Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung

Language Typology and Universals

Focus on:
Sentence types and sentence structures

Editors: Jost Gippert, Marcel Erdal & Rainer Voßen

Editor-in-chief: Th. Stolz, Bremen

Advisory Board: W. Bisang, Mainz · N. Boretzky, Bochum · B. Comrie, Leipzig
W. Croft, Manchester · Ö. Dahl, Stockholm · L. Dezső, Padova · W. Dressler, Wien
M. Haspelmath, Leipzig · E. König, Berlin · G. Lüdi, Basel · H. Lüdtke, Kiel · U. Mosel, Kiel
P. Muysken, Leiden · V. P. Nedjalkov, St. Petersburg · W. Oesterreicher, München
P. Ramat, Pavia · W. Raible, Freiburg · H.-J. Sasse, Köln · H. Seiler, Lenzburg · P. Sagall, Prag
M. Shibatani, Kobe · U. Stephany, Köln · S. Thompson, Santa Barbara · T. Vennemann, Ried

Akademie Verlag
Admirativity: between modality and evidentiality

Abstract

There is a systemic distinction between narrative and sentential nonconformatives in the Balkan languages, and this distinction impacts on the sentence types in which nonconformatives can occur. This distinction results from the manner in which the conformative/nonconformative opposition is realized in a given system. If marked nonconformatives can be used in extended discourse, they cannot function as true presents, they will not occur in extended discourse. 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, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Megleno-Romanian), perfect-based sentence level (Albanian, Fraschieri Bela di Suprã Aromanian, Kostur-Koča Macedonian), and modal-based sentence level (Daco-Romanian and Novo Selo Bulgarian). Moreover, the smaller languages and dialects were influenced by contact with larger surrounding languages: Megleno-Romanian by Macedonian, Bela di Suprã Aromanian and Kostur-Koča Macedonian by Albanian, and Novo Selo Bulgarian by Daco-Romanian). It may well be that universal properties affected these three distinct convergences.

1. Introduction

For the purpose of this paper, I shall define evidentiality in terms of its grammaticalization in the Balkan languages, i.e. as a grammatical category encoding the speaker’s evaluation of the narrated event, often, but not always, predicated upon the nature of the available evidence.1 Evidentials can be of two types: confirmative (sometimes called ‘witnessed’) and nonconfirmative (sometimes called ‘reported’ and/or ‘inferential’). The nonconfirmative can, in Austin’s (1962) terms, be felicitous (neutral) or infelicitous, in which latter case the nonconfirmative expresses either acceptance of a previously unexpected state of affairs (i.e. surprise, admirativity sensu stricto) or rejection of a previous statement (i.e., doubt, sarcasm, etc., dubitativitiy). Evidentials differ from related categories such as epistemic modals or lexical items (e.g. adverbs of evaluation) in that they are independently and fully grammaticalized and exist alongside these other systems and interact with them. In some Balkan languages, however, there is an interaction between modal particles (future, subjunctive, conditional) and nonconfirmative evidential meaning. This is especially true in the case of admirativity. In this paper, I shall argue that there is a systemic distinction between narrative and sentential nonconformatives in the Balkan languages, that this distinction impacts on the sentence types in which nonconformatives can occur, and, moreover, that this distinction results from the manner in which the confirmative/nonconfirmative opposition is realized in a given system.

2. Narrative nonconfirmativity

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 pre-existing 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 yağdı ‘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 of falling, the expressions ke vrnelo or yağmur yağacakmaz ‘it will/would [have] rain[ed]’ (they say)2 can be used to report a prediction that has already been made but cannot communicate an intuition about the future based on present evidence, i.e. there must always be some sort of past reference (cf. Aksu-Koç & Sloan 1986: 163). It is this combination of underlying truth presentness with nonconfirmativity that results in the use of the perfect in connected narratives, as in the Megleno-Romanian and Balkan Turkish examples (1) and (2) from Capidan (1928: 101) and Pljžková (1997: 253), respectively, both with Macedonian translations supplied by bilingual speakers:3


Si imâla ednaš edna majka tri kerki i gi ispratla na perene na rekata. Kako što perede tana, došla edna jabolka po rekata i ja zela najmala sestra i ja pokažala na tie drugite sestri i ne ja tzeš, tuka i odnela kaj majka i.

