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FACTIVITY IN BALKAN NARRATIVE AND DISCOURSE

Among her many significant contributions to the study of Balkan and Slavic linguistics, Zuzanna Topolinska’s identification of the grammaticalization of the category of FACTIVITY (i.e., the distinction between “facts” and “non-facts”) as a Balkanism (convergent process) explaining in a unified manner such developments as various uses of the analytic future marker (in her terms, the _volilo_-particle), the dental modal subordinator (Slavic _da_, Albanian _të_, Romani _te_, Romance _alsii_, Greek _na_ — in Topolinska’s terms to subjunctive particle), and the development of the category often referred to as evidentiality since Jakobson (1957/1971) first applied it to Macedonian and Bulgarian, although Aronson (1977) argued convincingly that the phenomena are better treated as status. As Topolinska (1994:114) notes, citing Friedman (1997:7), this latter category “specifies the relationship of the speaker to the narrated event.” Topolinska (1994:113) points out that the Macedonian _l_-form does not, in and of itself, signal non-factivity, although it may enter into expressions of a non-factive character. In this she focuses on the use of the _l_-form to express the speaker’s unwillingness to confirm the statement either owing to felicitous or infelicitous (in Austin’s [1962] terms) incredulity, i.e. disbelief or surprise, or to some neutral consideration such as the source being an inference or report. I have grouped these meanings together in what I call the mark-
pastness with non-confirmativity that results in the use of the perfect in connected narratives, as in the Megleno-Romanian and Balkan Turkish examples given below from Capidan (1928:101) Pilićkova (1997:253), both with Macedonian translations:

1. Ash **vut-ă** ună- ără ună mümă trej fețiș ši li **trimes-ă** la spilarea la văli. Cum **spilat-ă** cuyla **vinit-ă** ună ăștară dî pri văli ši **ăș lat-ă** tsea mai μićă suără ši **ăș spus-ă** la tseali lastili sorur ši nu **ăș măcăt-ă**, tucă **ăș dus-ă** la mümă-

Si imala ednă edna majka tri ărki i gi ispratila na perenje na rekata. Kako što **perele** tamu, došla edna jabolka po rekata i ja zela na-
jmalata sestra i ja **pokažala** na tie drugi sestri i ne ja izela, tuku ja odnela kaj majka i.

Once upon a time a mother had three daughters and she **sent** them to do laundry at the river. As they were washing there an apple **came** [float- ing] down the river and the youngest sister **took** it and **showed** it to the other sisters and did not **eat** it but rather **took** it to her mother.

2. Bir **varimiş**, bir **yokimiş**. Isiyave ve karisi **istermişler** yesmner bir taş. Almişlar pazardan o taşni, amma **bilemezmişler** nekadar tuz koy-
sunlar. Isiyare **gümüş** furunciye sonsun nekadar tuz koyunur. Furunci de-
miş ona: Bir pnaca.

Si bilo što ne bilo, Isiyare i žena mu sa kale kokoška da jadat. **Kupile** kokoška od pazar, ama, ne **znaće** so kolku sol treba da se posoli kokoškata. **Otišol** Isiyare kaj furnadžjata da praša so kolku sol treba da se posoli kokoškata. -- Sol kolku edna raka, **rekol** furnadžjata.

Once there was, once there was not. Isiyare and his wife **wanted** to eat chicken. They **bought** a chicken at the market, but they didn't know how much salt to put on it. Isiyare **went** to the baker's to ask how much salt should be put on the chicken. The baker **said** to him: "One handful."

---

Victor A. Friedman

(edally non-confirmative (Friedman 1981), all of which involve, in Topo-
linska's terms, some sort of relation to factivity in the speaker's internal (mental) world. Topolinska's (1994:106) account deals with the utterance, and she characterizes sentences as "the most typical constructions ranking as utterances." In this paper honoring my dear friend and colleague, I shall argue that there is a systemic distinction between narrative and sentential non-confirmatives in the Balkan languages, that this distinction impacts on the sentence types in which non-confirmatives can occur, and that this distinction results from the manner in which the factive/non-factive opposition is realized in a given system.

