Admirativity and Confirmativity

Since the articles by Weigand (1923) and Conev (1910/11: 14–15), the use of some form of the Balkan Slavic (i.e. Macedonian and Bulgarian) past tense in -l and the Turkish past tense in -miş to indicate the surprise of the speaker at a newly discovered fact has been compared to the use of the Albanian present indicative in the same function. Consider the following example from Konstantinov's Baj Gano, in which the speaker is expressing his admiration for the Bulgarian countryside, which until that moment he had never noticed because he had spent all his time sitting in coffee houses:

(1) ja gledaj, če tja bila xubava našata Bulgarija, (Konstantinov 1973: 94)
    gledaj širo bila ubava našata Bugarhija, (Konstantinov 1967: 97)
    Meğer bizim Bulgaristan'ımız çok güzelmiş... (Konstantinov 1972: 156)
    po qënkë e bukur kjo Bulgaria jonë, (Konstantinov 1975: 104)
    Well look, how beautiful our Bulgaria is!

Put in the broadest possible terms, there are two types of problems arising from the traditional treatment of these phenomena: ONE) If the Balkan Slavic and Turkish forms are markedly, i.e. specified as, past, how can they be used with a present meaning? If, on the other hand, these forms are marked for some form of reporteness, i.e. specified as being used in reported speech, as is sometimes claimed (e.g. Andreječin 1978: 253–254 [§ 335]), how can they be used for something actually witnessed by the speaker? TWO) Although the Albanian admirative is traditionally classified as a mood expressing surprise (Demiraj 1971: 32, 1977: 104), it appears to be different from other moods, e.g. the conditional, optative, or subjunctive, even perhaps possessing marked modal forms or uses of its own (Lafe 1972, Demiraj 1967: 218–219, but v. 1977: 104), and surprise is clearly not its basic or invariant meaning, i.e. the
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1 Cf. also Koneski (1965: 148). On the use of the term Balkan Slavic, v. Alexander (1979). For the purposes of this article, the so-called Torlak dialects of Serbo-Croatian are being excluded because they do not display the phenomena under consideration.

2 It should be noted that reported is being used here in an expanded sense to cover that constellation of meanings which denote that the speaker is somehow not directly responsible for the information, e.g. due to its being un witnessed, inferred, deduced, doubted, disbelieved, etc.

3 It should be noted that, unless otherwise specified, this article will of necessity be restricted to the consideration of these phenomena in the modern literary varieties of the languages in question.

4 For the sake of convenience, these traditional labels will be used in this article, although they do not describe all the uses of the forms in question, since the indefinite past can occur with definite past time adverbs (e.g. 6, 7) while the definite past can occur with indefinite past time adverbs and in contexts where there is no specification or implication of definite past time (e.g. 2b). The meanings 'definite' and 'indefinite' do occur in the uses of the definite and indefinite pasts, especially in the first two persons (v. n. 6 below), but such meanings need not always be present. They are contextually determined and derive from the basic confirmative/non-confirmative opposition to be discussed in this article. For further discussion and examples, v. Friedman (1977: 38–39, 54–58). The same types of arguments can be used against defining the opposition between the Turkish di- and miş-pasts as definite/indefinite (e.g. 18). Especially important in this regard is the discussion of examples (5) and (15).

It should also be noted that the aspectual distinction between the aorist and imperfect which occurs in both the definite and indefinite pasts will not be relevant to the questions being considered here. This distinction does not affect the grammatical categories and specific meanings differentiating the two types of past, as can be seen from the fact they both possess it. (Cf. