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1. Introduction

More than twenty years ago (Friedman 1977a: 34–52), I proposed that the synthetic pasts of Macedonian are marked for confirmativity, i.e., the speaker’s vouching for the truth of the information rather than some more literal notion such as ‘witnessed’ (much like the situation described for Bulgarian by Aronson 1967: 87). Based on the evidence of my field research, I went on to propose that the Macedonian past tense descended from the Common Slavic resultative perfect using the l-participle (sometimes called the indefinite past) did not carry any sort of marking for reportedness, but rather was an unmarked past vis-à-vis the marked confirmative past, and thus had nonconfirmativity as its chief contextual variant meaning. Although my basic framework was founded on Jakobson (1957 [1971]), there was no place in my analysis for his category of evidential (E/E*) in Jakobson’s formulation, since it was clear from the data that, contrary to Jakobson’s and others’ assertions, the actual source of information (“evidence”) was not crucial in determining the choice of verb form. Rather, it was the speaker’s attitude toward that information (which often, but not always, was influenced by its source) that determined the choice. Using analyses that developed from discussions with H. Aronson (published in Aronson 1977: 14 and Friedman 1977a: 7), I argued that it was the grammatical category of status, defined as the relation of the participant in the speech event (P) to the narrated event (E), that was expressed by the opposition confirmative / nonconfirmative. Moreover, it also became clear that in new paradigms utilizing l-participles which developed in Macedonian (and Bulgarian) during the late medieval and ear-
ly modern periods, it was precisely ‘nonconfirmative’ that became the invariant meaning. In subsequent research I examined related phenomena in other Balkan and also some Caucasian languages. In this paper, I shall survey the results of some of that research. I shall conclude the paper with an outline of topics relevant for further investigations of status and its interactions with other grammatical categories.

2. Balkan Slavic

The relevant forms of Balkan Slavic necessary for understanding the functioning of status in those languages are outlined in Table 1 (based on Friedman 1986: 170).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Confirmative Past</th>
<th>Unmarked Past</th>
<th>Nonconfirmative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AORIST</td>
<td>pravix</td>
<td>sâm pravil</td>
<td>sâm pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pravi</td>
<td>e pravil</td>
<td>pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERFECT</td>
<td>pravex</td>
<td>sâm pravel</td>
<td>sâm pravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pravele</td>
<td>e pravel</td>
<td>pravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUPERFECT</td>
<td>bajx pravil</td>
<td>[sâm bil pravil]</td>
<td>sâm bil pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(aorist)</td>
<td>beše pravil</td>
<td>[e bil pravil]</td>
<td>bil pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUPERFECT</td>
<td>bajx pravel</td>
<td>(sâm bil pravel)</td>
<td>sâm bil pravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(imperfect)</td>
<td>beše pravel</td>
<td>(e bil pravel)</td>
<td>bil pravel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Confirmative Past</th>
<th>Unmarked Past</th>
<th>Pluperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AORIST</td>
<td>(na)praviv</td>
<td>sum (na)pravil</td>
<td>bev (na)pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(na)pravi</td>
<td>(na)pravil</td>
<td>bev [na]pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERFECT</td>
<td>pravev</td>
<td>sum pravil</td>
<td>bev pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pravele</td>
<td>pravil</td>
<td>beše pravil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMA SERIES</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Pluperfect</th>
<th>Nonconf*v Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imam praveno</td>
<td>imav praveno</td>
<td>sum imal praveno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. 1sg. and 3sg. of ‘do’ (imperfective) in Bulgarian and Macedonian


2.1. Confirmative vs. nonconfirmative in Balkan Slavic

The following examples illustrate the fact that the basic meaning of the opposition in question is confirmative/nonconfirmative:

1. *No poton se slučaja rabot za koi ne znaev.* but after that in they-happened things about which not I knew
   ‘But after that things happened which I didn’t know about.’ *(Nova Makedonija 19. VI. 74: 5 [Mac.]*)

2. Beše tamo.
   She was there.
   ‘She was there.’ [said of someone who was at a conference the speaker did not attend] *(May 1981) [Blg.]*

   tell how you eloped
   ‘Tell [the story of] how you eloped.’ [said by a legitimate daughter to her mother] *(September 1973) [Mac.]*

4. a. Ne veruvam deka toj go napraviti*| napravi tova.
   not I-believe that he it did-male-did that
   b. Ne vyarvam če toj napraviti*| napravi tova.
   not I-believe that he it did-female-did that
   ‘I don’t believe that he did it.’ *(Mac./Blg./Friedman 1978: 110)*

   Z. B. was-M in Moscow. K. Yes he was.
   ‘Zusa: “Blazes was in Moscow.” Kosta: “Yes, [I know] he was.”’ *(October 1986) [Mac.]*

6. Mu se javiv na vukvo mi. Ne beše doma,
   to-him in 1-called to uncle to-me not he was at home
   na plaža bil
   at beach was-M
   ‘I called my uncle. He wasn’t home, apparently he was at the beach.’ *(Based on a telephone call) (August 1992)*

Example (1) is a Macedonian translation of an English sentence uttered by Richard Nixon on the Watergate tapes. The aorist clearly refers to un witnessed events of whose veracity the speaker is nonetheless convinced. In context, the same use of confirmative aorists for unwitnessed events is true of examples (2) and (3). Example (4) shows that
the confirmative past cannot be subordinated to a verb that overtly and felicitously contradicts confirmation (Friedman 1976). Examples (5) and (6) show contrasting use of the confirmative and unmarked past. In each case, the source of the information is the same report, but the speakers relate to that information differently. Thus in (5) both Zuza and Kosta know that Blaže was in Moscow only on the basis of having been told. Zuza presents the information without confirmation and thus, by implication in this context, as hearsay, whereas Kosta responds with the confirmative since he considers the information well established. In (6), the speaker has only his aunt’s report as evidence for both statements, but he chooses to place greater emphasis on his conviction of the first statement, since his uncle would have been expected to come to the phone had he been home, whereas he might or might not have actually been at the beach.

