect in reported and dubitative usage is much like that of English sequence of tenses (cf. She forgot to tell me that she didn't [doesn't] eat meat.) In the case of admiring usage, the obligatory reference to a pre-existing state is demonstrated by the fact that such usage is infelicitous unless there is such reference. Thus, for example, upon walking into an establishment expecting to see the owner, it would be incorrect to ask Káde bil majstorát? 'Where is was the boss?' since there is no pre-existing state involved. However, it would be acceptable to exclaim Ah, tuk ste bili! 'Oh, here you are/have been!' if he suddenly appears from behind a curtain, since that would be surprise at a newly discovered pre-existing state. Wiegand (1923/24) mistakenly compared the Bulgarian usage to Albanian, confusing the diachrony of the Albanian paradigms with the synchrony of the Bulgarian usage. In fact, the Albanian admiring is a true present, and thus the Albanian equivalent Ku gjenka mjeshtiri? is acceptable. Moreover, it is precisely in those contexts that permit a Balkan Slavic admiring usage of the nonconfirmative past (and also of the Turkish mis-past) that Albanian permits both present and past admiring. In the Albanian translation of the Bulgarian novel Bay Ganojo (by Aleko Konstantinov), out of 59 Albanian present admiring, 44 corresponded to plain presents in the Bulgarian original and only 6 were translations of Bulgarian admiring usage, all of them referring to pre-existing states (cf. Friedman 1982b).

5. Macedonian

In the case of Macedonian, the earliest scholarly grammars (as opposed to pedagogical grammars, dialect descriptions, and brief outlines) of the standard language date from the middle of the twentieth century and contain clear formulations of a status type of category. The earliest such description is Lunt (1952:87-93), who uses the terms distanced, nondistanced, direct, and witnessed. Lunt uses distanced to refer to the past tenses using the verbal l-form (the Common Slavic resultative participle) descended from the old perfect, and defines the term as meaning 'distanced in time or reality', thus attempting to capture both perfect and nonconfirmative status meanings. The synthetic pasts descended from the Common Slavic imperfect and aorist are then opposed to the distanced forms as nondistanced or direct, with witnessed also being used for the aorist. The next, and first native description, Koneski (1954:202), identifies 'uses of the forms of the past indefinite tense with the meaning of reportedness' and also specifies the past definite (i.e. the synthetic aorist and imperfect) as denoting witnessed events (Koneski 1954:163, 165). Friedman (1977:114-35) has demonstrated that the synthetic aorist and imperfect are marked for confirmation (as in Bulgarian, they can be used for unwitnessed but not for disbelieved events, e.g. No potoa se slàcija raboti za(k) ni znaev 'But after that things happened which I didn't know about' [Friedman 1977:150]), the analytic aorist and imperfect are the unmarked (nonconfirmative) members of the opposition, the old pluperfect and the new present perfect in ima 'have' do not enter into the opposition at all, while the new perfects using the synthetic and analytic imperfects of ima as their auxiliaries are equipollently marked as confirmative and nonconfirmative, respectively. Like Bulgarian, Macedonian also has admiring, dubitative, and reported uses of its analytic (indefinite) past. The same arguments and restrictions apply.

Table Four is the Macedonian equivalent of Table Three. The use of square brackets indicates the fact that the imperfect stem can be either perfective or imperfective (with restrictions on the occurrence of perfective imperfects that need not concern us here), while the aorist stem is limited to perfectives (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>synthetic (definite)</th>
<th>analytic (indefinite)</th>
<th>pluperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>napravi</td>
<td>napravil</td>
<td>beše napravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>nonconfirmative</td>
<td>post</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4: MACEDONIAN 3 SG (MASC) 'DO'

Among the many differences between standard Macedonian - like the western dialects on which it is based - and standard Bulgarian, are the following: 1) Macedonian has a new set of perfects formed from the auxiliary ima 'have' (present, l-form, and synthetic imperfect) plus the invariant neuter verbal adjective (descended from the Common Slavic past passive participle), 2) the Macedonian future marker ke is invariant, unlike Bulgarian ste, which inflects in the
past tenses; since *še* can occur with any of the past tenses (except the synthetic aorist), it can be analyzed as nonparadigmatic along with similar modal particles such as the subjunctive marker *da* and the conditional protasis marker *ako* 'if'; 3) in the analytic (indefinite) and nonconfirmative paradigms, the third person auxiliary is never used, and thus there is no contrast between its presence and absence as in Bulgarian; 4) the analytic (indefinite) form of *be* (3 sg masc *bil*) never functions as an auxiliary, and thus the so-called emphatic reported forms of Bulgarian do not occur; 5) the imperfective aorist is almost completely obsolete in modern Macedonian, thus the aorist occurs only with perfective verbs while the imperfect verbal 1-form has expanded completely into a parallel position with the 1-form based on the aorist stem (cf. Friedman 1993). Although the semantics of status oppositions are essentially the same in Macedonian and Bulgarian, their grammatical forms and distributions differ as a result of post-Common Slavic developments. Moreover, as one moves southwest on Macedonian linguistic territory, semantic isoglosses differ from morphological ones. Thus, for example, in the Ohrid region, the analytic (indefinite) past is markedly nonconfirmative - it can never have its old perfect functions - while in the extreme southwest, around Korča (Albanian Korce) and Kostur (Greek Kastoria), the old perfect (analytic [indefinite] past) has become obsolete and has been replaced completely by the new perfect in *ima* (see Friedman 1988a). For an extensive account of these phenomena in Macedonian, see Foulon-Hristova 1995 (cf. also Friedman 1997).

In addition to East South Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian), those dialects of Southern West Slavic (the former Serbo-Croatian) that preserve an opposition between synthetic pasts and the old perfect - especially in the southern part of the region - are said to have similar status oppositions (Sami-lov 1957), while the omission of the auxiliary from the unmarked past (the old perfect) is likewise sometimes associated with expressive meanings (Grickat 1954:34-38). To the extent that the situation in the relevant dialects of former Serbo-Croatian resemble the adjacent Macedonian and Bulgarian dialects, they arguably represent the furthest outposts of the spread of these developments. It is particularly noteworthy that auxiliary omission in the former Serbo-Croatian is not considered the basis for constituting separate paradigms. Moreover, 1-forms based on the imperfect stem are absent.

5. Balkan Romance

Although the most frequently cited Balkan status categories are from Albanian, Slavic, and Turkish, recent years have seen the discovery of analogous paradigms in Balkan Romance. As mentioned earlier, Fiedler (1968) states that Arumanian lacks the type of what he calls Admiritativ-Komentativissysm found in Macedonian, Albanian, and Bulgarian. It was Atanasov (1984) who first observed that Megleno-Romanian has an inverted perfect that has the same functions as the nonconfirmative uses of the Macedonian l-form, i.e. reported/deductive, admiralitve and dubitative, e.g. *pirut-āgy* si vigha la noj (Atanasov 1984:528) '[Apparently] he wanted to come to our place'. This datum was noted by Fiedler (1989) and discussed in greater detail in Atanasov (1990:220-21). It should be noted that Caragi-Marioteanu (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, whereas Atanasov (1990:119-220) makes it clear that Megleno-Romanian has both inverted and uninvited perfects. In addition to the inverted perfect, Megleno-Romanian also has a pluperfect using an inverted perfect auxiliary alongside the unmarked pluperfect, which uses an imperfect auxiliary and is similarly marked for status, e.g. *vūt-āgy* mēncēt cēn vūt-āgy jāl (Atanasov 1984:528) '[Apparently] you had eaten when he came'. Table Five gives an illustrative paradigm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFECT</th>
<th>PLUPERFECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vizūt-ām</td>
<td>vizūt-ām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vizūt-āj</td>
<td>vizūt-āj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vizūt-āy</td>
<td>vizūt-āy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5 THE MEGLENO-ROMANIAN INVERTED PASTS 'SEE'

