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EVIDENTIALITY, MODALITY, AND NARRATIVE IN MACEDONIAN AND OTHER BALKAN LANGUAGES

Victor A. Friedman

Abstract. Topolíska (1994) observes: “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 nonfactive 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 nonconfirmative complex. At the same time, however, there appears to be a fundamental difference between this type of nonfacticity at the sentential and at the discourse levels. If marked nonconfirmatives 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, Frashërtër Gorna Belica Aromanian, Novo Selo Bulgarian). In the case of Aromanian and Novo Selo Bulgarian, the influence of Albanian and Daco-Romanian, respectively, is clear, while the influence of Macedonian 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). My paper will discuss the possibility that these three distinct convergences are motivated by universal tendencies.

Zuzanna Topolíska (1994: 113) identifies the grammaticalization of the category of FACTIVITY (i.e., the distinction between "facts" and "nonfacts") as a Balkanism (convergent process) explaining in a unified manner such developments as various uses of the analytic future marker, the dental modal subordinator (subjunctive particle), and the development of the category of so-cal led evidentiality or pekazhanost that "specifies the
relationship of the speaker to the narrated event." Topolińska points out that the Macedonian *l*-form does not, in and of itself, signal nonfactivity, although it may enter into expressions of a nonfactive 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 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 "markedly nonconfirmative" all of which involve, in Topolińska's terms, some sort of relation to factivity in the speaker's internal (mental) world. Topolińska's account deals with the utterance, and she characterizes sentences as "the most typical constructions ranking as utterances." In this paper, I shall argue that there is a systemic distinction between narrative and sentential nonconfirmatives in the Balkan languages, that this distinction impacts on the sentence types in which nonconfirmatives can occur, and that this distinction results from the manner in which the factive/nonfactive opposition is realized in a given system.

We can identify two types of realizations of nonfactivity in this respect, one that operates regularly at the level of narrative discourse involving more than one sentence, and one that is more characteristic of the level of sentence. The former is the classic type of so-called "renarration" that uses the *l*-participle in Balkan Slavic, the mis-past in Turkish, and the inverted perfect in Megleno-Romanian. The second type can be called the admired (sensu-largo) characteristic of Albanian, Aromanian (Fraserriote dialect of Bela 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 probabilitive 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 meaning (i.e., without any reference to a real or putative past event, state, or statement), whereas the latter is distinguished by the fact that it is not used in extended narratives and can function as a true present tense, particularly in exclamations and questions.

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 im-plied previous statement or the discovery of a preexisting state [so-called dubitativity and admirativity (sensu stricto), respectively]. When combined with the future marker, the meaning 'inferred' is excluded, which is the opposite of what happens in systems where the future marker is formative of the evidential-like paradigm, as occurs in Daco-Romanian and Novo Selo. Thus, for example, whereas Macedonian Vrnelo or Turkish Yağmur yağmış 'It is/was 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 ęe vrnelo or Yağmur yağacakmış '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 always be some sort of past reference (cf. Aksu-Koço and Slobin 1986: 163). It is this combination of underlying true pastness with nonconfirmativity that results in the use of the perfect in connected narratives, as in the Megleno-Romanian and Balkan Turkish in examples (1) and (2) from Cupidan (1928: 101) Piličkova (1997: 253), respectively, both with Macedonian translations supplied by bilingual speakers:


2) Sī imalu ednaš edna majkja tri kerki i gi ispratiila na perenje na rekata. Kako što perēle tamu, došla edna jabolka po rekata i ja zela najmalata sestra i ja pokažala na tie drugije sestri i ne ja izela, tuku ja odnela kaj majkja 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 floating down the river and the youngest sister took it and showed it to the other sisters and did not eat it but rather brought it to her mother.

(2) Bir varımıș, bir yokmuş. Işıyare ve karışı istermişler yine bir taşak. Anımlarlar pazardan o taşı, amma bilmeniz mişler nekadar fazıyla anlarlar. Işıyaren bir gizim, furuncuye sorunan nekadar fazıyla anlar. Furunci demiş ona: Bir panca.