2.2. Unmarked past in Macedonian

The following examples illustrate the fact that the Macedonian past paradigm based on the l-participle functions as the unmarked past rather than being marked for nonconfirmation:

(7) *Bugarite od Sofija — gošto ne doašja vo Ohrid?*  
the-Bulgarians from S. why not they-came in Ohrid

*Tie bila... ne se sečavam točno... tie bile*  
they they were not IN I remember exactly they were -P

*vo Ohrid porano... Rea vo maj mesec! I taka*  
in O. earlier they were in may month and so

*nemaše pari.*  
there wasn’t money

‘The Bulgarians from Sofia, why didn’t they come to Ohrid [in August]? They were... I don’t remember exactly, they were in Ohrid earlier—they were there in May—and so there wasn’t enough money.’ (December 1995)

(8) *Zatoa što forma *treše* *rešeno* odgovara na se*  
for-that what the-form it was decided-N answers to IN

*reši, t.e. na minatoto opredeleno vreme, koe go*  
it decided i.e. to the past definite tense which it

*upotreblavame za označavanje dejstva što se *vrylja* ili*  
we-use for indication actions what IN performed-P or

*se izvlile vo opredelen moment vo minatoto.*  
IN accomplished-P in definite moment in the-past

‘It is because the form had been decided corresponds to was decided, i.e., to the past definite tense, which we use to indicate actions that were performed or accomplished at a definite time in the past.’ (Minova-Gurkova 1984)

(9) *Liceko koe podnelo bananje za nosnirkačija, odnosno*  
The-person who submitted-N application for validation or

*priznavanje na ekvivalencijo na svjedectvo stekano vo*  
recognition of equivalence of diploma earned-N in

*stransto, meče uslovno da go posetova narednoto*  
abroad he can conditionally that he attend the appropriate

*oddelenje, dokolka postupka ne e završena do istekot*  
oddelenje, dokolka postupka ne e završena do istekot

*grade insofar-as the-process not is completed-P until the-expiration*  
of the-deadline for registration of the-pupils in school

‘A person who has submitted an application for the validation 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.’ (Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija 20.IX.95, Vol.51, No. 44, p. 1134)

(10) *Turko mi bil mnogo merakljiva za cvoka.*  
Father to-me was-M very fond for flowers

*My father was used to be very fond of flowers.* (December 1973)

(11) *Dosta sme rabotele.*  
Enough we are worked-P

*We have worked enough.* (April 1974)

In (7), the alternation between confirmative and unmarked pasts has nothing to do with the source of information, but rather with the speaker’s relationship to his own recollection of witnessed facts. In (8) and (9), the unmarked past is used in its neutral, defining (or perfect) function. In (8) the unmarked past is used to define the meaning of a form that is confirmative, while in (9) the unmarked past refers to any potential case of a situation. Examples (10) and (11) are both uses of the unmarked past that relate to its lack of marking for status. The first, uttered by a speaker reminiscing about her childhood memories, renders a habitual action or state in the distant past of relevance to the present (the conversation was about flowers), while the second, uttered by one
old man to another referring to their right to retirement, is a simple present resultative.

2.3. Auxiliary omission in Bulgarian

For the most part, the Bulgarian treatment of status is, mutatis mutandis, the same as in Macedonian. Although there are important differences in the development of new analytic paradigms based on different auxiliaries—Bulgarian uses the unmarked past of 'be' (3sg. bit) plus the old resultative participle in -l while Macedonian has developed an entirely new set of perfects using the auxiliary ‘have’ (3sg. presen: ima, imperfect imala, unmarked past imal) plus the neuter verbal adjective—the basic opposition confirmative / nonconfirmative based on the inherited tense forms is roughly the same. There is, however, one important difference between Macedonian and Bulgarian status usage in the inherited paradigmatic sets; whereas the Macedonian unmarked past never uses the auxiliary in the third person, the Bulgarian equivalent has the option of using it or omitting it. The alternation is treated in all current standard descriptions as constitutive of two separate homonymous paradigms that are differentiated only in the third person. Empirical investigation of actually occurring oral and written usage, however, reveals that the basis of auxiliary omission is neither the source of the information nor the speaker’s attitude toward the information itself (Friedman 1982a: 159-160). Rather, presence versus absence of the auxiliary is a pragmatic device encoding narrative perspective (distance, see Fielder 1995, 1996: 216, 1997: 177-179). Space does not permit a complete elaboration of the arguments, and so only a few examples will be adduced here.

(12) Ami az pomncia majka mu, br... učela me g
But I remember mother to-him he... taught me is
songs that I-sing
‘Well, but I remember his mother, man,... she used to teach me songs to sing.’
(Stankov 1967: 341)

(13)... vdelaz g pašval ot Burgas nadolu kâm granicata... selo
once is traveled-M from B. down toward the-border village
F- and traveled-M be — arrived-M is the-evening to some
village with bus and after that needed-M that he-goes-on
‘... 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.’ (Roth 1979: 177)

(14) V semejnite razkazi se podcrtava... če Nanka g... bila
in the-family stories it... it-emphasized that N. is was-
ljubimata sestra na Savata... Nanka g... prodlživala
do the-favorite sister of the S... N. is continued-M that
nariča brat si Savo vopreki če toj sam se... se... okazal
she-call brother own S. despite that he self in is renounced-M
ot tova si ime kato pripadal, če ne mu pripaja
from that own name as considered-M that not to-him it-suits
dobre i već imeto na vujka si...
well and took-M the-name of uncle own
‘The family stories always emphasized that Nanka was the favorite sister of
Sava... Nanka continued to call him Sava, although he himself renounced
his own given name since he considered it unbecoming and took the name of his

(15) Elica ovdana... če [el... uspala] mnogo kasi
E. she-replied that [is] slept-M much late
‘Elica replied that she had slept very late.’ [author did not use auxiliary, 7 out
of 8 informants insist only with auxiliary is acceptable] (McClain 1991)

Example (12) illustrates that the imperfect l-participle can occur with the auxiliary and moreover is not limited to reported contexts. Examples (13) and (14) show the auxiliary both present and absent when describing events known from the same source of information. The difference is clearly not one of evidentiality but of the relationship of the event to the narrative itself. In (13), the exact same event is described both with and without the auxiliary. The first usage, with the auxiliary, sets the scene, the background, while the subsequent, foregrounded narrative is without the auxiliary. In (14), the omission of the auxiliary signals a shift in narrative perspective. Although the source of information throughout is “the family stories”, the auxiliary is used in describing Nanka and then omitted when the perspective shifts to Sava’s own point of view. Example (15) illustrates the gap between prescrip-
tion and practice. Although the original sentence was auxiliariless, seven out of eight native speakers insisted that the auxiliary had to be present. In similar examples, McClain (1991) found that speakers were more or less evenly split over whether the auxiliary was required or forbidden. Although space does not permit us to enter into the details of the discourse function of third person auxiliary omission with the Bulgarian l-participle, the foregoing examples illustrate that this phenomenon is not paradigm-forming, neither is it conditioned by the source of information.