Given the semantic parallel with Macedonian and the formal parallel with Albanian as well as the location of Megleno-Romanian in eastern Macedonia (between Voden [Greek Edessa] and Gevgelija), the question naturally arises regarding the origin of the Megleno-Romanian inverted pasts. There are at least three possible explanations. One is that auxiliary postposing was an internal development of a type found in other Romance languages, and the semantic developments became attached to it subsequently through contact with Macedonian and/or Turkish, which were both spoken in villages in the region. (Prior to the Bal-
kan wars, the largest Megleno-Romanian village was Muslim, and the nahija of Maja Dag, next to the overwhelmingly Megleno-Romanian nahija of Karadžova, was entirely Turkish [KANCHE 1900:149-53].] A second explanation is that the auxiliary postposing was the result of contact local Macedonian and/or Turkish dialects, which both have verbal enclitics, and Turkish/Macedonian contact also gave rise to the semantics. In this scenario, Megleno-Romanian would have imitated a Macedonian/Turkish element order and then associated the most marked meanings of the Macedonian old perfect and/or Turkish mës-past with the new order. A third possibility is to be found in the fact that the Meglen (Máglen) region was along a major route of Eastward migration from Albania during the Ottoman period (see JARANO 1932). It is conceivable that there was a contact with Albanian during that period which provided an impetus for these inverted

While the relation of Albanian influence to Megleno-Romanian must remain in the realm of speculation, it is quite clear that Albanian is the source of the dialectal Aromanian adverbial. Aromanian generally lacks nonconfirmative verb forms - at least according to the available descriptions of dialects from Greece and Macedonia and the small amount of fieldwork I have been able to conduct in Albania - except in the Frasheriote (Fărșălot) dialect of the village of Gorna Bëlica (Beala di Supră) northwest of Struga in southwestern Macedonia. In this dialect, the third person singular Albanian adverbial marker -ka has been borrowed as an invariant particle which, suffixed to a past participial base (usually underlying the masculine plural from an imperfect stem), functions exactly like the Albanian adverbial (for details see FRIEDMAN 1994). It does not inflect for person, but can enter into oppositions of other verbal categories. The following example, given with a Macedonian translation in parentheses and taken from my fieldwork of 1992, is illustrative: Un a meu o'ospit bânera tu Bitul'i, ma di mul-
tu ot'ra nu n(a) avem vâzut. Aseră vini náš la mini ku Mercedes. Mi l'oj di mënti [Mi, cudos]: Abe tora tinu fusha avut om! [Eden mëj prijatele žive vo Bitola, no odamna se nembide videna. Vcera toj dojde kaj mene so Mercedes. Se šasardisov: A be sega ti së bil bogat čovek! ‘A friend of mine lives in Bitola, for we had not seen one another for a long time. Yesterday he came to my place in a Mercedes. I was amazed: Hey, you are a rich man now!’ Table Six (based on MARKOVIN 1995) gives a comparison of the Frasheriote Aromanian and Standard Albanian forms showing some of these distinctions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidentiality in the Balkans</th>
<th>533</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NONADMIRATIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADMIRATIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>lukră</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>ari lukrată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td>ave lukrată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pluperfect</td>
<td>avu lukrată</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double perfect</td>
<td>ari avut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double pluperfect</td>
<td>ave avut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd double pluperfect</td>
<td>avu lukrată</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 6: AROMANIAN (Fărșălot-Beala di Supră) & ALBANIAN INDICATIVES (3SG 'WORK')**

7. Romani

Although Romani is not usually treated among the canonical Balkan languages, the existence of status type distinctions in Romani deserve mention here. According to KOSTOV (1973:108), there is a dialect of Romani spoken in Sliven, Bulgaria, that has borrowed the evidential category of Bulgarian by reinterpreting the /u/ of the I-participle as a particle, viz. li, in much the same way that the Aromanian dialect of Beala di Supră reinterpreted and borrowed the Albanian third person singular present adverbial marker -ka. KOSTOV gives the following two examples with their Bulgarian equivalents: ...ti kanatu naknhas-li manușa opre pribuqatat, šumelas-li rascasa: "Pavljö, Pavljö!" = ...i kogom minavali hora po mosta, cvalo se prez noša: "Pavljö, Pavljö!" ‘And as people passed over the bridge, through the night was heard: "Pavljö, Pavljö!"’. Oda vakerjgas mangi, či tu phirshas-li. = Toj mi kaza či ti së hodel. ‘He told me that you were going.’

