Admirativity can be defined as the use of a special form or the special use of a form to express the speaker’s surprise. In Balkan Slavic (here: Bulgarian and Macedonian), Albanian, and Turkish, such forms are all related to the perfect in some fashion, either synchronically or diachronically. The following example illustrates this basic concept:

(1) Toj bil bogat! (Bulgarian, Macedonian)
    Ai qenka i pasur! (Albanian)
    O zengin įmig! (Turkish)
    Why, (much to my surprise) it turns out that
    he’s rich!

The similarities between these phenomena in the Balkan languages mentioned here was first remarked upon in the early part of this century, and since that time a number of different analyses have been proposed. This paper will survey the history of the study of admirativity in Balkan Slavic, Albanian, and Turkish up to 1977. In a later work, I intend to present my own conclusions regarding these phenomena.

**BULGARIAN**

The initial grammatical frame of reference for Bulgarian will be taken from Stankov’s analysis (1967) of the literary Bulgarian indicative system in which there are two pairs of paradigmatic sets based on the aorist and imperfect l-participles. Both pairs employ the auxiliary sâm ‘be’ in the first two persons, but one pair also employs the auxiliary in the third person while the other omits it. The first set will be referred to by the traditional term perfect (Stankov’s neutralnotskasan) for convenience, although it should be kept in mind that this form is in fact the unmarked past (Aronson 1967:88-91). The second set will be designated by the traditional term reported (preiskasan), and the term past indefinite (mínalo neopredeleno) will be used here when referring to the perfect and reported as a single group of forms. Table I illustrates these distinctions with the 1sg and 3sg of the verb piša ‘write’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reported</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pišel sâm</td>
<td>pišel sâm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pišel e</td>
<td>pišel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>písal sâm</td>
<td>písal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I: 1sg and 3sg past indefinite of piša ‘write’**

Due to the total homonymy between the perfect and the reported in the first two persons, Aronson (1967:93) has argued that the opposition is neutralized there and can only exist in the third person. As has been noted by Andrejčin (1938:45, 60), Maslov (1956:228), Demina (1959:324-325), and Aronson (1967:93n.14), however, nonreported events can be narrated in the perfect without an auxiliary, in which case there is total neutralization of the opposition perfect/reported. In view of this fact, a Bulgarian admirative must have a present meaning in order to be treated as a special usage, since a so-called admirative with a past meaning is completely indistinguishable from a perfect with a deleted auxiliary.

The first comparison of Bulgarian admirative usage to another language of the Balkans was made by Conev (1910/11:15-16), who attributed the construction of sentences such as Toj bil dobár dovek! ‘What a good man he is!’ and To bilo daleko! ‘Wow, it’s far!’ to the influence of Turkish models: ey adam imig, ozaq imig. Conev did not distinguish perfect and reported paradigms (although he was aware of the phenomenon of omission of the auxiliary), and so for him the admirative use of the Turkish indefinite past in -imig with a meaning of present surprise influenced the use of the Bulgarian past indefinite in -l with the same meaning.

The second comparison, and the best known, was made by Weigand (1923/4, 1925) between the Bulgarian usage and the Albanian present admirative, which he described as an inverted perfect, as in the following example used in both of his articles:

(2) To bilo xubavo v gradal (Bulgarian)
    Kjen-ka bukër ndë kasabal (Albanian)
    How fine town life is!

In his 1925 article, Weigand went so far as to sugges
that the Bulgarian usage was of Albanian origin. It was Weigand who first applied the term
admirative (coined for Albanian by Dozon in 1879, see below) to the Bulgarian phenomenon, and between his two arti-
cles he presents nineteen examples which he labels
admirative. Of these, nine employ the verbs bil 'be' and imal 'have' (past indefinite), as in the example
cited above. Of the remaining ten, two are clearly
optative uses and two others have past references
and use bil as an auxiliary. The remaining six are
the following:

(3) Ax, to valjalo!
Oh, just look, it's raining' (upon closing the
window)

(4) Ma čujte, Boško znal da xortua!
Hullo, Boško can talk after all! (when a taciturn
peasant lad makes an unexpectedly long reply to a
question)

(5) Ax, to kapalo!
Damn it, it's coming in! (upon entering a dugout
and discovering rain dripping through the roof)

(6) Toj ne priličal na bašta si!
He's not at all like his father! (no context)

(7) Toj govoril mnogo xubavo!
The man speaks very well, better than I thought
he would.