1 For additional discussion, see Johanson & Utas (2000).

2 I wish to thank Petar Atanasov and Marjan Maxeov for the translation of the Megleno-Romanian into Macedonian. The translation of the Turkish text was that of the bilingual speaker himself.
Bir varımıș, bir yokunuș. İşıyare ve karisi isterimleşer yeseler bir taşık: Alımıșlar pazardan o taşıgi, anna bilmezmişimler nekadar tez köyünler. İşıyare gitmiş furuncuya sorusan nekadar tez köyunur. Furuncu demis ona: Bir panca. Si bil mi ne bil, İşıyare i zena mu sakale kokşka da jadat. Kapile kokşka od paz, ama, ne znaele so kolku sol tez da se posoli kokşkata. Otısol İşıyare kaj furundžajata da prasa so kolku sol tez da se posoli kokşkata. – Sol kolku edna raka, rekoł furundžajata.

'Bir varımıș, bir yokunuș. İşıyare ve karisi isterimleşer yeseler bir taşık: Alımıșlar pazardan o taşıgi, anna bilmezmişimler nekadar tez köyünler. İşıyare gitmiş furuncuya sorusan nekadar tez köyunur. Furuncu demis ona: Bir panca. Si bil mi ne bil, İşıyare i zena mu sakale kokşka da jadat. Kapile kokşka od paz, ama, ne znaele so kolku sol tez da se posoli kokşkata. Otısol İşıyare kaj furundžajata da prasa so kolku sol tez da se posoli kokşkata. – Sol kolku edna raka, rekoł furundžajata.

Once there was, once there was not. İısıyare 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. İısıyare went to the baker's to ask how much salt should be put on the chicken. The baker said to him: “One handful.”"
In languages with true present admirative 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 Aromanian is a particle based on a reinterpretation of the Albanian third person singular present admirative marker and has also been elaborated, the Daco-Romanian presumptive 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 probabilistic is a reinterpretation of the Serbian-type future (infinite + future marker) in a system whose regular future is of the Balkan type (invariant pre-posed particle + finite form), and it is also elaborated into a group of paradigmatic sets. 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 utilization in the Balkan languages.

3. Admirative nonconfirmativity

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 acquaintances, who were speaking in the Kosovar variant of standard Albanian. During the course of the trip, I recorded the admiratives that were used. As can be seen, with 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 observed in order to be fully understood. At the same time, however, examples such as (4i) involve dubitative rather than admirative usage. In two places, I have also given the responses, which were in the non-admirative indicative, demonstrating that the only difference between the two verb forms is the internal reaction of the speaker:

(4a) Këtu grotat paskan nisë menjëherë.
   'The holes have begun to appear' (referring to road conditions)

(4b) Ah, këtu e paskan kufizuar.
   'Ah, they have limited it (the speed, i.e. made a speed limit) here.'

(4c) Paskan të drejtë.
   - 'They are right.' (upon seeing the curves in the mountain road)

(4d) - Po rruga e mirë qenka. - Po, po, është 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 nji shkollë
   'They have a school.' (on seeing a school)

(4g) Paska Nezim Berati?
   'It has [the name] Nezim Berati? (checking on name of school)

(4h) Turqit qenka.
   'They are Turks.' (on seeing the nationality of a KFOR checkpoint)

(4i) Livadhi qenka e bukur.
   'The field is beautiful.' (on rounding a curve with a view)

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

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

(4l) A mos paskan sjellur strukturizm.
   '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 mjaf. - Po është mjaf.
   - 'It has quite a bit of water. - Yes, it is quite a bit.' (on seeing a river running high)

(4o) Paskan bë nji xhami të re.
   'They 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) Dilça paska ndodhur.
   'Something has happened.' (on passing a car wreck on the highway)

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

4. Comparative perspectives

The difference between narrative usage at the sentence level and in larger units of discourse can also be seen in the following Albanian (5) and (6) and Macedonian (7) news stories. 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 admiritative perfects relating previous events in a larger narrative made up of a coordinated imperfect 'they were speaking' and a series of aorists, but here the admiratives function as a grid 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 -forms.
Më 16 nëntor 10 policë rrethuan shqiptarë e Qamıl Nuzaq, ish-kyetarët e Aktivit të LDK-së në Pinoshec dhe e arrestuan atë dhe vëllain e tij Beqir Nuzaq. Pasi i tordurun deri në orët e vonë të mbërrezjes në Staticon e policisë në Pinoshec, Beqirin e liruan, kurie Qamilen, me procedurë të shpejtë e dënuan me 15 ditë burg për arsye se ndjekjeve të vazhdueshme për armë paska pas i takur në Shqipëri e tash paska ardhur për ta vizituar familjen. (Këshilli për Mbrojtjen e të Dreshtheve e të Librave të Njeriu Informata nr. 276, 19-26 November 1995, www.albanian.com/kmdlinj –cdhr@albanian.com).

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


‘In the center of town, two unknown persons who were speaking Serbian attacked and attempted to kidnap the student Aferdita Aliu (1973) from Old Kaqançut, 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 Aferdita and threatened her with a revolver also on 17 January.’