2.4. Bulgarian and Turkish

Let us now turn to Turkish in comparison with Bulgarian. The situation in Turkish has been described in great and admirable detail by Johanson (1971: 280–310) and Aksu-Koç (1988: 21–26), and so I shall only dwell here on the superficial parallels and significant differences between the two. Table 2 (cf. Friedman 1978: 112) shows the apparent parallels between Turkish and Bulgarian as observed in much of the comparative literature (e.g., Mirchev 1958: 211).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BULGARIAN</th>
<th>TURKISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Perfect&quot; Nonconfirmative</td>
<td>&quot;Perfect&quot; Nonconfirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg napravil sâm</td>
<td>yapmışım</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg napravil si</td>
<td>yapmışın</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg napravil e napravil</td>
<td>yapmış'tır</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaving to one side the specific functioning of -miš within the Turkish system, the key issue I wish to discuss here is the superficial parallel between the two sets of third person forms. The use of the Turkish particle -dir is frequently treated in comparative literature as the model for manipulations of the auxiliary in Bulgarian (see Friedman 1978: 112). In fact, however, the two processes are completely different. In Turkish, -dir is a clitic particle that can be added to any person in a variety of tense forms as a kind of emphatic or terminative particle. In its copulative function it is normally omitted unless such emphasis is required. Examples (16) and (17) illustrate such uses of -dir in functions that have no Bulgarian equivalent.

(16) Hayatımda onun kadar çok az insan bekenmiş ve in-my-life of-him like very few the-person valued-miš and saymışım'dur
respected-miš-I-am-is
‘In my life, I have valued and respected very few people as much as him.’ (Johanson 1971: 299)

(17) a. Biliyorsunuz,
you-are-knowing
‘You know.’ (Lewis 1967: 139)

b. Biliyorsunuzdur,
you-are-knowing-is
‘You surely know.’ (Lewis 1967: 139)

Examples (18)–(20) are taken from a Bulgarian-language grammar of Turkish. Without going into details (see Fielder 1994 for additional analysis), the main point that these examples illustrate is that there does not exist the type of isomorphism between Bulgarian and Turkish verb form usage that one might expect if Bulgarian auxiliary omission were the actual equivalent of Turkish -dir usage. Thus in (18) a Turkish di-past corresponds to a Bulgarian old perfect without auxiliary, in (19) a Turkish miš-past without -dir corresponds to a Bulgarian old perfect with the auxiliary, while in (20) the Turkish miš-past corresponds to a Bulgarian confirmative.

(18) a. Zayčar načalnik her halde Belgat-tan [sic] karʿl emirler.
Z. its-official every in-case from Belgrade strict orders
almış olmatadır ki, kaçakları hepsi iade etti. received-miš, must-be-is that the-runaways all return made-di

b. Na vseki slučaj Zajčarški iakoški načalnik hrabro da e polučil
on every case the-Z. regional official is-must that he-is received-m from Belgrade that returned-m all runaways
strict orders from Belgrade that returned-m all runaways
‘In any case, the Začar [regional] official must have received strict orders from Belgrade, so that he returned all of the runaways.’ (Glabov 1949: 270) (Turk. di-past/Bulg. past indef. without aux.)
2.6. Marked nonconfirmativity in Balkan Slavic

At this point we are ready to examine the uses of the unmarked past with apparent present meaning in Balkan Slavic. The following types of usage are often cited as justifications for the claim that the so-called reported neutralizes the opposition of present and past tense. In fact, however, such usages always refer to a real or presumed past event, speech act, or state of affairs. They thus represent a kind of expressive tense agreement not unlike the English sequence of tenses in its surface realization. The apparent present usages of the unmarked past are of three types (see also Friedman 1977a: 72–78, 1999: 515):
1) explicit nonconfirmativity with the implication or statement that the information is derived from a report (reportedness), 2) the expression of surprise at a pre-existing state of affairs that the speaker would not have been willing to vouch for prior discovery (admirativity), and 3) the expression of sarcastic disbelief, i.e., expressively marked rejection of confirmation (dubitativity). In each case, the correct English translation of this type of usage involves a present tense form, but likewise in each instance there is actually some past reference that allows the Balkan Slavic unmarked past to be used, as can be seen from the following examples:11

(22) Čovekov *bil* od Amerika.
this-person was-M  from L.
'This guy [said he] *was* from America.' (May 1974)

(23) She forgot to tell me she didn’t eat meat.

(24) She asked if I was the new girl, and I said I guessed I was.

L. will she-says [that] not knew-P
'Lidija will say she *didn’t know.' (Friedman 1977a: 71)

(26) Ti *ti* bil Rom! Ne im znal.
you are were-M Rom  not I-am knew-M
'Why, you are a Rom! I didn’t know.' (November 1973)

2.5. Auxiliary omission in South Slavic

The omission of the auxiliary in the third person in Bulgarian is part of a general pattern of auxiliary loss in the Common Slavic perfect that was carried to its logical extreme in East Slavic, where the auxiliary has been lost in all three persons. In Standard Macedonian and the Western dialects on which it is based, auxiliary loss occurs only in the third person, but it is complete in that person. The situation in Southern West South Slavic (the former Serbo-Croatian) is quite similar to Bulgarian insofar as the tendency to omit the auxiliary is basically pragmatically determined in the third person, as in example (21):10

(21) *Doban, kašu, Petar*
*came-M* they-say P.
'They say Peter *came.*' (Koneski 1965: 148)

No one has ever suggested that the auxiliaryless perfect in Southern West South Slavic constitutes the basis for a separate paradigm. Moreover, it should be clear that whatever the occasional superficial similarities between Bulgarian and Turkish, the two phenomena are quite distinct. The Turkish phenomenon is the result of the addition of an emphatic particle, while the Bulgarian is a pragmatically determined interpretation of the omission of an auxiliary.
(27) Beograd!

**He’s running (as a thief suddenly flees).** (Friedman 1982b: 66)

(28) Toj povek od tebe znaci. —Toj povek znaci!
—he more from you he-knows —he more knew-M

‘—He knows more than you do.—He knows more, indeed!’ (Friedman 1977a: 78)

In example (22), the statement was made by a cleaning lady, explaining to a student that (I had said) I was from America. There was no nuance of disbelief in her statement, but given the fact that I spoke fluent Macedonian she had no evidence for my statement other than my own report, and she chose not to add her personal confirmation upon repeating it. Although the statement could be rendered with a present tense verb form in English, the effect is more like that of sequence of tenses, as illustrated by examples (23) and (24). Example (25) demonstrates that the unmarked past must indeed refer to a past statement. It cannot be used to report an anticipated but not actually made future statement. Similarly, the unmarked past in example (26) expresses surprise at the present discovery of a pre-existing state. It is felicitous to use this form to describe an event that actually begins to take place at the moment of speech. By shifting an originally present tense statement into the unmarked past in the second sentence of (28), the speaker is engaging in ironic repetition, which specifically refers to and rejects the validity of a previously made statement. Thus all these types of usage of the unmarked past, which can be felicitously translated by English present tenses, nonetheless contain some type of past reference. This is demonstrated by the fact that they cannot be used felicitously in the absence of such a reference to the past. Later in this paper, when discussing the Albanian imperative, which is a true marked nonconfirmative with a true present tense, we shall have occasion to provide contrasting examples which support the claims being made here.

It is important to note that while it is confirmativity which is marked in the inherited past tenses in Balkan Slavic, with confirmativity being the chief contextual variant meaning of the unmarked past, in the new past tenses that have developed since the break-up of Common Slavic, nonconfirmativity has become the marked meaning of those forms using an unmarked past as an auxiliary. Moreover, in the extreme southwest of Macedonia, where paradigms using the old l-participle have been completely replaced by new formations (perfects and pluperfects using the auxiliary ima ‘have’ plus the neuter verbal adjective [the old past passive participle] and a future particle plus imperfect for the conditional), the only remnants of the unmarked past are those with markedly nonconfirmative meanings, i.e., the reported, imperative, and dubitative meanings described above (see Friedman 1986: 179, 1988a: 39). Examples (29)–(31) show that the new Macedonian perfect with the unmarked past of ‘have’ cannot be used for events that the speaker would have to confirm, while examples (32)–(33) exemplify similarly nonconfirmative forms in Bulgarian, using the unmarked past of ‘be’ as the auxiliary.

(29) Jas vidov kako toj go imal napraveno too.
I saw how he it had-M done-N it

‘He saw how that he had done it.’ (cf. Friedman 1977a: 110) [Mac.]

(30) Mislam deka toj go imal napraveno too.
I-think that he it had-M done-N it

‘I think he did it.’ (cf. Friedmann 1977a: 111) [Mac.]

(31) Sto znam, mozebi sum go imal storeno.
what I-know maybe I-am it had-M done-N

‘Who knows, maybe I have done it.’ (cf. Friedman 1977a: 111) [Mac.]

(32) Ništo ne bi napravl.
nothing not was-M did-M

‘He (claims he) hasn’t done anything.’ (September 1995) [Bgl.]

(33) Stankiewicz ne bi hodil v Plovdiv.
S. not was-M went-M in P.

‘Stankiewicz [has supposedly/apparently] never been to Plovdiv.’ (September 1988) [Bgl.]

To sum up the Balkan Slavic situation, we know from Old Church Slavonic that during the early medieval period status was not a grammatical category in the South Slavic verbal system. By the early modern period, the system as it is currently attested in the various languages was in place. It was thus during the Ottoman occupation that the past
definite became marked for confirmativity, the old perfect became the unmarked past (as in the rest of Slavic) but also acquired the chief contextual variant meaning of 'nonconfirmative' (as in Turkish), and 'nonconfirmative' became the marked meaning for newly developed past tenses using the l-particle of the old perfect. In those Macedonian dialects where the new perfect in 'have' completely replaced the old perfect in 'be', the l-particle survives only in expressive nonconfirmative contexts. In much of Bulgarian (including the literary language), as well as in Eastern Macedonian dialects and also Southern West South Slavic, presence versus absence of the auxiliary in the third person of the old perfect is manipulated as a discourse phenomenon marking narrative distance, but not evidentiality per se. Let us now turn to strikingly similar but nonetheless quite distinct phenomena in Albanian.

3. Marked nonconfirmativity in Albanian

Table 3 gives the first person singular of the present and past indicators of a maximal Albanian paradigm. As can be seen, the admirative is based on an inverted perfect, i.e., the auxiliary 'have' (1sg. pres. kam) of the active perfect is suffixed to a reduced short participle. It is interesting to note that while both the present and imperfect auxiliaries can be used to form the admirative, the aorist cannot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Nonadmirative</th>
<th>Admimrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kam</td>
<td>paskam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kam pasur</td>
<td>paskam pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kisha</td>
<td>paskësha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kisha pasur</td>
<td>paskësha pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kam pasë pasur</td>
<td>paskësha pasë pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kisha pasë pasur</td>
<td>paskësha pasë pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pata</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pata pasur</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pata pasë pasur</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The admirative is traditionally described as expressing surprise (cf. Friedman 1980: 17), but in fact it is a marked nonconfirmative, expressing the three basic types of nonconfirmative meaning described for the Balkan Slavic l-form: reportness, dubitativity, and admirativity (Friedman 1981). The following examples illustrate typical usages:

34. Qeshë i luntur të dëgjua se qëngjëni
I was pr pleased that I-heard that you are-A
mirë me shëndet të gjithë.
well with health pr all
'I was delighted to hear that you all are in good health.' (Personal letter, April 1995)

35. Ai paska një letter.
he he-has-A a letter
'[He says] he has a letter.' (August 1976)

36. Ti kërcyqës shumë mirë!
you you-dance-A very well
'You dance well!' (August 1995)

37. Sipas një neokomunisti serb Kosova na qënga "pjesa më e
according a neocomunist Serb Kosovo to-us it-is-A the-piece most pr
sigurt e Serbias," secure pr of-Serbia
'According to a Serbian neocomunist, Kosovo is "the most secure part of
Serbia."' (Kosovo Information Center, Informatori ditor, nr.1167, 26 IX 1995)

Examples (34) and (35) are pure nonconfirmative admiratives based on reports. The first is from a letter written after a telephone conversation with the addressee, while the second is taken from a conversation in which the speaker was reporting my words to a third person. (I was trying to track down a letter that I had been told had come for me while I was in Pristina.) In both cases there are nuances of surprise or disbelief, but only insofar as the marked nonconfirmation that characterizes the invariant meaning of the Albanian admirative must, by definition, involve the withholding of personal confirmation. Example (36) is a typical expression of sincere surprise at the discovery of an unexpected fact, and (37) expresses sarcastic disbelief of the statement being reported, i.e., pure admirativity and dubitativity, respectively.
3.1. Albanian nonconfirmativity vs Balkan Slavic and Turkish

Ever since Weigand (1923–1924, 1925) first noted the similarity between Balkan Slavic uses of the unmarked past with apparent present meaning to express marked nonconfirmativity (especially surprise as in Example 26 above) and the Albanian present admirative, the two have been treated as comparable phenomena. Example (38) which is taken from the Bulgarian novel Baj Ganjo and the respective Macedonian, Albanian, and Turkish translations (Konstantinov 1895, 1967, 1975, 1972), is typical in this respect:

(38) a. Bravo, be Gunjo — pokrava se baj Ganjo, — ti si bil cjal 
bravo hey G. he-exclaimed Mr. G. you you-are was-M entire 
Bismark. (Konstantinov 1895 [1973]: 109) [Blg.]
B.

b. Bravo, be Gunjo — vikna baj Ganjo, — ti si bil cel
bravo hey G. he-exclaimed Mr. G. you you-are was-M entire 
Bismark. (Konstantinov 1967: 119) [Mac.]
B.

c. Bravo ore Gunjo — thirri baj Ganasu entuziastmua — ti genke 
bravo hey G. he-exclaimed Mr. G. pr amazed you you-are-A 
nji Bismark i vretete. (Konstantinov 1975: 123) [Alb.]
B. pr true
B.

d. Bravo be Gunyo! dedi. Sen magallah baxshitan bir Bismark’
bravo hey G. he-said you praise-God complete one B.
missan be.
you-are-mish hey (Konstantinov 1972: 188) [Turk.]
‘Bravo Gunjo—exclaimed Baj Ganjo—you are a veritable Bismark.’