(8) Niko jo ne poznal, koja edna žena običa naistina
ot šårce!
No one knows if a woman loves sincerely; that is
How can one know, etc.!

As can be seen, all of these examples refer to states,
qualities, or events which existed or were occurring
before the moment of speech, and in cases where no
context is given or where the auxiliary is used, as
in (8), it is not clear if the apparent meaning is
really present. Like Cenev, Weigand does not dis-

Romanski (1926) rejects Weigand's assertion of
the Albanian origin of Bulgarian admirative usage,
saying that the Bulgarian perfect can function
admiratively regardless of whether the auxiliary (at
least in the first two persons) precedes or follows,
whereas in Albanian it must always follow. The point
here is that the Albanian admirative is an independ-
ent paradigmatic set, descended from but synchroni-
cally unconnected with the perfect, while the Bul-
garian admirative is merely a use of the past

indefinite, and a restricted one at that.² Although
Romanski does not quite grasp the difference between
the two phenomena (in part due to Weigand's presenta-
tion), his observation that they are in fact essen-
tially different is significant. Romanski, too, does
not distinguish perfect and reported. He thus cites
toj e umrjal 'He has died' and Tja bila xabavea
'They say/It turns out that she's a beauty' as equal-
ly reported or perfect.

Beševliev (1928) supports Romanski's rejection
of Weigand's hypothesis by adding similar usages
from Ancient Greek and thus concluding that such
phenomena can arise independently in various lan-
guages. The two usages cited by him are the use of
the imperfect, ordinarily that of eñai 'be', with the
nonconfirmative particle āra to express surprise
at something which was true in the past but was only
accepted or realized by the speaker at the moment of
speech, e.g., oudeñ ār en práma 'It is, as it ap-
ppears, no matter after all' (Plato. Symposium 198e;
cf. Denniston 1954:36-38), and the epistolic past,
e.g., met Artabasou hóan eñi šempa, práse 'Negot-
iate with Artabazus whom I sent you' (Thucyrides
1.129; cf. Smyth 1956:433). The former usage really
is reminiscent of the Bulgarian admirative, but
Ancient Greek has an explicit lexical marker, āra,
whereas Bulgarian uses the past indefinite without
any lexical specification. The epistolary past is
just a form of tense agreement such as is found in
the English translation and is not really comparable
with admirative usage.

Sandfeld (1930:119-120) cites Weigand as showing
that Bulgarian possesses "un mode 'admiratif' comme
l'albanais" and describes it as "un emploi spécial du
prétérít", adding another example with bil.

With Andrejčin (1938), who based himself on
Trifonov (1905), the concept that the reported con-
stitutes a separate mood independent of the perfect
becomes established as the norm for literary Bulgar-
ian, although the third person auxiliary can some-
times be included in the former (1938:62, 1944:295)
and omitted from the latter (1938:45, 68; 1944:262).
Given the perfect/reported dichotomy and the fact
that its one distinguishing feature—absence of the
auxiliary in the third person—is not consistently
observed, and given the apparent witnessed but non-
past meaning of admirative usage, the question arises
as to whether it should be assigned to the reported,
despite its nonreported nature, or to the perfect,
despite its nonpast nature, or to yet another
hands. Even municipal power.

There is also an example of dubitative usage presented by Maslov (1955:314) to show that reported forms can have present meanings which is relevant to our discussion:

(11) —Az dori ne ja poznavam!
—Ne ja poznavam! Cjel svijat ja pozna, toj ne ja poznavam!
—I don't even know her!
—He says he doesn't know her! The whole world knows her, but this one doesn't know her!

In this case, the second speaker is mocking and doubting the first by repeating his words as if they were a report. Another example in this same section shows the similarity of doubt, which is sincere disbelief, to astonishment, which is insincere disbelief or an expression of past disbelief:

(12) —Ne plašite, mари, Genoveva e živa v gorata!...
—Ginka, živa li; bila? Ama da se kaže na gorkija da ne plače (Maslov 1955:314)
—Don't cry, dear, Genoveva is alive in the forest!...
—Is she really alive, Ginka?! But someone should tell the poor fellow so he won't cry (conversation between two village women during a melo-drama, from Pod igoto).

These examples are of particular importance to Darden's interpretation of the admiralative as a marked dubitative (see below).

Demina (1959:325–328) agrees with Andrejećin that the admiralative cannot be considered as a separate mood, but she says that it constitutes a separate group of forms adjoining (prizymkajuščāt) the indicative. Of the 19 examples she cites, nine are clearly past, and thus not truly admiralative as was explained above, six use bil, one uses imal, one is Weigand's Valjalo (3), while the remaining two, cited below, both exhibit a kind of past tense or reported meaning:

(13) Razbrax, ama kášno, i to sled kato drugute bratuški mi izjadoča cjalca svinja. "Katleti" značalo päržoli (p. 326).
I found out, but too late, only after the other dear brothers had devoured a whole pig of mine. "Katleti" meant (meant) pork chops.

(14) ...—Nali je papá e târgovec—na spirt. A pâk spirt se pravel ot carevica i kartofi.
Představte si—čak se ga naučix tova (p. 327).
... And isn't papa a merchant too—of grain alcohol. And alcohol is made from corn and potatoes. Imagine that, I just found out. (Or: they said it was made ...)

Demina (1968) reiterates her view in a comment on Fiedler (1968), viz., the Bulgarian admirative cannot be considered as a form of the reported, at least on the synchronic level, since the latter requires a secondary source of information while the former involves a personal attestation on the part of the speaker. It must therefore be considered indicative.

Stojanov (1964:381) agrees with Andrejčin that the admirative is a modal use of the reported and cites three examples, two with bil and one which can be interpreted as an auxiliariless perfect:

(15) Ja nebeto savelo se tajamilo, greelo slunce, a az mislex, če ošte vali!
Look here, the sky has cleared up completely, the sun has been shining, and I thought it was still raining.

Stojanov (1964:382) does cite one particularly interesting example which he explains as a present reported with an auxiliary:

(16) Gledaj, gledaj kakav čovek e bil toja, deto e napisal taja knjižka!
Look, look at what a man this is/was who wrote this booklet!

Without a context, however, it is not possible to comment on this usage other than to say that given Stojanov's analysis it represents further evidence for the weakness of the opposition perfect/reported.

Debraeckeleeer (1966:265-267) agrees with Demina, writing that the admirative is a form of the perfect which happens to be totally homonymous with the reported. He claims that the admirative developed from the resultative meaning of the perfect, and that then the auxiliary dropped in the third person by analogy with the reported. His examples are all past except one, which is identical with (3) in this article.

Aronson (1967:93n.14, 94n.15) cites Weigand, Andrejčin, Maslov, and Demina, but does not commit himself to a conclusion. He appears, however, to favor Demina's analysis. He also observes that, with the exception of the example cited here as (10), all unambiguously present admiratives that he has found use bil or īmal. It could be added here that even

(10) refers to a state which existed before the moment of speech and thus does not differ semantically from the static past value of īmal and bil.

Stankov (1969:176-178) cites Weigand, Beševliev, Andrejčin, Maslov and Demina and concurs with Demina. Of his six examples, three use bil and three use īmal.

Dejanova (1970:187-88) also concurs that the admirative is a modal use of the perfect. She writes that the peculiarity of the admirative is not so much its expressive relationship to the action as its use of a past tense form to describe a concrete present fact; her one example uses bil.

Christiforov (1972:101-102) considers the admirative to be an affective use of the perfect and cites two examples with īmal, one with bil, and two which do not appear to be present:

(17) Kakvo sedmala da smjal!
"Tiens, queuls comptes elle se fait!"