We can identify two types of realizations of non-factivity in this re-
spect, one which operates regularly at the level of narrative discourse in-
volving more than one sentence and one which is more characteristic of the
level of sentence. The former is the classic type of so-called "renarration"
that uses the 1-participle in Balkan Slavic, the mit-past in Turkish, and the
inverted perfect in Megleno-Romanian. The second type can be called the
admirative (sensus-largci) characteristic of Albanian, Aromanian (dialect of
Bolu di Supra), and Daco-Romanian (the so-called presumptive mood),
as well as the Balkan Slavic dialect of Novo Selo, Vidin Region (the so-called
probabilitative mood). The former type is distinguished by its occurrence in
longer chunks of connected narratives (i.e., a group of sentences) and its
inability to express true present ("real" or "factive" or "non-past") meaning,
whereas the latter is distinguished by the fact that it is not used in extended
narratives and can function as a true (but non-factive) present tense.

The former type uses a perfect of some sort (in Balkan Slavic, an
inherited perfect, in Turkish a fully functioning perfect, and in Megleno-
Romanian an inverted perfect of the type participle- auxiliary) in connected
narratives to render reported or inferred information, and at the same time
can use this perfect to express felicitous and infelicitous incredulity at a real
or implied previous statement or the discovery of a preexisting state (so-
called dubitativiti and admirativity [sensus stricti], respectively). When
combined with the volo-particle or future marker, the meaning 'inferred'
is excluded. Thus, for example, whereas Macedonian **Vrnelo** or Turkish **Yağ
mur yağıms** 'It is/vas raining' can be uttered upon seeing wet ground or
upon opening the curtains and discovering that rain is already in the process
falling the expressions **ke vrtelo** or **Yağmur yağacakam** 'it will/would
[have] rain[ed] [they say] can be used to report a prediction that has already
been made but cannot communicate an inference about the future based on
present evidence, i.e. there must be some sort of past reference (cf.
Aksu-Koç and Slobin 1986:163). It is this combination of underlying true

---

Footnote:

I wish to thank Petar Aramasev and Marjan Markoviç for the translation of the Megleno-
Romanian into Macedonian. The translation of the Turkish text was that of the bilingual
speaker himself.
It is important to note that lengthy extended narratives, while possessing the capability of using these forms exclusively, generally show some variation in the deployment of verbal categories during their complete course. Thus it is normal to achieve stylistic and narrative effects such as shifts in perspective, the creation of tension, the signaling of a climax, etc., by varying the choice of verbal categories. It is interesting to note that in the Turkish/Macedonian tales collected by Pilićkova from bilingual narrators in Macedonia, the Turkish versions show more variation in such choices than do the Macedonian, but whether this is due to the respective verbal systems or personal styles of narration requires further investigation. (See Fielder 1999 for a comparative analysis of Turkish and Bulgarian choices of verbal categories in narrative techniques.)

In languages with true present admistrative usage, such extended connected narratives do not occur and the sources of the relevant forms are various. The Albanian is from an inverted perfect that has been elaborated into a group of four paradigmatic sets, the Arromanian is a particle based on a reinterpretation of the Albanian third person singular present admistrative marker and has also been elaborated, the Dacu-Romanian prescriptive is a construction made up of a modal particle (subjunctive, future, or conditional) the non-finite form fi 'be' and the present gerund or past participle of the main verb, and the Novo Selo probabilitive is a reinterpretation of the Serbian-type future (infinitive+volo auxiliary) and again elaborated into a group of paradigmatic sets. (For details, see Friedman 1999).

In these languages, the admistrative is limited to exclamations or brief statements that contain the speaker's non-confirmative attitude. As an illustration of typical Albanian admistrative usage, I give below a kind of narrative of an automobile trip from Pristina to Dragash, Brod, Prizren, and Gjakova in southwestern Kosovo in May 2002. I was riding in a car with two Kosovo colleagues, who were speaking in the Kosovo variant of standard Albanian. During the course of the trip, I recorded the adverbs that were used. As can be seen, when provided with the context in which they were uttered, they form a kind of disjointed narrative of the trip, but at no point do they constitute a connected narrative. It is worth noting that on many occasions the witnessed nature of admistrative usage is emphasized by the fact that the statement must be supplied with the context of what was being seen in order to be fully understood. At the same time, however, examples such as (14) involve dubitative rather than admistrative usage. In two places, I have also given the responses, which were in the non-admistrative indicative, demonstrating that the only difference between the two verb forms is the internal reaction of the speaker:

(3) Këtu gropat paskan nisë menjëherë.
   The holes have begun [to appear] here right away. (referring to road conditions)
(4) Ah, këtu e paskan kufizuar.
   Ah, they have a [speed] limit here.
(5) Paskan të drejtë.
   They are right. (upon seeing the curves in the mountain road)
(6) -- Po ruga e mirë qenka. -- Po, po, është asfalti.
   --Hey, this is a good road. --Yes, yes, it is asphalt.
(7) Paskan lopë.
   There are cows. (upon seeing cows on the road)
(8) Paskan një skolë.
   They have a school. (on seeing a school.)
(9) Paska Nezim Berati?
   It has [the name] Nezim Berati? (checking on name of school)
(10) Turqit qenkan.
   They are Turks. (on seeing the nationality of a KFOR checkpoint).
(11) Livadhi qenka e bukur.
   The field is beautiful. (on rounding a curve with a view)
(12) Paska një teqe.
   They have a teke. (walking along a street)
(13) Paskan zanat.
   They have crafts. (on seeing the bazaar)
(14) A mos paskam sjellur strukturalizm.
   Had I not, by chance, brought in structuralism [they said]. (recounting a story about Serbian accusations in the 1980's)
(15) Qenka zona e bukur.
   The area is beautiful. (about the Dragash region)
(16) --Paska ujë mjafit. --Po është mjafit.
   --It has quite a bit of water. --Yes, it is quite a bit. (on seeing a river running high).
(17) Paskan bë një xhami të re.
   They have built a new mosque.
(18) Më ngadalë, se kontrol paska.
[Go] more slowly, since there's a check point. (on seeing an oncoming car's headlights flash)

(19) Ky paska parking.
This [place] has a parking lot.

(20) Dëja paska ndodhur.
Something happened. (on passing a car wreck on the highway)

The difference between narrative usage at the sentence level and in larger units of discourse can also be seen in the following Albanian (21) and (22) and Macedonian (23) news stories. In (21), the story is related using aorists and the compound perfect and plain perfect adverbials at the end relate a sequence of two previous events as marked dubitative embedded in the larger narrative. In (22), we have a similar embedding of two adverbial perfects relating previous events in a larger narrative made up of a coordinated imperfect and a series of aorists, but here the adverbial function as a kind of neutral rather than a dubitative report. By contrast, in (23) there are several sources of information and narrative perspectives, but the entire article is related using only I-forms.

(21) Më 16 nëntor 10 policë rrethuan shitpinë e Qamilit Nuzës, ish-kryetar i Aktivit të LDK-së në Ponashec dhe e arrestuan atë dhe violentin e tij Beqir Nuzën. Pasi i torturuhan deri në orët e vona të mbërregjes në Stacionin e polisë në Ponashec, Beqirin e liruan, kurse Qamitin, me procedurë të shpejtë e dënuan me 15 ditë burg - për arsye se pas ndjekjave të vazhdueshme për armë paska pas ikur në Shqipëri e tash paska ardhur për ta vizituar familjen. (Këshilli për Mbrojtjen e të Drejtave e të Lirive të Njerit Informata, nr. 276, 19-26 November 1995, www.albanian.com/kmdnj - cdhrf@albanian.com).

On 16 November, ten policemen surrounded the house of Qamil Naza, former head of the Assembly of Delegates to the Democratic League of Kosovo in Ponashe and arrested him together with his brother Beqir Naza. After they had tortured them until late into the night at the police station of Ponashe, they freed Beqir, whereas after a quick trial they sentenced Qamal to fifteen days prison because after [being subjected to] continual searches for arms he had [supposedly] gone to Albania and now [supposedly] had returned to visit his family.

(22) Në qenedër të qytetit, dy persona të panjohur, që filmin serbisht, sulman dhe tentuan të rëmbënjë studenten Aferdita Aliu (1973) nga Kaçaniku i Vjetër, të ciles ia plaçkëtën 60 DM dhe 50 dinare. Faqe ndërhyjeve se një qytetari shpjetar ajo shpëtoi nga rëmbëns dhe u dergua në ambulancë ku u dha ndihma mjekësore. Njeri nga personat e panjohur e paska sulmuar Aferditan e dhe e paska kërçenuar me revole edhe më 17 janar. (Këshilli për Mbrojtjen e të Drejtave e të Lirive të Njerit Informata, nr. 457 9 February 1999, www.albanian.com/kmdnj - cdhrf@albanian.com)

In the center of town, two unknown persons who were speaking Serbian attacked and attempted to kidnap the student Aferdita Aliu (1973) from Old Kaçanik, from whom they stole 60 DM and 50 dinars. Thanks to the intervention of two Albanian citizens she was saved from the assault and sent to a clinic, where she received medical attention. One of the unknown persons had attacked Aferdita and threatened her with a revolver also on 17 January.

(23) Çetiridisejt i çërtirgodoqan kumanovec zagal od elektricën udar vo vtoronilet kaj seloto Studena Bara pokraj rekata Pëniqja, vo momentot kogat so vrovit od trskata udrit vo ţica od dalekovod. K.B. bij pronajden mrtvo vo neposredna blizina na rekata vo ronite utirski časovi vo sredata. Spored policijata, tej zanimal na ribolov vo vtoronilet popladne, a otko ne se vratil, negovota sopragna organizirala potraga po nego. Po pronajganjeto na teloto, ta bila izvestena od lokalnata policija, koja zacedo so istražen sudija izvršila uvid na mestoto na nastanot. Pričivnite policijski informacii velat deka smrta nastapila otkako K.B. barajski povolno mesto za ribolov se divižel so trska v race i so vrovit od trskata udrit vo ţica od dalekovod, pri to došo do elektricen udar. Po izvršeniet pregled bi pronajdeni tragi od elektricen udar vo predelot na desnata raka. (Dnevnik, 17 May 2002, 13).

A forty-four year old man from Kumanovo died from an electric shock on Tuesday near the village of Studena Bara along the river Pëniqja when the tip of his fishing pole hit a high tension wire. K.B. was found dead right by the river early on Wednesday morning. According to the police, he had gone fishing on Tuesday afternoon, and when he did not return his spouse organized a search for him. After the location of the body, she was informed by the local police, who together with the chief investigator examined the place where the event occurred. Preliminary police information states that the death occurred when K.B., seeking a good fishing
spot was moving along with his pole in his hands and struck the wire with the tip of his pole, which caused the electric shock. After a complete examination, traces of electric shock were found on his right hand.

It is worth noting here (pace Sadiku 1976:57-58 and Asenova 2002:256-57) that the Albanian aorist and imperfect, unlike the Macedonian and Turkish, do not carry a nuance of personal witnessing. In this respect, a fundamental difference between languages with true present admissibles, on the one hand, and Balkan Slavic and Turkish, on the other, is the fact that the former do not have marked confirmatives whereas the latter do. That the meaning in question is personal confirmation and not literal witnessing is beautifully illustrated by an example that I witnessed in an interchange between Zuzana Topolinska and a Macedonian colleague back in October of 1986. In the course of conversation, the following interchange occurred:

Zuzana: Blaże was in Moscow. Macedonian colleague: Yes, [I know] he was.

In example (24), Zuzana chose the l-form because she was not in Moscow herself, but our Macedonian colleague, who was also not in Moscow, responded in the definite (confirmative) past because he accepted the fact as generally known despite the fact that he did not see Blaże in Moscow (pace Lunt 1952-93). Interestingly enough, however, Megleno-Romanian appears to possess the narrative non-confirmative without a corresponding marked confirmative. It is well-known that this language has been heavily influenced by Macedonian, but it appears here that the marked non-confirmative uses of the l-form were calqued without any influence of the marked confirmative uses of the definite past, thus creating a system midway between the Balkan Slavic/Turkish type, on the one hand, and the Albanian/Daco-Romanian/Aromanian on the other.

Aside from the relative absence from extended connected narratives, the admimtrative type of non-factive in languages where it is a true present occurs in sentence types where admimtrative usage of perfect cannot occur, namely in present-tense interrogatives. An excellent example occurs in the opening panel of the comic strip "Tafë Kusuri" published in "Rilindja" (8 June 1982, p. 8): a man walks into a barber shop and sees the barber's ap-

prentice but is surprised that the barber himself is not in his shop. He asks, in Albanian: "C'ii, ku qenka mjeshtri?". "Where is the master, lad," thus indicating that he is surprised at the very moment of speech. In such a context, however, he cannot ask in Bulgarian "Kále bi majstor?" nor in Macedonian "Kále bi majstor?!" nor in Megleno-Romanian jënd iost-1g majstor[l] nor in Turkish "Usta neredeymis?" With regard to Macedonian (and Bulgarian), this is consistent with Topolinska's (1994:113) observation that: "The l-form cannot present an actual action or state." (cf. Friedman 1981). Here, the Albanian admimtrative can function as a true present tense, whereas as such usage is unacceptable in Balkan Slavic, Megleno-Romanian, and Turkish. Interestingly enough, such usage cannot occur with the Aromanian admimtrative. And so, here again, we see that a South Danubian Balkan Romance language that borrowed or calqued a contact language's non-confirmative has integrated it into the overall system in a different fashion. Moreover, in the Daco-Romanian presumptive only the form using the future marker is acceptable in this context: Thus the customer could ask [Pej! Under va fi fiind mešteri?], but could not use să fi fiind or ar fi fiind.4