‘A forty-four year old man from Kumanovo died from an electric shock on Tuesday near the village of Studena Bara along the river Pëjina 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.’

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 admiratives, 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 Topolinška and a Macedonian colleague back in October of 1986. In the course of conversation, the following interchange occurred:

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

In example (8), 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 Blaže in Moscow (pace Lunt 1952: 93). Interestingly enough, however, Mbelwan-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 affirmative 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 mjeshtri?
Daco-Romanian: [Pe] Unde va fi fiind meșterul?
Novo Selo Bulgarian: Kâde budâch majstroj? (cf. Mladenov 1969: 110)
Bulgarian: Kâde bil majstroj?
Macedonian: Kade bil majstoroj?
Turkish: Usta neredeyim?
Mbelwan-Romanian: Jundi fost-a majstorul(ul)?
Rela dî Suprâ Aromanian: In fussa majstoroj?
‘Where is the boss?’ [Albanian, Daco-Romanian, Novo Selo Bulgarian]
‘Where was the boss?’ [Bulgarian, Macedonian, Turkish, Mbelwan-Romanian]

The context of the example is that of a man walking into a barber shop expecting to see the boss. The Albanian admirative 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 probabilive, respectively. Here, the Albanian admirative can function as
have introduced the impetus for all these developments, nonetheless, there appear to be three distinct groupings: perfect-based discourse level (Turkish, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Megleno-Romanian), perfect-based sentence level (Albanian, Bela di Supra Aromanian, Kostur-Körč Macedonian), and modal-based sentence level (Daco-Romanian and Novo Selo Bulgarian). Moreover, the smaller languages and dialects were influenced by contact with larger surrounding languages: Megleno-Romanian by Macedonian, Bela di Supra Aromanian and Kostur-Körč Macedonian by Albanian, and Novo Selo Bulgarian by Daco-Romanian. It may well be that universal properties affected these three distinct convergences.
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5. Conclusion

There appears to be a fundamental difference between nonconfirmatives at the sentential and at the discourse levels. If marked nonconfirmatives can be used in extended discourse, they 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). Moreover, 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

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.

a true present tense, whereas as such usage is unacceptable in Balkan Slavic, Megleno-Romanian, and Turkish. Interestingly enough, the Aromanian presumptive equivalent 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, only the form using the future marker (va) is acceptable in this context: 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 ima '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 pre-existing states and cannot have true present meaning (cf. Mazon 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-adjectiveative never developed (Altimari 1994), in Ukraine it has remained a kind of inverted perfect (Konova 1956), while in Northern Albanian (especially rural Ceg), the adjectival form remains patterns of its meaning as an inverted perfect (Chazov 1979: 16–18) or perhaps has retained or reverted to non-adjectival meaning under the influence of local Serbian dialects or at least restriction to the past tense. Thus, for example, in Dushman, 30 km east of Shkodër near the Montenegrin border, the adjectival only occurs in the perfect, e.g. pačka pača, Standard Albanian paska pasur (see Cimochowski 1951: 116).
## Appendix: Verb tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synthetic (definite)</th>
<th>Analytic (indefinite)</th>
<th>Pluperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>napravi</td>
<td>beše napravi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>[na]praveše</td>
<td>beše [na]pravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>ima [na]praveno</td>
<td>imaše [na]praveno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Nonconfirmative</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Macedonian 3sO (masc) ‘do’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Con-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confirmative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>napravi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Macedonian and Turkish 3sO ‘do’ past & future (partial)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Pluperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vizūt-ām</td>
<td>vizūt-ām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vizūt-āj</td>
<td>vizūt-āj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vizūt-āy</td>
<td>vizūt-āy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vut-ām vizūt</td>
<td>vut-ām vizūt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vut-āj vizūt</td>
<td>vut-āj vizūt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vut-āy vizūt</td>
<td>vut-āy vizūt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: The Megleno-Romanian Inverted Pasts ‘see’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Nonadministrative</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>paskam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>kam pasur</td>
<td>paskam pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>kisha</td>
<td>paskēša</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect (impf.)</td>
<td>kisha pasur</td>
<td>paskēša pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Perfect</td>
<td>kam pasē pasur</td>
<td>paskēša pasē pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Pluperfect</td>
<td>kisha pasē pasur</td>
<td>paskēša pasē pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>pata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pluperfect</td>
<td>pata pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Double Pluperfect</td>
<td>pata pasē pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Albanian 1sO ‘have’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>gledăčăm</th>
<th>gledăčimo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>gledăčāš</td>
<td>gledăčātā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>gledăčā</td>
<td>gledăčāju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>čā gledăčām, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>hudăčăm - bičēm glădăl, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: The Novo Selo Probabilitive ‘see’