(18) Ah! Slīmal se večel!
"Tiens! Il fait déjà jour!" (The translations are Christiforov's)

Both these sentences use aorist 1-participle and would be translated by perfects in English.

Darden (1977) argues that the Bulgarian admirative is an emotive use of the dubitative which is itself an emotive use of the reported. He cites the use of such expressions as I can't believe it's really you! in English, where the speaker is expressing surprise by using a dubitative expression in a context in which it is not meant literally, as illustrative of the same type of phenomenon as the admirative use of the dubitative type of reported in Bulgarian (cf. examples 11 and 12 above).

Gerđikov (1977:32-33), after discussing Demina, Stankov, and Maslov, as well as S. Mladenov's idea that the admirative constitutes a separate mood, concludes that it is a perfect with deleted auxiliary. His four examples all employ bil and one also uses the verb se kriel 'have been hiding' in a context where it is not unambiguously present:

(19) Satana si bil. Onzi s kozite se kriel v tebe, gospod da me ubie.
You are Satan! Those ones with the goats have been hiding in you, may God strike me dead.

It can thus be said that aside from S. Mladenov's highly dubious idea that the admirative constitutes yet another mood of Bulgarian, there have been three main analyses of the Bulgarian admirative:
(1) as a use of the past indefinite with no perfect/reported distinction, supported by Conev, Welgand, Beševliev, and Romanski, (2) as an expressive use of the reported, supported by Andrejčin, Maslov, Stoianov, Darden, and others, and (3) as an expressive use of the perfect with a deleted auxiliary, supported by Demina, Debraekeleer, Stankov, Christiforov, Dejanova, Gerdžikov, and others, including, perhaps, Aronson.

Macedonian

For Macedonian, as for Bulgarian, the survey will be limited to the literary language. The Macedonian past indefinite (minato neopredeleno) always lacks the auxiliary in the third person, so one cannot speak of a perfect/reported opposition but only of the use of the past indefinite to render reported speech (cf. Koneski 1967:477). Koneski (1967:462-467) identifies the basic meaning of this form as indefinite, while Lunt (1952:67) writes that it is marked for distant aspect (see also Topolińska 1975, and Usikova 1974, 1977:364-366). I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1976, 1977:36-37) that since no single basic meaning can account for all of the uses of the past indefinite, because for every possible invariant meaning there exist counterexamples which cannot be explained, the past indefinite must be treated as the unmarked past (cf. Aronson 1967: 88-91 on Bulgarian).

In discussing the use of the past indefinite to express surprise at some fact or result which becomes known to the speaker only at the moment of speech, Koneski (1967:473) writes that the element of surprise and amazement at the fact which we suddenly "discover" can sometimes be especially expressed, so that it gives a basic emotional coloring to the sentence:

(20) Ti si bil maž!
You're quite a man!

(21) Evo koj bil čovek!
Here's a real person!

(22) Toj mnogu pijel, bre!
Hey man, he drinks a lot!

(23) Što ubavo peele devojčinjava!
How beautifully these girls sing!

In an earlier work Koneski (1949:294) specifically labeled this usage *admirative*.

Lunt (1959:97) defines this usage as stating "a fact which was previously unknown to, and perhaps unsuspected by, the speaker, but which is now accepted," and gives the following example:

(24) Ama ti si bil igrač, ne znaev dosega.
Why you're a dancer! I didn't know before.

All other examples of literary Macedonian admirable usage with clearly present meanings that have been cited by various scholars use some form of bil or imal (Usikova 1974:113, 1977:366; Topolińska 1975:299; Friedman 1977:78, 174-175). It can be noted here that Darden's theory of the Bulgarian admirable as marked dubitative usage has equal potential for applicability to Macedonian (Friedman 1977:78-79).

The only comparison of Macedonian usage with other languages of the Balkans has been made by Koneski (1965:143), who refers to Turkish influence producing admirable usage as in ey adam imti corresponding to toj bil dobar čovek 'what a good person he is!' and who also makes a passing reference to Albanian. This passage is in turn referred to by Demiraj (1971:31n.1) and Fiedler (1966, 1968), who discusses Macedonian and Bulgarian in his articles on the Albanian admirable to be discussed below.