According to MATRAS (1995), pragmatic status (he uses the term *evidentiality*) is the organizing principle in the opposition between person-marked and gender-marked third person singular intransitive simple preterits in Romani (itself part of an inherited feature from Middle Indo-Aryan). Thus, for example, in
most Romani dialects, including the Kalderash/Lovari dialects on which MATRAS based his study, the 3 sg of the verb meaning 'came' can be the personal *avilas* or the participial *avilo* (masculine)*/avili* (feminine), agreeing with the subject in gender rather than person. (The potential opposition is neutralized in the 3 pl, where *-e* is both the participial and the personal ending, while only person-number inflection is used in the first two persons.) MATRAS attributes the rise of this distinction to Balkan language contact. According to him, the participial form is used for the presentation of unexpected (admirative) or ironic (dubitative) information as well as for deductive or resultative knowledge, whereas the person-marked form emphasizes the speaker's personal knowledge or the knowledge as well-established fact. Thus the participial past shares nuances of marked nonconfirmative status categories in the Balkan languages, while the personal past - which is the more common of the two - is unmarked. The following two pairs of examples illustrate MATRAS' point. (1) *Bui zuma ven es te intregin pe, arakhena buča ane fabrika. A lе *parudžilas khanci pa ginduri sar train e Rom [...]. Sa khetame šaj phenav tumenge kado: Ke sar sas de katar avilam ame ane Evropa ţi adreses, ci parudžili pa amari situacija khanci* 'Many tried to integrate, they found jobs in factories. But nothing changed with regard to prejudices about how the Roms live [...] All together I can tell you this: That as it has been since we arrived in Europe and until today, nothing has changed with regard to our situation' (MATRAS 1995:100). MATRAS argues that the person-marked *parudžilas* stresses the basis on personal knowledge, whereas the participial *parudžili* is a resultative deduction from the presentation in which the addressee is invited to share in the conclusion. (2) *Numa jexh, o Jono arakhadžilo ando Čecho, aj vov kote ande temnica arakhadžilo. Ke phari sas e Katika, [...]. Taj phandade la, e romni phari. Taj arakhadžilas o Jono ande temnica, no ‘Only one, Jono, was born in the Czech Republic, and there he was born in prison. For Katika was pregnant, ... and they arrested her, a pregnant woman. And [so] Jono was born in prison’ (MATRAS 1995:101-102). Here, according to MATRAS, the participial form *arakhadžilo* stresses the unexpected and exceptional nature of the event, while the personal *arakhadžilas* is used for the now established fact.

All of the paradigms and particles that we have been examining thus far do not involve the participation of modal markers. However, some Balkan languages have paradigmatic sets with overt modal markers that by their exclusively status-like nature deserve mention here, viz. the Romanian presumptive and the probabilitive mood (*verojačnostno naklonenje*) of the Bulgarian dialect of Novo Selo, Vidin region.

8. Romanian

The Romanian presumptive mood (*modul prezumtiv*) is said to express the same complex of meanings that occur in forms marked for nonconfirmative status in the Balkan languages discussed so far, i.e. supposition, (ironic) doubt, surprise, report. There is some debate about whether the presumptive is a separate mood and, if so, which potential members of the paradigm actually belong there (see FRIEDMAN 1998). Here we shall accept the maximal definition, i.e. the presumptive consists of any of the three sets of analytic modal markers (future, subjunctive, and conditional) plus the nonfinite form *fi* ‘be’ plus either the gerund or the past participle, as illustrated in Table Seven.

| invariants ~ 1-2-3sg-1-2-3pl | o ~ i ~ voi-vei-va-vom-veji-vor ~ | ioi-oi-o-om-oți-or | (future) | lucrând (present) |
| sâ-ai-ar-am-ăți-ar | (subjunctive) | fi | lucrâ (past/perfect) |

**TABLE 7: THE DACO-ROMANIAN PRESUMPTIVE ‘WORK’**

The following two examples illustrate typical admirative and dubitative usage of the Romanian presumptive: *Doar, n-or fi avind purici! ‘Surely he doesn’t have fleas!’ (Ioanna Chitoran, personal communication); - Îi zice lumea “Niciulată Minciună”? - Mi-o fi zicînd. ‘- Do they call you “Nick the Liar”? - They [supposedly] call me that’ (cited in FRIEDMAN 1998). The two additional examples that follow are taken from a Romanian translation of *Baj Ganjo*, for which I have supplied the Bulgarian original as well. The first is a type of reported, while the second is more dubitative: ... îmi spuse cum că băiatul ar fi avind în Bulgaria un frate funcționar... (= ...kaza mi, če tuj monče incalo u vas, v Bulgarija, brat činovnik...) ‘...he told me that this boy had a brother who was an official in your country, in Bulgaria...’. *Bai Ganiu îmi ceru să-i fac cinste, deoarece pe drum aş fi fumat din tutumul lui (= Baj Ganjo poiska az da počer-pjaja, ponez iz pátia sâm pušil ot negovija tjetjin) ‘Baj Ganjo wanted me to...
treat him, since on the road I had smoked some of his tobacco.’ (both cited in FRIEDMAN 1998). It is clear from the foregoing examples that the Romanian presumptivt has the semantics of a marked nonconfirmative, and yet it is interesting to observe that it is in complementary distribution with the Albanian admiring, at least in the translations examined thus far (FRIEDMAN 1998).

CARAGIU-MARIOȚEANU (1968:110-111) lists Aromanian presumptives based on the future marker plus the perfect subjunctive (e.g. 1 sg ‘sing’ va s-am’ kintă-tă = Romanian vor fi cîntat), and also plus the aorist, conditional, and past conditional (e.g. 1 sg ‘kill’ va vitimai’ - va vitimam – va avenam’ vitimatătă), but no such constructions were found by GOLAB (1984:107). ATANASOV (1990:224) reports that in Megenlo-Romanian (except the dialect of Crna Reka/Țărnareca), the erstwhile future marker va combines with the infinitive to form a presumptive mood like that of Daco-Romanian, e.g. jâl vă ărári călo (= Romanian el o fi arind acolo) ‘he must have been working here’. These are matters that require further investigation.

Insofar as it involves the grammaticalization of an historical future marker to express nuances of marked nonconfirmativity, the presumptive mood of the Bulgarian dialect of Novo Selo, Vidin district resembles the Romanian presumptive. Moreover, Novo Selo was a Bulgarian enclave surrounded by Romanian speech at the beginning of this century (MLADENOV 1969:8). Although inverted futures are attested in eastern Bulgaria and double futures among the Gallipoli Serbs, it is only in Novo Selo that this phenomenon has been paradigmaticized. In diachronic terms, the Novo Selo present probabilitive appears to be formed from the aorist or infinitive stem plus an inflected future marker (cf. MLADENOV 1969:108-13). The past is formed with the present probabilitive of ‘be’ (which shows variation in the stem) plus the l-participle while the future is formed with the invariant future marker că plus the present probabilitive. Table Eight gives a full present paradigm and indicates formation of the future and the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>gledăčăm</th>
<th>gledăčǎmo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future</td>
<td>că gládacăm etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>budačăm ~ budām ~ bičam glādāl, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8: THE NOVO SELO PROBABILITIVE ‘SEE’

In synchronic terms, the probabilitive comprises a set of past, present, and future paradigms used to convey various forms of nonconfirmativity, e.g. doubt, probability, possibility, qualified certainty, uncertainty, irony, surprise, and indirect questions, as in the following examples from MLADENOV 1969:110-11):

Budăčată bili i vi tāmo ‘You [apparently] were there, too’;
Koko bićá stránu neznâm ‘I don’t know how it happened’;
Răbotěčă nisâtām ‘He is [apparently] working somewhere’;
Jutră kopăčās lázā? ‘Will you [by any chance] be hoeing the vineyard tomorrow?’

Insofar as this is a grammaticalized paradigm, it should be included in an account of Balkan status categories. Moreover, it appears that all those nonconfirmative functions performed by the so-called reported (nonconfirmative) in Standard Bulgarian are fulfilled by the probabilitive in Novo Selo, where, as in Serbian, the descendant of the old perfect (past indefinite) never omits the third person auxiliary, uses only an aorist-stem l-participle, and has expanded into past contexts beyond those that are strictly resultative (MLADENOV 1969:107).

9. Greek

Greek is the one classic Balkan language that does not grammaticalize status in a manner analogous to that of the rest of the Balkans. (Of the nonclassic Balkan languages, i.e. those that do not figure in SANDFELD 1930 but do figure in works such as JOSEPH 1983, such a category is also not attested in Judezmo. However, as our experience in Beala di Supră demonstrates, the absence of a category from the published descriptions does not mean that there does not exist an as yet undescribed dialect - either Greek or Judezmo - in which the relevant phenomenon occurs.) In the case of Greek, perfect usage appears as a mirror image of the other Balkan developments. In all the other Balkan languages, definite past
time adverbs are permissible with periphrastics at least in certain contexts, whereas in Greek, as in English, they are not (Friedman 1977:126). Moreover, it is precisely the perfect in Greek that carries the kind of personal emphasis that makes it felicitous in nonvoluntative statements, e.g., Khôris ná tó katalávo, éspasa *ekho spasêt tê mpoukala ‘Without noticing it, I broke/have broken the bottle’ (Friedman 1977:127). This sentence is actually a translation from Macedonian (Ništò da ne setam, sum go škršl šišeto; Lunt 1952:97), where the old perfect would be expected and the aorist would sound strange if not incorrect. In the same vein, Symeonidou-Christidou (1982:135-36) observes that the perfect is the preferred past tense in political discourse and government proclamations in the press, since it renders a greater sense of credibility. The Greek future marker (thá) with the aorist (perfective past) expresses the kinds of suppositions that are also associated with status but also with epistemic modality. Thus, for example, Mackridge (1985:275) uses the label inferential to describe such a construction, which, as Asenova (1989:214) notes, corresponds to a future perfect in Bulgarian, e.g., tha égrapsa (= Bulgarian šie [da] sâm napisal) ‘I probably will have written/I must have written’. Insofar as a future marker is involved, this construction resembles the type of modal status we have observed in Romanian and, diachronically, in Novo Selo Bulgarian. The position of the aorist vis-à-vis the perfect, however, appears to be just the opposite of the situation in the rest of the Balkans.

10. Typology

We can summarize the manifestations of the grammatical category of indicative status as a Balkanism in terms of three typologies that are distinct but partially overlapping: 1) an opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative, in which an aorist or simple preterit is marked as confirmative and a perfect has a contextual variant meaning of nonconfirmative, 2) a marked nonconfirmative that has developed out of an older perfect (called perfectoid by Guéntchêva 1996b), and 3) a marked nonconfirmative particle added to a verbal stem or finite verbal form. Type 1 is found in Turkish and Balkan Slavic, Type 2 is found in Balkan Slavic, Albanian, and, pragmatically, in Romani, Type 3 is found in Balkan Romance and Romani. We can add to these a fourth type, which we can call modal status, involving the use of a modal (usually future) marker for paradigms explicitly restricted to nonconfirmative status. This applies to Balkan Romance and, perhaps, to Greek. Historically, Novo Selo Bulgarian might also be considered in the fourth type, but synchronically it appears to be more a variant on type 2. The confirmative functions of the Greek perfect represent an interesting mirror image to type 1.

Joseph (1983:191) makes the point that parallel independent developments are of no interest to a theory of areal linguistics, while Mufwene (1996) notes that the selection of features (language ecology) in cases of language contact is a crucial issue. The Balkan environment (like English), while for socio-historical reasons not considered in the context of pidgins and creoles nonetheless has relevant similarities insofar as attested linguistic contact is involved. While superficial resemblances such as Bulgarian third person auxiliary omission on the one hand and the addition of -dir to the mts-past in Turkish on the other can arguably be classed as parallel developments rather than calquing (see Friedman 1978), the fact that Turkish had grammaticalized status before arriving in the Balkans, while those languages with which it came in contact and for which we have sufficiently ancient data did not, suggests at least a Turkish impetus in the direction of selection for such a feature. In this respect, manifestations of status can be classed as a Balkanism, albeit one that may participate in a larger areal phenomenon that includes other areas where Turkic languages have had a significant presence (cf. Friedman 1988b).
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DER EINFLUSS DES LATEINISCHEN IN SÜDOSTEUROPA

1. Einleitende Bemerkungen
2. Zur sprachökologischen Charakteristik des Lateinischen im Horizont der Zeit
3. Charakteristik regionaler Kontakte des Lateinischen in Südosteuropa
4. Zur Frage der Nachwirkungen des lateinischen Kulturerbes in Südosteuropa


Später, u. zw. seit dem 3. Jh., stellte sich das Lateinische flexibel darauf um, die Ideenwelt des Christentums sprachlich zu konstruieren. Dabei erlebte besonders der Wortschatz erhebliche innovative Umgestaltungen. Die Sinn-