In fact, however, the Albanian present admirative is a true present, and is thus quite different from the Balkan Slavic uses of the unmarked past and the Turkish uses of -miş to signal nonconfirmativity. The Balkan Slavic unmarked past, as noted above, must always refer to a pre-existing state, and as such always has a nuance of pastness. Example (40c) indicates the same type of restriction for Turkish. This is not the case with the Albanian admirative, as can be seen in examples (39)–(42) and Table 4 below.

(39) Po vrapska!
qG he-runs-A
‘He’s running!’ [Alb.]

(40) a. Ku genke mjeshtri? [Alb.]
where he-is-M the-boss
b. Kade bil majstorot?
where was-M the-boss
c. Usta nerede miq?
boss where-miş
‘Where is the boss?’ [Alb.]*[Mac.]*[Turk.]

(41) a. Brej, hepten magare bil tozi čovek.
hey complete ass was-M this person
(Konstantinov 1895 [1973]: 88, 89) [Blg.]
b. Brej, epten magare bil tozi čovek!
hey complete ass was-M this person
(Konstantinov 1967: 91, 93) [Mac.]
c. Vay anasam,
be here! hepten de esempniq be!
woe the-his-mother this gay complete and ass-miş hey
(Konstantinov 1972: 144, 146) [Turk.]
d. Bre! gomar i madh paska qenë ky njeri!
hey ass pr big he-has-A been this person
(Konstantinov 1975:96) [Alb.]*[perfect]
e. Ore, fare gomar pasqish qenë ky njeri!
hey complete ass he-has-A been this person
(Konstantinov 1975: 98) [Alb.]*[perfect]
‘What an ass that guy is!’
f. Ama njerës fare pa mend qenëshin këta...
but people completely without mind they-were-A these
(Konstantinov 1975:24) [Alb.]*[perfect]
‘What fools are these...’

(42) a. Vjë sajëm mez hjaq teqeto — uçu'de se baj Ganajo 
you completely without bread you-eat wonders in Mr. G.
(Konstantinov 1895 [1973]: 58) [Blg.]
b. Vie sësena mez leb teqeto — ë së di e baj Ganajo.
you completely without bread you-eat 
in wonders Mr. G.
(Konstantinov 1967: 50) [Mac.]
c. Çudi qysh e heqërën i rrj gieleten, fare pa
strange that it you-eat-A you the-food completely without
bukë — thaj baj Ganaju çuditet,
bread he-said Mr. G. pr amazed
(Konstantinov 1975: 58) [Alb.]
d. Siz eknekiz mi icvorues që çorç, yahu diye
You bread-less q you-are-stinking this the-soap hey saying
de gaju Bay Gana.
and wonders Mr. G.
past rather than a present admiring to refer to that pre-existing state while simultaneously referencing surprise. Thus (41d–f) each use a different Albanian past admiring to translate the admiring use of the Balkan Slavic unmarked past (and Turkish -miş) in (41a–c). Example (42) and Table 4 illustrate the fact that the Albanian present admiring most often corresponds to a true present in languages such as Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Turkish. Table 4 gives the total number of present adjectives in the Albanian translation of Baj Ganjo and the number of times these forms corresponded to present tenses in the Bulgarian original and the Turkish translation, as well as the number of occurrences that did not have exact equivalents due to differences in translation style and those occurrences that did correspond to a Bulgarian -li participle and a Turkish form in -miş.16 As can be seen clearly, the overwhelming majority of Albanian present adjectives correspond to ordinary presents in the other languages. Example (42) is a typical illustration. Moreover, adjectives using the Balkan Slavic unmarked past are in fact the rarest. The point is that Albanian has developed an entire paradigm of marked nonconfirmatives, including a true present, whereas in Balkan Slavic the use of the unmarked past to express nonconfirmative nuances with apparently present meaning does not, in fact, represent a neutralization of tense but rather always contains a reference to a past, pre-existing state (cf. Friedman 1982b: 66).

4. Balkan Romance

4.1. Nonconfirmativity in Megleno-Romanian

Turning now to Balkan Romance, we come to three very distinct manifestations of nonconfirmativity among the three Balkan Romance languages, viz. Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Daco-Romanian. Megleno-Romanian has an inverted perfect (the present auxiliary meaning ‘have’ postponed to the past participle, see Table 5), which is formally like the Albanian admiring but semantically like Macedonian nonconfirmative uses of the unmarked past. Typical examples are given in sentences (43)–(45), which are cited exactly as in Atanasov
(1990: 220), i.e., Megleno-Romanian with Macedonian and French translations.

Table 5. The Megleno-Romanian inverted perfect of ‘see’

| vizűt-ām       | vizűt-ām       |
| vizűt-ağ       | vizűt-āt       |
| vizűt-Āj       | vizűt-āğ       |

(43) a. á bră, tu fust-dī mări om!
a hey you been-have big man
b. a be, ti si bil golem ēovek! [Mac.]
a hey you you are was-M big person
‘Mais je viens d’apprendre que tu es une personne importante!’ (Atanasov 1990: 221)

(44) a. nu vut-ași bun gîjît
not had-have good life
b. nemenile dobar život. [Mac.]
not-had-er good life
‘On dit que leur vie conjugale n’est pas réussie.’ (Atanasov 1990: 221)

(45) a. ier fust-dī an cățănu
yesterday been-have to village
b. văera si bil na sela. [Mac.]
yesterday you are was-M to village
‘J’ai entendu parler (on m’a dit) que hier tu étais (as été) au village/à la campagne.’ (Atanasov 1990: 221)

4.2. Nonconfirmativity in Aromanian

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 Frascheriote (Fărșălot) dialect of the village of Gorna Belica (Beala di supră) in southwestern Macedonia. In this dialect, the third person singular Albanian admirative marker -ka has been borrowed as an invariant particle which, suffixed to a past participial base (usually underlyingly the masculine plural from an imperfect stem), functions exactly like the Albanian admirative (for details see Friedman 1994b: 84–85). It does not inflect for person, but can enter into oppositions of other verbal categories. Table 6 (based on Markovik 1995: 80) gives a comparison of the Frascheriote Aromanian and Standard Albanian forms showing some of these distinctions.