Albanian

The Albanian admirable (habitorja), unlike the Balkan Slavic, is a separate series of paradigmatic sets rather than a special use of an already existing form. Table II illustrates the differences by means of the 1 sg of jam 'be' and kam 'have' in the four admirable tense forms of Standard Albanian and in some of the relevant tense forms of the nonadmirative indicative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 sg</th>
<th></th>
<th>1 sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMIRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 sg</td>
<td>1 sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>qenkim</td>
<td>paskam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>qenkësha</td>
<td>paskësha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>paskam qënë</td>
<td>paskam pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>paskësha qënë</td>
<td>paskësha pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONADIRIVITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>jam</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>isha</td>
<td>kisha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>kam qënë</td>
<td>kam pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>kisha qënë</td>
<td>kisha pasur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: 1 sg Admirative and Nonadmirative of jam 'be' and kam 'have'
As was indicated above, the Albanian admirative was first labeled as such and described by A. Dozon in 1879 in his *Manuel de la langue ahkipe ou albanaise* (p. 226) (cited by Demiraj 1971:31), where he defines it as a group of "compound tenses" expressing surprise and admiration, sometimes ironic. Nine years later, C. Meyer in his *Kurzgefasste albani­sische Grammatik* (p. 45) used the term modal in referring to the admirative (Demiraj 1971:32). In the century or so since Dozon's grammar, this has been the only essential change in the traditional description of the meaning of the Albanian admirative, viz., a mood expressing surprise, etc. (Demiraj 1977:102-104).

Two major questions concerning the admirative have been its origin and the number of forms or paradigmatic sets subsumed under it. The first question has been answered, insofar as is possible, by Demiraj (1971), who demonstrates that, contrary to the thesis proposed by Jokl and accepted by Sandfeld (1930:185, but see also p. 119, where he cites Weigand!) that the admirative is descended from an old but unattested future, the admirative is in fact descended from an inverted perfect. In the same article, Demiraj also mentions comparisons of the Albanian admirative with Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Turkish (p. 31n.1, pp. 47-48), his main point being that the Albanian phenomenon is quite different from the others and that influences in any direction have yet to be demonstrated and that such questions must be carefully studied. It can be mentioned here, by way of contrast, that Fiedler (1968:368-69) concentrates more on the similarities and the possibilities of mutual influence while admitting that the differences are significant.

The second question has been treated in great detail by Lafe (1972) from both synchronic and diachronic viewpoints, while Demiraj (1977:102-104) has given normative judgments on similar questions, e.g., the existence of a conjunctive admirative (1 sg pres tø paskam) as a separate set or series (Demiraj essentially rejects it, but v. Domi et al. 1976:274).

Aside from traditional grammatical descriptions, Schmaus and Fiedler have both devoted special studies to the meaning and use of the admirative, while Camaj's grammar also offers some useful ideas. Schmaus (1966:111, 124) has observed that surprise cannot function as the basic invariant meaning of the Albanian admirative, since that form is also used to express genuine disbelief (cf. also Fiedler 1966: 564, 1968:368 II.2, and Domi et al. 1976:274). 

In
indicates that the event took place at an indefinite time in the past or was completed in the past but has results in the present, directs the addressee's attention to a point beyond the critical terminus of the action, etc., i.e., some type of what may be loosely termed perfect. Adherents of the first type of viewpoint include Underhill (1976:170), Kreider (1968:103), Németh (1962:69), Swift (1963:92), Lewis (1967:101), Menges (1968:130), Bazin (1966:272), Gabain (1963:195), Vogel and Ellinghausen (1943:55), Ergin (1972:300), and Kissling (1959:302). Supporters of the second set of concepts include Johannson (1971:283, 285), Gadjieva (1968:37, 221), Emre (1945:492), and Ivanov (1976:81, 1977:53). Although Deny (1920:354-55, 1959:209-10) and Gállaby (1949:247) stress the importance of meanings of the first type, Deny admits that usage does not always reflect this meaning, and Gállaby gives examples which directly contradict it. Kononov (1938:48) treated the second set of meanings as primary and the first set of meanings as proceeding from it, and this appears to be Dmitriev's (1962:186) view as well. But in his grammar of literary Turkish, Kononov (1956:232) attempts to combine the two viewpoints in his definition of the mîg-past without giving one precedence over the other. Duda (1955:339-342) and Ljubimov (1971) indicate the problems and conflicting approaches but do not attempt to choose among them. 6