İşte bilo şıtko, Işıyare i żena mu sakale kokska da jadat. Kupile kokska od pazar, ama, ne znaele so kolku sol treba da se posoli kokska. Otısol Işıyare kaj furadžijata da praša so kolku sol treba da se posoli kokska. — Sol kolku edna raka, rekol furadžijata.

Once there was, once there was not. Işıyare 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. Işıyare went to the baker's to ask how much salt should be put on the chicken. The baker said to him: "One handful."

It is important to note that lengthy extended narratives, while possessing the capability of using these forms exclusively, generally show variation in the deployment of verbal categories during the their complete course (cf. Fielder 1999 on Bulgarian). 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 Piliçkova 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. The example below is illustrative:

The merchant thought: This man is very poor He might hit/kill me with an/the ax and take my money." This merchant had around his waist a belt, a cummer-
band with money. He pulls/pulled out the belt and
puts/put it under his pillow. He had a pistol, and he
puts/put it/the pistol by his pillow, so that the master of
the house/poor man would see it and be afraid and leave
his money alone because of the pistol.

The master of the house, his wife, the children/
everyone was fast asleep/are sleeping, only the mer-
chant does/could not sleep from fear. The little baby
stays in the cradle. At midnight three angels of fate
come/came. One stands/stood on the right side of the
cradle, one on the left side, and one stands by the feet.
Each of the three holds a notebook and pen/pencil. The
angel on the right asks/asked: [...] The one by the feet says/said: [...] The angel on the right side said: [...] The one/angel on the left side says/said: [...] The angel on the right side said: [...] The two angels now ask/asked the angel on the
right/her: [...] The merchant hears everything that they are say-
ing. The one on the right said: [...] The three angels wrote down this/these words in
their notebooks. The merchant became very upset when
he heard this. The writing angels went out and left. They
wrote [them] down and left. The merchant became very
upset when he heard this. Now the merchant could not
sleep at all/the merchant even so could not sleep, now he
was totally unable to sleep. Until morning/All night, he
thought about how to kill the child. When morning
came, he said to the child's/his father:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NONADMITRATIVE</th>
<th>ADMITRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>pas kam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>kama pasur</td>
<td>pas kama pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperfect</td>
<td>kida</td>
<td>pas kida pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperfect (imp.)</td>
<td>kida pasur</td>
<td>pas kida pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double perfect</td>
<td>kama pasu pasur</td>
<td>pas kama pasu pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double pluperfect</td>
<td>kida pasu pasur</td>
<td>pas kida pasu pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sorit</td>
<td>pata</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pluperfect (sec.)</td>
<td>pata pasur</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd double pluperfect (sec.)</td>
<td>pata pasu pasu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Albanian 1sg 'have'
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NONADMIRATIVE</th>
<th>ADMIRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present</td>
<td>lukrati</td>
<td>punon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>arlukrati</td>
<td>kapaun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pluperfect</td>
<td>avulekra</td>
<td>kishpunuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pluperfect</td>
<td>avulukra</td>
<td>potpunuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double perfect</td>
<td>arsuvet</td>
<td>kapaşpunuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double plup.</td>
<td>avelukrat</td>
<td>kishpaşpunuar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd dbl. plup.</td>
<td>avulukrat</td>
<td>potpaşpunuar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Aromanian (Fârşăloş-Bela di Suprâ) and Albanian Indicatives (3rd 'work')

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>invariants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-2-3sg-1-2-3pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-i-voi-vei-xa</td>
<td>voc-vei-xa</td>
<td>lucrud (present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an-ti-vu-aj-aj</td>
<td>lucra (past/perfect)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The Daco-Romanian Presumptive 'work'

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present</td>
<td>gledâçãm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>gledâçãa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>gledâçãa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
<td>čã gledâçãm, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>past</td>
<td>budaçãm – bîçâm gledâçãl, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The Novo Şelo probabilistic 'see'

Note also that in these languages the future marker is arguably part of the irrealis modal system. Thus, true admirativity moves between the evidential and the modal in its realization in the Balkan languages.