Table 6. Aromanian (Fărșălot of Beala di supră) and Albanian indicatives (3sg. ‘work’)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present</th>
<th>NONADMIRATIVE</th>
<th>ADMIRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lukrăt</td>
<td>lukrătă</td>
<td>lukrătă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>ari lukrătă</td>
<td>ari lukrătă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td>ave lukrătă</td>
<td>kish punuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pluperfect</td>
<td>ari avut lukrătă</td>
<td>ari avut lukrătă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double perfect</td>
<td>ari avut lukrătă</td>
<td>ari avut lukrătă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd double pluperfect</td>
<td>ari avut lukrătă</td>
<td>ari avut lukrătă</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example (46) is a typical example in context and is followed by Macedonian and English translations. The Aromanian admirative has the same nuances of nonconfirmation, surprise, and disbelief recorded for the Albanian and for nonconfirmative uses of the Balkan Slavic unmarked past.

(46) Un a meu o’șpit bănăță ‘u Bîtu’l, ma di multu
a to me friend lives in B. but from much
o’ră na n(s) avem vixătă. Aște ră vini nás{n}o{la} times not us we have seen-ER yesterday came he to
mini ku. Mercedes Mi l’aj di mimi [Mi]
me with M. me it took from mind [me
šudos]: Abo tora tini fusha avut om!
amazed hey now you are-ER rich man
Eden moj prijatel živee vo Bîtola, no odamma
one my friend lives in B. but long-time-ago
se nemame videno. Viera toj dojde kajmene so
in not-we have seen-N yesterday he came by me with
Mercedes. Se šalardisav: A be sega ti si bil bogat čovek!
M. in I-wondered well hey now you are was-M rich person
‘A friend of mine lives in Bitola, but 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!’ [Mac.] (August 1992)
4.3. The Daco-Romanian presumptive mood

In Daco-Romanian, the so-called presumptive mood (modul presupunător) also has the three basic types of nonconfirmative meaning described above. Unlike the forms we have been considering thus far, however, the Daco-Romanian presumptive makes use of a modal particle (see Table 7); any of the modal particles in column one can be combined with invariant fi ‘be’ and either the present or past participle). Moreover, when formed with the invariant marker of the future (o, i) or subjunctive (să), it is like the Aromanian admisive insofar as it does not mark person. Examples (47)–(49) are typical present presumptives showing that all three types of modal particle can be used with no appreciable difference in meaning. Examples (50) and (51), from the Romanian translation of Baj Ganjo (Konstantinov 1964: 96–57), show present and past presumptives corresponding to the Balkan Slavic nonconfirmative past and the Turkish -miş form. In (50) the usage is pure nonconfirmative, while in (51) it is dubitative. Sentence (50) uses a present presumptive, since it refers to a state of affairs that might still obtain in the present, whereas (51) uses a past presumptive, since the action to which it refers is entirely in the past. It is interesting to note that while a Romanian presumptive will often (although not always) correspond to a Balkan Slavic and Turkish nonconfirmative in the respective translations of Baj Ganjo, the Romanian presumptive and the Albanian admisive never correspond. This may be connected with the fact that the Albanian paradigms are completely divorced from their original perfect meanings whereas the relevant Balkan Slavic and Turkish forms are not. In their deployment of pragmatic criteria, the Balkan Slavic and Turkish thus mediate between the indicative status of Albanian and the nonconfirmative modality of Daco-Romanian. Different types of contact phenomena may also be involved (cf. Friedman 1998a: 39 and note 9).

Table 7. Presumptive of ‘work’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-2-3pl</th>
<th>1-2-3pl</th>
<th>(future)</th>
<th>lucind (present)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voi-vei-vam-ve ș i-voi ș i oi-o-o-am-o ș i-o</td>
<td>să</td>
<td>(subjunctive) fi</td>
<td>(conditional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asti-zi-am-a ș i-ar</td>
<td>lucră (past/perfect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Romani

We can mention in passing that according to Kostov (1973: 108), the Romani dialect of Sliven in eastern Bulgaria has borrowed the -l of the old resumptive participle in the form of -li (the plural) and reinterpreted it as a marker of reportedness, as in example (52), given here with the Bulgarian translation supplied by Kostov:

(52) a. ti kanatu nakinas-li manula opre phrucjatar, funçalas-li and when passed-li people on from-bridge was-heard-li racjas: "Pavljo, Pavljol!" with-night P. P.

b. i kogatominavali xora po mosta, fovalo se and when passed-P people along the-bridge heard-in in pres nola: "Pavljo, Pavljol!" [Blg.] (Kostov 1973: 108) through the-night P. P.

'And as people passed over the bridge, through the night was heard: "Pavljo, Pavljol!"'

Matras (1994: 206–207) argues that the opposition between participial forms that agree with the subject in gender and gender-neutral forms that take the expected person marker in the third person singular simple preterit of intransitive verbs of motion and change of state in Kalderash Romani is determined by discourse factors similar to Balkan evidentials. Thus forms with the personal affix (e.g., gela ‘came’) denote personal (exclusive) knowledge whereas the participial affix (e.g., masc. gela, fem. geli) denote deduction from shared (inclusive) knowledge (Matras 1994: 206–207). Due to considerations of space, it will not be possible to go into greater details here.

6. The Caucasus

Although status oppositions are also found in all the Caucasian languages, we shall examine only two here, one Kartvelian (Georgian) and the other Dagestanian (Lak). Due to limitations of space, we shall only consider here certain details distinguishing the Caucasian languages from the Balkan ones vis-à-vis status. Both Georgian and Lak have perfects that are associated with nonconfirmativity and aorists.
that are associated with, among other things, confirmativity. Unlike
the Balkan languages, however, which have quotative and dubitative
words such as Bulgarian kaj, Albanian gjoja, and Romanian cică,
Georgian and Lak have quotative clitics (e.g. Georgian -o, Lak -tar) that specifically mark reported speech, as in the following Georgian
example:

(53) ’janom ra mindao?
’vano-e what 1-want-qi
‘What did Vano say he wanted?’ (Kim Braithwaite: personal communication)

Georgian has typical admirative uses of the perfect (surprise at a newly
discovered pre-existing state) as in (54), and moreover uses the perfect
as a performative as in (55), but, as in the Balkan languages, cannot use
the perfect to express surprise at an on-going act (56).21

(54) Ra lamazi gogo d’opilas.
what beautiful girl you-have-been
‘What a beautiful girl you are!’ (Friedman 1979: 341)

(55) Momelocas!
’l-have-congratulated-you
‘Congratulations!’ (Friedman 1979: 342)

(56) Is c’erili d’agric’riel.
this letter you-have-written
‘You have written/are writing that letter!’ (Friedman 1977b: 25)

Lak, however, does not have admirative uses of its perfect, nor does it
have dubitative uses of the type illustrated by example (28) above. Lak
does have a set of verb forms not found in any of the other languages
being considered here, viz. the assertive.22 In the present tense in ordi-
nary conversation, the assertive has an effect similar to the use of Eng-
lish do in affirmative sentences, as in example (57). The Lak assertive,
however, is not the normal tense for objective, neutral statements in offi-
cial style, as in (58) and (59). Such usage at the colloquial level, how-
ever, is emphatic, much like the use of -dir in Turkish. Thus, (60) is the
colloquial version of (59).