At this point it is necessary to list the three grammatical functions of the suffix -mîg in modern Turkish: (1) stressed, attached directly to the verbal base or stem, used nonpredicatively or predicatively with suffixes in addition to person markers, mîg- forms the perfect participle, which has no nonconfirmative nuances (cf. nonpredicative uses of the i-participle in Bulgarian, e.g., minalo vreme 'past tense', Turkish geqmîg zaman); (2) stressed, attached directly to the verbal base or stem, used only predicatively and only with person markers, -mîg forms the past tense which the majority of grammarians say is nonconfirmative; (3) the mîg-past of the verb 'be', 3 sg mîg, can be used enclitically and added to almost any kind of predicate, in which case it is never stressed and is said to be unmarked for tense (Lewis 1967:101-103, 122-124; Swift and Agrall 1966:202-204; Deny 1920: 355, Elowe 1941:337; Gállaby 1949:88; Johannson 1971:63; Kononov 1956:250, 391). A complete illustration of all the possibilities of these three functions would require too lengthy an exposition, and so we will limit our examples to a few cases:

As has already been noted, the mîg-past has often been compared with the past indefinite of Balkan Slavic, but since a complete examination of the similarities and differences is beyond the scope of this paper, the discussion will be limited to the treatment of admirativity, which amounts to limiting it to the 3rd person singular. The following examples represent typical uses of mîg, in what is said to be its nonpast meaning:

(29) a. Gelmiş oğlan güzel(dir).
   The boy who has come is handsome (Having-come-boy handsome(is). Usage 1)

   b. Güzel oğlan gelmiş.
   I gather the handsome boy has come (Handsome boy came/has come. Usage 2)

   c. Oğlan güzelmiş.
   The boy is said to be handsome (Boy handsome-is/was. Usage 3)

   d. Güzel oğlan gelmiş
   The handsome boy is/was said to have come (Handsome boy having-come-is/was. Usage 1 + 3)

   As has already been noted, the mîg-past has often been compared with the past indefinite of Balkan Slavic, but since a complete examination of the similarities and differences is beyond the scope of this paper, the discussion will be limited to the treatment of admirativity, which amounts to limiting it to the treatment of mîg. The following examples represent typical uses of mîg, in what is said to be its nonpast meaning:

   (30) Ben gerici imişim.
   I am said to be reactionary (and it's true and I'm proud of it/ but this is a wicked slander). (Lewis 1967:101).

   (31) Bu köyün ismi "Eski Hisar" imiş.
   The name of this village appears to be Eski Hisar (Kreider 1968:104).

   (32) Yarın hava güzel olacakmış.
   Tomorrow the weather is supposed to be beautiful (Underhill 1976:196).

   (33) --Yer yok! --Ne diye yer yokmuş? (Lewis 1963:110).
   --No room! --What do you mean no room? (spying on empty place).

In (30), mîg is used for a reported speech event, and the material in parentheses indicates that the use of mîg by itself makes no evaluation of the truth of the report. In (31), the speaker is hedging on commitment to the truth of a statement which could be the result of a report, a deduction, etc. In (32), mîg is used with a future participle to indicate a reported expectation, while in (33) the speaker is reporting the interlocutor's statement back to him, i.e., the usage is dubitative. The admirative use of mîg, however, has
received almost no attention in Turkish grammars, and it has even been mistakenly claimed that such usage does not exist in Turkish (Debraekeeleer 1966:267). The following examples represent typical admirative sentences cited in the abovementioned grammars and articles, although the list could be prolonged indefinitely by examples from literature and conversation:

(34) Ne çok kitabım varmış! How many books I (seem to) have! (Underhill 1976:199).
(35) Ben çok güzelmişim (Kononov 1956:391). Why, I’m very beautiful! (said by an ugly girl in a fairy tale who sees a beauty’s reflection in a pool and mistakes it for her own).
(36) ...ne güzel vallahı...köşk gibi bir evmiş... (Kononov 1956:391). O Lord, how beautiful... it’s a house like a palace!
(37) Peh magallah ... ne pek âlim fazıl adam imiş (Deny 1920:727). Praise be! What a very learned and virtuous man he is!
(38) Of, ne güç hal imiş (Deny 1920:726). Oof, how difficult it is!

Many grammars omit reference to such usage altogether, and those which do cite it treat it as an emotive nonconfirmative of surprise. There is also some evidence, however, that imiş is not the only verb that can be used admiratively in Turkish. This is to be found in an article by Başkan (1968:7) where he claims that sometimes a蔑-past can be used in the same context as a present progressive in colloquial Turkish, and the context he cites appears to be admirative:

(39) Bu elbise dolgusu çok yakılmış/yakışıyor. (Başkan 1968:7) This suit actually suits you quite well.

While the蔑-past itself can be associated with a meaning of surprise (cf., e.g., Kononov 1938:44), unless that meaning is clearly nonpast, we cannot be said to be dealing with true admirativity. The problems raised by Başkan’s example require further investigation.

CONCLUSION

A history of the study of admirativity in the languages of the Balkans shows that it is a cover term for different phenomena which share three features: (1) the element of surprise, (2) a present meaning, and (3) a diachronic (and sometimes, but not always, a synchronic) relationship to a perfect. The earliest treatment of the phenomenon occurs in the description of Albanian, which is the only Balkan language in which the admirative constitutes a distinct set of forms. The key issues in the study of the Albanian admirative have been the following: (1) its origin, (2) the number of paradigmatic sets actually occurring, (3) its basic meaning, and (4) its status as a grammatical category—modal or other. The Bulgarian admirative use of the past indefinite was first observed in its comparison with Turkish and Albanian. The two issues most debated have been (1) autochthonous vs. foreign origin and (2) assignment to the perfect or reported series of these forms. The Macedonian usage has simply been treated as a nuance available to the past indefinite (there being no morphological justification for a perfect/reported opposition), and as comparable with Turkish without any special discussion. The admirative use of imiş (and perhaps other蔑-past forms) in Turkish has received the least amount of attention of all, outside its comparison with other languages of the Balkans, and it has been virtually completely submerged in the debate on the basic meaning of the蔑-past, a debate whose two main sides correspond, mutatis mutandis, to the perfect/reported split of Bulgarian.

While it would be premature to suggest any solutions on the basis of the data which have been presented, certain facts and problems which emerge from them can be pointed out.

I. In all the languages concerned, admirativity, i.e., the expression of surprise itself, cannot be defined as the invariant meaning of the form. A constellation of similar contextually determined meanings, e.g., reportedness, dubitativity, and perhaps resultativity, cluster around each form, and admirativity in sensu stricto is only one of them. This is a clear case in Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Turkish, where admirativity is only a usage. The research of Fiedler, Schmaus, and Camaj indicates, however, that this is also true for the distinct series of paradigmatic sets of Albanian, and hence another basic meaning must be sought.

II. As the only feature differentiating the
reported from the perfect in Bulgarian is absence of the auxiliary in the third person, and as there can still be perfects with deleted third person auxiliaries, then only that usage of the past indefinite which has a nonpast meaning of surprise can be treated as truly admiring, and since this meaning apparently contradicts both the perfect and the reported by being both nonpast and nonreported, the conflict between the two groups represented by Andrejčin and Demina remains unresolved.10

III. In Bulgarian and Macedonian, the overwhelming preponderance of actual occurrences of admiring usage employ bil and imal. Those with most other verbs actually have a past rather than a present meaning. Those with a present meaning other than bil and imal, e.g., Bulgarian znača 'mean' and vali 'rain', still refer to events or states occurring before the moment of speech. This raises the possibility that the admiring still has some type of past reference even when its apparent meaning is present.