In these languages, the admirative is limited to exclamations or brief statements that contain the speaker's nonconfirmative attitude (usually surprise). As an illustration of typical Albanian admirative usage, I give below a kind of narrative of an automobile trip from Prishtina to Dragash, Brod, Prizren, and Gjakova in southwestern Kosovo in May 2002. I was riding in a car with two Kosovar colleagues, who were speaking in the Kosovar var-

iant of standard Albanian. During the course of the trip, I recorded the admiratives that we 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 admirative 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. In two places (4d and 4n), I have also given the responses, which were in the nonadmirative indicative, demonstrating that the only difference between the two verb forms is the internal reaction of the speaker:

(4a) Këtu gropat paskan nisë menjëherë. The holes have begun to appear] here right away. (referring to road conditions)
(4b) A, këtu e paskan kufizuar. A, they have limited it [the speed, i.e., made a speed limit] here.
(4c) Paskan tê drejtë. They are right. (upon seeing the curves in the mountain road)
(4d) --Po rruga e mirë qenka. --Po, po, ëshëtë asfalti. --Hey, this is a good road. --Yes, yes, it is asphalt.
(4e) Paskan lopë There are cows. (upon seeing cows on the road)
(4f) Paskan një shkolë They have a school. (on seeing a school)
(4g) Paska Nezim Berati? It has [the name] Nezim Berati? (checking on name of school)
(4h) Tërrijet qenka. They are Turks. (on seeing the nationality of a KëOR checkpoint)
(4i) Livadhi qenka e bukur.
The field is beautiful. (on rounding a curve with a view)

(4j) Paska nji teqe. They have a tekke. (walking along a street)

(4k) Paskan zanat They have crafts. (on seeing the bazaar)

(4l) A mos paskam sjellur strukturalizm Had I not, by chance, brought in structuralism [they said]. (recounting a story about Serbian accusations in the 1980s)

(4m) Qenka zona e bukur The area is beautiful. (about the Dragash region)

(4n) --Paska ujë mjalt.--Po është mjalt. --It has quite a bit of water.--Yes, it is quite a bit. (on seeing a river running high).

(4o) Paskan bâ nji xhami të re. The have built a new mosque.

(4p) Më ngadalë, se kontroll paska. [Go] more slowly, since there’s a check point. (on seeing an on-coming car's headlights flash)

(4q) Ky paska parking. This [place] has a parking lot.

(4r) Dëcka paska ndodhr. Something has happened. (on passing a car wreck on the highway)

A similar narrative could be constructed using Daco-Romanian presumptives, Bela di Suprë Aromanian admiratives, or Novo Selo Bulgarian probabilitives.

The difference between narrative usage at the sentence level and in larger units of discourse can also be seen in the following news stories in Albanian (5) and (6) and Macedonian (7). In (5), the story is related using aorists, and the compound perfect and plain perfect admiratives at the end relate a sequence of two previous events as marked dubitative embedded in the larger narrative. In (6), we have a similar embedding of two admirable perfects relating previous events in a larger narrative made up of a coordinated imperfect (fitin ‘they were speaking’) and a series of aorists, but here the admiratives function as a kind of neutral rather than a dubitative report. By contrast, in (7) there are several sources of information and narrative perspectives, but the entire article is related using only I-forms.

(5) Më 16 a.nëtor 10 policë rrëthuan shëqpërinë e Qamil Nüzës, ish-kryetar i Aktivit të LDK-së në Ponošeç dhe e arrestuan atë dhe vëllain e tij Beqir Nüzës. Pasi i torturuan deri në orët e vonë të mbërëmsjë në Stacionin e policisë në Ponošeç, Beqirin e rrëthuan, kurse Qamilen, me procedurë të shpejtë e dënuan me 15 ditë burg - për arsy se pas ndjekjeve të vazhdueshme për armën paska pasikur në Shqipëri e tash paska ardhur për ta vizituar familjen. (Këshilli për Mbrojtjen e të Dërgatve e të Lirive të Njeriut Informata, nr. 276, 19-26 November 1995, www.albanian.com/kmdinj-cdhrf@albanian.com).