(57) Na čašar čičara / čičašara.
1 letter 1-wrote / 1-do-write
‘I wrote/do write a letter.’ (Friedman 1988a: 132)

(58) Hrâlil stil danamu asar k’ic’lagonč’la buvsa maqru,
business in-style impression producing decorative being words
kalimartttu tîla qapalszsr,
and-phrases used are-not
‘In business style, emotive and decorative words and phrases are not used.’
(Friedman 1994a)

(59) Arkinaxkasssa malinartttu bauqasvirjin bavnu, cîla c’umal
necessary cars absence having-been its-own of-time
qus łaqla qapalszsr,
goods send did-not-go
‘Due to the absence of necessary cars, the goods were not sent in time.’ (Friedman
1994a: 116)

(60) Hâq’INU čanssa malinartttu hîxa. Qus łaqla dukkan žâooksa qapalszra,
today few cars were goods send to-go from-us was-not-done
‘There were too few cars today. We didn’t send the goods.’ (Friedman 1994a:
116)

Lak also possesses defective confirmative paradigms that only occur
in the first person. For the other two persons, forms from a paradigm
not marked for confirmativity are used (cf. Friedman 1984: 137–138).

7. The Balkans and the Caucasus

7.1. Verb choice in formulas

Formulaic usages also highlight similarities and differences among the
different manifestations of status. Thus, for example, the traditional
beginning of a fairy tale that functions as the equivalent of the English
Once upon a time generally translates ‘Once there was and once there
was not’. Balkan Slavic, Turkish, and Lak all use perfect-type (non-
confirmative) forms, while Albanian, Balkan Romance, and Georgian
use simple preterits, as in (61). In proverbs, however, the patterning is
a bit different. For past tense proverbs that constitute miniature alle-
gorical stories, Balkan Slavic and Turkish use nonconfirmatives (un-
(61)  Bilo ne bilo (lmalo edno vreme) [Mac. & Blg.]
was-N not was-N there-was-N one time
fšte se na ć ishtel [Alb.]
t-was that to-us what-it-was
fi gi ira ma nu gi ira [Aromanian]
sut and it-was but not and it-was
Bir vrmis bir yolmuš [Turk.]
one exist-mis one not-exist-mis
iq'o da ara iq'o [Georgian]
t-was and not it-was
šk'un ur, qqavš'un ur [Lak]
not-having been was
Once upon a time...’ (Friedman 1988a: 132)

(62)  Vidijala šabata če kovat bivola, i tja navirala krokla. [Blg.]
saw-f the-frog that they-shoe the-buffalo and she lifted-f the-leg
Kúze nal čakrđiší gőrmüş, kuraša da ayağını
o-ox horseshoe its-hammering
having-seen frog too its-the-foot
balkirmiş [Turk.]
t-lift-mis
Videla šabata deka bivolo go kovat i sama dignala
saw-f the-frog that the-water-buffalo it they-shoe and herself lifted-f
sogatu. [Mac.]
foot
Bedeurebsa ćeddenn baq'aq'mac pexi ašivirao [Geo.]

horses they-were-shoeing frog-too foot it-lifted-qi
‘The frog saw them shoeing the ox/horses/water buffalo and lifted its foot, too.’
(Friedman 1989–1990: 668)

(63)  Magareto i na haďiláč da hodi, a pak magare se vrušta. [Blg.]
he-us and on pilgrimage that it-goes and yet ass is-it-returns
ierusalims niori gagezavne, dalbruda da iesv ćardao. [Geo.]
Jerusalem garlic went it-returned and still it-stank-qi
Ka’valin lavgunni kunu lačči čimis nac’u x-usu
Ka’aba it-went saying garlic garlic sweet having-become
qaheć’aisser [Lak]
t-not-returns
‘Garlic [donkey] went on a pilgrimage, but it came back stinking [still a donkey].’ (Friedman 1989–1990: 667)

7.2. Conclusion

In the course of this paper, I have tried to show the similarities and differences among the Balkan languages that have some sort of grammatical coding in the verb for the category of status. I have argued that the label evidential is infelicitous, since the motivation for verb form choice is the attitude of the speaker toward the information, which, while often determined or influenced by the source of the information (evidence), is nonetheless not obligatorily (or grammatically) dependent upon it. The Balkan Slavic opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative very much resembles the Turkish opposition between the past tenses in -di and -miş, whereas the Albanian and Balkan Romance paradigms encode only nonconfirmativity. In the Caucasus, as represented here by Georgian and Lak, a remarkably similar set of meanings are encoded in similar types of past tense forms, but there are also significant differences that are no doubt linked to the interrelationship among these forms and the rest of the verbal systems in which they are embedded. Linguistic contact with Turkish, which of all the languages considered here has the oldest attested status forms, is a possible source or at least motivating impetus for developments in the Balkans and the Caucasus, but at the same time, certain typological universals (e.g., the constellation of meanings associated with marked nonconfirmativity) may also be involved as explanatory factors. I shall conclude this paper with an outline of topics for investigation I first proposed in Friedman (1979:346, cf. Friedman 1984: 145–146). Although space has not permitted me to elaborate on all of these here, this outline provides a framework for continued investigation of the relevant phenomena in these and other languages.
Table 8. Outline for the comparative investigation of verbal systems with morphologically marked status categories in the Balkan-Anatolian-Caucasian area