IV. The Turkic admiring seems to be limited to imiş, although the mtg-past in general is said to be capable of expressing a nuance of surprise and, one example of apparent admiring usage has been cited in scholarly literature. The superficial similarities between Turkish and the other languages under consideration especially Bulgarian, make comparisons tempting, but the deep structural differences make them difficult.

V. This leads to two final problems: (1) the existence, direction, and amount of influence exerted by these various languages on another in connection with admiring and other related phenomena and (2) the nature of the grammatical category expressed by the forms used for admiring; is it modal, aspectual or something else, e.g., evidential or status (cf. Jakobson 1957, Aronson 1977)?

Such, then, are some of the chief problems which have been raised by the study of admiring. Their solutions await discovery.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

NOTES

1 This article was written as a paper at the First Symposium/Conference on Southeastern Europe sponsored by The Ohio State University in April 1977. Since this article was presented, I have completed that later work. It is entitled "Admiring and Confirmativity" and is scheduled to appear in Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, Vol. 17 No. 1, 1981, pp. 12-28.

2 In fact, Albanian can use the nonadmirative indicative perfect of jam 'be' and kam 'have' in precisely the same type of admiring meaning as is found with the Bulgarian indefinite pasts bil and imal (see Fiedler 1966).

3 Admiring uses of the perfect are also found in the Scandian languages (Kissing 1959:300, Koefoed 1958:183), Tajik (Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:82), Georgian, and others.

4 There are also two compound admiring tense forms using the Geg perfect and pluperfect admiring with short-form participles as auxiliaries: a perfect (paska pasë genë, paska pasë pasur) and a pluperfect (paskësh pasë genë, paskësh pasë pasur) [These are the 3 sg forms.] However, these forms are marginal or excluded in Standard Albanian.

5 This use of the admiring is reminiscent of the use of the 3 sg past indefinite auxiliary bërsë 'it was' as an emphatic past tense enclitic with all persons of the past indefinite (Koneski 1965:169, 1967:484-85; Lunt 1952:97). It should also be noted that the present administrative still functions as an inverted perfect, or as an "historical present indicative in place of the aorist," in the Albanian dialects of Bulgaria and the Ukraine (Domí and Shuterqi 1965:114). Desnickaja (1968:17) writes that in standard Albanian the admiring (still) has a nuance of resultivity.


7 It should be noted that imiş is often treated as a special enclitic not belonging to the mtg-past proper, and in some Turkic languages where the mtg-past is lacking, i.e., languages outside the Oghuz group other than Yakut, e.g., Uzbek (Kononov 1960:272, 276) and Uighur (Pritsak 1959:559), the mtg-past of 'be', viz. emiş, is used as a "modal particle" which appears to have the same functions as imiş in Turkish (v. also Gabain 1963:151). The Uzbek usage is thought by Menges (1968:130) to be a borrowing). The relationship of imiş to (other) mtg-past forms is in need of further investigation, however, and beyond the scope of this article. The Turkic languages other than Yakut and the Oghuz (Southwest) group have past tenses corresponding to the mtg-past in function, but they use forms of the suffixes -yan (verbal noun) or -p (gerund) (see Deny et al. 1959 and Laude-Cirtautus 1976).

8 The entire problem of the use of the emphatic-copulative enclitic -dir and other phenomena have been omitted because they do not fall within the limits of this survey insofar as they do not relate directly to admiring.

9 Since writing this article, I have published a study of some of these problems: "On the Semantic and Morphological Influence of Turkish on Balkan Slavic" in Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society, 1978:108-118.
At the time this paper was written, the work by Walter cited in the bibliography was unavailable to me. In 1977a:77-78, he gives eight examples, none with bil or imit, but without any surrounding contexts or sources. As a result, it is difficult to determine if the meanings are genuinely nonpast. His basic standpoint, given his theoretical framework, is on the side of Andrejčin, i.e., he considers the admirative to be an expressive usage of the auxiliariless (reported) paradigm.
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