On 16 November, ten policemen surrounded the house of Qamil Nuža, former head of the Assembly of Delegates to the Democratic League of Kosovo in Ponošeç, and arrested him together with his brother Beqir Nuža. After they had tortured them until late into the night at the police station of Ponošeç, they freed Beqir, whereas after a quick trial they sentenced Qamil 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.

(6) Në qerdë të qytetit, dy persona të panjohur, që fitin serisht, sullmuan dhe tentuan të rëmbjnë studenten Afërdita Aliu (1973) nga Kaçanik un Vjetër, të cilës ia plakithën 60 DM dhe 50 dinarë. Falë ndërhyrjes së një qytetarë shqiptar ajo shpëtoi nga rëmbimi dhe u dërgua në ambulancë ku iu dha ndihma mjekësore. Njëri nga personat e panjohur e paska sullmuan Afë-

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

The difference between narrative usage at the sentence level and in larger units of discourse is that the Albanian aorist and imperfect, unlike the Macedonian and Turkish, do not carry any nuance of personal witnessing. In this respect, a fundamental difference between languages with true present adveritaves, 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 Topolińska and a Macedonian colleague back in October of 1986. In the course of conversation, the following interchange occurred:

(8) Zuzana: Blaže bil vo Moskva.
Makedonski kolega: Da, beše.
Zuzana: Blaže was in Moscow.
Macedonian colleague: Yes, [I know] he was.

In example (8), Zuzana chose the I-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 Blaže in Moscow (pace Lunt 1952: 93). Inter-

A forty-four year old man from Kumanovo died from an electric shock on Tuesday near the village of Studena Bara along the river Pećinja when the tip of his fishing pole hit a high tension wire. K.B. was found dead right
estingly enough, however, Megleno-Romanian appears to possess the narrative nonconfirmative 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 nonconfirmative uses of the *l-form* were calqued without any influence of the marked confirmative uses of the definite pasts, thus creating a system midway between the Balkan Slavic/Turkish type, on the one hand, and the Albanian/Daco-Romanian/Aromanian on the other.

In languages where the admistrative does not occur in extended narratives and functions as a true present, it can occur in present interrogatives, whereas this is not the case in languages where the nonconfirmative is a narrative tense. Example (9) is illustrative.

(9) Albanian: Ku qenka mjeshtrit?  
Daco-Romanian: [Pe] Unde va fi fiind meserul?  
Novo Selo Bulgarian: Kudë *budëca* majstor? (cf. Mladenov 1969: 110)  
Bulgarian: Kâde *bil* majstorât?  
Macedonian: Kade *bil* majstoror?  
Turkish: Usta *neredeymiş"*?  
Megleno-Romanian: Jundi *fost-âug* majstorul[]?  
Bela di Suprâ Aromanian: *Îu fuska* majstorul?  
Where is the boss? [Albanian, Daco-Romanian, Novo Selo Bulgarian]  
Where was the boss? [Bulgarian, Macedonian, Turkish, Megleno-Romanian]

The context of the example is that of a man walking into a barber shop expecting to see the boss. The Albanian admistrative indicates that he is surprised at the very moment of speech, and Daco-Romanian and Novo Selo Bulgarian permit similar usages of the present presumptive and probabilitive, respectively. In (9), the Albanian admistrative can function as a true present tense, whereas such usage is unacceptable in Balkan Slavic, Megleno-Romanian, and Turkish. (This is an important difference between admistrative 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: "Iyi be, usta neredeymiş," "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 Macedonian and Bulgarian equivalents.) Interestingly enough, the Aromanian admistrative does not appear to be acceptable at all. And so, here again, we see that a South Danubian Balkan Romance language that borrowed or calqued a contact language's nonconfirmative has integrated it into the overall system in a different fashion. Moreover, in the Daco-Romanian presumptive, which can normally be formed with the future, subjunctive, or conditional marker [Table 3], only the form using the future marker (va) is acceptable here: In this context the customer could not use the subjunctive *să* or conditional *ar* in place of *va*, although apparently the subjunctive marker can occur in yes/no questions. Moreover, reported use of the Daco-Romanian presumptive appears to be limited to the conditional marker.