I. Perfect as pure resulative vs Perfect as nonconfirmative vs Perfect as unmarked past or confirmative
   A. First person
   B. Connected narratives
      1. With definite past-time adverbs
      2. In folk tales
II. Perfect with apparently nonpast meanings
    A. Resultative
       1. Admenerative
       2. Stative
       3. Performative
       4. Other emotive
    B. Nonconfirmative
       1. Dubitative
III. Quotative particles
    A. Clitic
    B. Independent
IV. Competing forms
    A. Resultative
    B. Confirmative
    C. Nonconfirmative
V. Relation of perfect to neighboring forms
    A. Simple preterit
       1. Marked confirmative
       2. Unmarked
       3. Other
    B. Pluperfect
       1. Pure reported
       2. Pure taxic
       3. Marked confirmative
       4. Modal
    C. Nonpreterit (present)
       1. Unmarked
       2. Confirmative
       3. Nonconfirmative
VI. Influence of other generic categories
    A. Aspect
    B. Voice
VII. Volition, Uncertainty, Interrogation, Negation
VIII. Synthetic vs Analytic construction
IX. Modality

Notes
1. The literature on status categories has proliferated to the extent that a separate monograph could now be devoted just to a bibliography of works on this topic (cf. Friedman 1980: 26–30). Two collections worth citing, however, are Nichols—Chafe (1986) and Guertchëva (1996). Unfortunately, this latter work was not available to me in time for me to take it into account in writing this article. Foulon-Hristova (1995: 113–229) is a recent treatment of Macedonian, see Friedman (1997) for a review.
2. The confirmative past is also called the ‘definite past’ in traditional grammars. The unmarked past is similarly called the ‘indefinite past’, and the nonconfirmative is called ‘reported’ or ‘dubitative’.
3. References given as a month and year are from my own field notes, usually based on spontaneous conversations. Translations are mine unless the original source provided one. A reference in an example involving more than one foreign language refers to all the languages in question. Unreferenced examples are ordinary, common sentences.
4. Note that if such contradiction is infelicitous, then the use of the confirmative is permissible, hence the square brackets around the asterisk. In the specific case of (4), for example, if the speaker really does believe that the person in question did it and is using the predicate don’t believe to mean ‘I am surprised at the fact that’, then the use of the confirmative is acceptable and would stress the fact that the speaker really does believe he did it. Cf. English I can’t believe I ate the whole thing.
5. This is in direct contradiction to Šunt (1952: 93), whose presentation of the facts is in this case influenced by normative rather than descriptive practices, cf. Friedman (1977a: 60).
7. Strictly speaking, the imperfect resulative participle is an innovation rather than an inheritance from Common Slavic, in which the resulative participle was based only on the aorist stem. The innovation, however, is a common Macedo-Bulgarian one and pre-dates later developments that differentiated Macedonian and Bulgarian. In this sense, therefore, it can be treated together with older inherited material.
8. Cf. example (21) and note 10.
9. Cf. also Golqë’s (1960: 34–38) comparison with Macedonian. The striking similarity between various status categories in the Balkan languages and in Turkish has supplied considerable material for debate over contact versus autochthony (based on typological universals of development) as sources of the phenomena (e.g., Demiraj 1971: 47–48 and Yilli 1989: 47 for Albanian, cf. Friedman 1978: 112 on Balkan Slavic). The actual data suggest that while contact may have provided an impetus, universal principles could also have been at work.

11. These examples are all in Macedonian, however they would be identical in Bulgarian, mutatis mutandis, and the basic points being made are the same (see Friedman 1981).

12. The ‘double’ and ‘second’ perfects and pluperfects are marginal in the literary language, and the details of their use and meaning need not concern us here. Although the adative is treated as a mood (mënëre) in traditional Albanian grammar, I have argued (Friedman 1981), that the category it marks is status, which is not itself modal, although it can interact with mood. Among the data from Albanian grammar that can be adduced to support this argument are the facts that the adative takes the indicative negator nuk rather than the modal negator mos, and, moreover, that the adative can occur in both modal as well as indicative constructions, e.g., in analytic subjunctive constructions in të (cf. Fiedler 1966: 563, Lafe 1977: 480–81, Sytov 1979: 1120–111). If the adative were itself a mood, it would require a double layer of modality to account for such usage. Since the adative marks status, however, it can be both modal and nonmodal.

13. The name adative, was introduced by Dozon (1879: 226–227) and is translated by the Albanian habitore from habi ‘surprise’. Although the term is somewhat infelicitous, since it only describes one of the nonconditional contextual variant meanings, it is sufficiently widespread and well established that I will continue to use it here.

14. The Macedonian (and, mutatis mutandis, the Bulgarian) and Turkish sentences are felicitous as dative expletives at a previous statement or with explicit past reference, but they cannot be used with present meaning in this context, hence the asterisks.

15. If however, the boss comes out from behind a current, the custom can then exclaim in Bulgarian [and Macedonian], using the unmarked past:

(i) Ah, tak[a] si bil!
   ah here you-are were-M

Similarly in Turkish one could exclaim:

(ii) Ah, buradaymışın!
   ah here-miş-you

Although the normal English translation would be ‘Oh, here you are!’, in fact the true meaning of the Balkan Slavic and Turkish exclamations is ‘Oh, [it turns out] you have been here [all along]!’. Cf. especially example (41).

16. The statistics for Macedonian are approximately the same as for Bulgarian and Turkish.

17. The Aromanian adative was discovered by me together with Marjan Marković in Ohrid in 1992, and example (46) was the context in which it was first elicited. My travel for this field work was supported by a grant from the Internatio-
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Evidentiality and typology: grammatical functions of particles in Burmese and the early stages of Indo-European languages

Gunilla Gren-Eklund

In the most common method used by comparatists in the field of Indo-European languages, linguistic features are studied in order to contribute to a genetic description of the individual languages. My concern here will be to use such material for typological purposes.

1. The particles in the early Indo-European languages

Many years ago, I published my dissertation on nominal sentences in the Upanishads and devoted one part of the discussion to the particles in these texts (Gren-Eklund 1978: 98–127). There, they are abundant, and I was mainly concerned with the idea that they might act in a special way upon the nominal sentences, which in this language are normally devoid of copula. It seemed to be necessary to determine the syntactic and/or semantic status of the particles in the material, described as old Vedic prose. The hypothesis about the particles was that in their origin they are semantic markers but that they are also apt to be taken over by morphosyntactic functions in 1) the lapse of time and 2) the development of the literary language. Circumstantial evidence for this is the general tendency in descriptions of individual languages to regard the genuine particles as a class of outsiders in relation to the established parts of speech. Linguists strive to give the particles their rightful place in the system, but they actually ascribe them as a class to various categories of speech. They are often transferred from the class of adverbial words in general to the separate categories of conjunctions, interjections or negations. Jespersen, for example, made the particles (excepting those of negation) a supergroup for all small words, including even adverbs. This comes, by the way, very close to the original definition of the parts of speech in native Sanskrit grammar (four: nāman, ākhyāta, upasarga, nipāta) and, as far as I understand, also in