It is also the case that a system can pass from one type to the other. Thus, for example, in the Macedonian dialects of the extreme southwest periphery (Korča-Kostur), the new perfect in ina 'have' has completely replaced the old perfect using the l-participle leaving only remnants of the marked non-confirmative uses and pushing the l-participle completely out of connected narratives. The result is a combination of Balkan Slavic and Albanian restrictions: In the Korča-Kostur dialects of Macedonian, the l-form does not occur in connected narratives (as in Albanian) and its apparent present meanings all have past reference, i.e. must refer to pre-existing states and cannot have true present meaning (cf. Mazon 1936, Friedman 1988). In the Arbëreshe dialects of Italy, the Arvanitika dialects of Greece, and the Lab and Çam dialects of the extreme south of contiguous Albanian

---

4 This is an important difference between admimtrative usage and dubitative usage. If the customer were to ask, e.g., in Turkish, "Usta nerede?" and the apprentice were to answer that he didn't know, that he wasn't around, that he wasn't at home, etc., and the exasperated customer did not believe him, he could then exclaim: "Hye, usta neredeymis?", "OK, then, where is the master?!" but this quotation would be an exclamation of sarcastic exasperation at the apprentice's previous responses, i.e. a dubitative, rather than a genuine question. The same holds true for the Bulgarian equivalent.

5 I wish to thank Adrian Porucic for this information. It represents a crucial differentiation among the three types of presumptive constructions, which are generally treated as synonymous. The investigation of this phenomenon will have to be left for another work.
linguistic territory, it appears that the inverted-perfect-based admirative never developed (Altimari 1994), in Ukraine it has remained a kind of inverted perfect (Kotova 1956), while in Northern Albanian (especially rural Geg), the admiring still retains nuances of its meaning as an inverted perfect (Cabej 1979:16-18), and even shows a tendency toward deparadigmaticization through restriction. Thus, for example, in Dushmani, 30 km east of Shkodër near the Montenegrin border, the admiring only occurs in the perfect, e.g. pa-ska pa-[s], Standard Albanian paska pasur; see Cimochowski 1951:116).

Let us now consider the implications of these data for an account of the grammaticalization of this aspect of FACTIVITY as a Balkanism. Topolinska (1994:112) identifies the Albanian admiring as "a possible source of the semantic derivation characteristic of the Macedonian I-perfect", but given the differences in the two systems, and especially taking into account the fact that the Turkish system is both older than and closer to the Balkan Slavic than is Albanian, it is more likely that the similarities are due to the nature of marked non-confirmatvity itself. The same semantic and pragmatic factors lead to the same constellation of meanings being associated with marked non-confirmatvity, itself a subset of non-factivity insofar as marked non-confirmatvity treats the narrated event as a non-event (disbelief, i.e. dubitative), a non-fact transformed into a fact (surprise, i.e. admirable), or an attenuated fact (report/inference). It is worth noting that in terms of Topolinska's anthropocentric theory of marking in nominal systems, the place of +/- definite at the top of the hierarchy intersects with the factive/non-factiver opposition in evidentials, which are also described in terms of a deictic (definite/indefinite, or non-distanced/distance) opposition (cf. Topolinska 1994, 1996). Topolinska (1994) concludes: "Under such circumstances [the need to be understood in the process of oral communication in a multilingual environment] the primary candidates for grammaticalization are also those signals that will guarantee successful reference [especially a] clear cut distinction between factive and non-factibe statements." A related factor, however, is the desire to attenuate, i.e. to distinguish different types of [potential] non-fact. This is what is particularly attractive about the non-confirmative complex. At the same time, however, there appears to be a fundamental difference between this type of non-factivity at the sentential and at the discourse levels. If marked non-confirmative can be used in extended discourse, they cannot function as true presents (Turkish, Balkan Slavic, Megleno-Romanian), and if they can function as true presents, they will not occur in extended discourse (Albanian, Daco-Romanian, Aromanian, Novo Selo). In the case of Aromanian and Novo Selo, the influence of Albanian and Daco-Romanian, respectively, is clear, while the influence of Balkan Slavic on Megleno-Romanian is well known. While Turkish appears to have introduced the impetus for all these developments, nonetheless, there appear to be three distinct groupings: perfect-based discourse level (Turkish, Balkan Slavic, Megleno-Romanian), perfect-based sentence level (Albanian and Aromanian), and modal-based sentence level (Daco-Romanian and Novo Selo). It may well be that universal properties affected these three distinct convergences.
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