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 nonconfirmative 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 preexisting states and cannot have true present meaning (cf. Mazov 1936, Friedman 1988). In the Arbëresh dialects of Italy, the Arvanitika dialects of Greece, and the Lab and Çam dialects of the extreme south of contiguous Albanian linguistic territory, it appears that the inverted-perfect-based admistrative never developed (Altimari 1994), in Ukraine it has remained a kind of inverted perfect (Kotova 1956), while in
Northern Albanian (especially rural Gëg), the admirative still retains nuances of its meaning as an inverted perfect (Çabej 1979: 102-104) or perhaps has retained or reverted to nonadmirative meaning under the influence of local Serbian dialects and can be restricted to the past tense. Thus, for example, in Dushmani, 30 km east of Shkodër near the Montenegro border, the admirative only occurs in the perfect, e.g., pëkam përa, Standard Albanian paska pasur (see Ćimochowski 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. Topolińska identifies the Albanian admirative as "a possible source of the semantic derivation characteristic of the Macedonian l-perfect [italics added]," 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 one than is Albanian, it is more likely that the similarities are due to the nature of marked nonconfirmativity itself. The same semantic and pragmatic factors lead to the same constellation of meanings being associated with marked nonconfirmativity, itself a subset of nonfactivity insofar as marked nonconfirmativity treats the narrated event as a nonfact (disbelief, i.e., dubitative), a nonfact transformed into a fact (surprise, i.e., admirative), or an attenuated fact (report/inference). It is worth noting that in terms of Topolińska’s anthropocentric theory of marking in nominal systems, the place of /+/- definite at the top of the hierarchy intersects with the factive/nonfactive opposition in evidentials, which are also described in terms of a deictic (definite/indefinite, or nondistanced/distance) opposition (cf. Topolińska 1994, 1996). Topolińska (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-factive statements." A related factor, however, is the desire to attenuate, i.e., to distinguish different types of [potential] nonfact. This is what is particularly attractive about the nonconfirmative complex. At the same time, however, there appears to be a fundamental dif-

ferences between this type of nonfactivity at the sentential and at the discourse levels. If marked nonconfirmatives 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. Although 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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**3EOR ‘WORD’: AN UN/MISRECOGNISED INDO-EUROPEAN ROOT IN SLAVIC**

Eric P. Hamp

Abstract. The Macedonian noun zbor ‘word’, usually etymologized as belonging with the Indo-European root *bher- ‘bear, carry’, is argued here to instead represent the outcome of a laryngeal-final root *bherH- ‘pronounce, say’, seen also in Old Irish, Latin, and even other Slavic languages (e.g., Polish and Serbo-Croatian).

We find a familiar Indo-European base in the Makedonski zbor2 (di(j)al), variant: собор ‘skup, zbor’, also собор ‘sabor, zbor’, and in соборе ‘skupiti, sabrati, zbrati’ in *Речник на македонскиот јазик (RMJ I: 249, III: 256, 257), in contrast with what we find in the Българо-английски речник А-Я (В-А: 824 and 281 [избирах, избира], respectively) собор and избора (избере-). This base has been adequately studied and recognized in Slavic and Indo-European philology and linguistics for its root/base, the prefinal *bher- ‘bear, carry, convey, bring’. I have studied the incidence of this base and others resembling it in Celtic and Albanian in Hamp 1982 (some of my views expressed there have been in the meantime revised, elaborated, or expanded). Many of the standard references, of course, document forms or offer comment long known, but much is not always easily accessible because it is assumed to be too well known to be repeated; many of our trusted reference works are growing old or repetitious. Greek attests usefully for Balto-Slavs the root *theke which supplet *bher- (here, correct now my account of Albanian). We have *bher- attested in Slavic berq, hovati, Vedic and Sanskrit, Iranian, Greek, Armenian, Latin and Italic, Celtic,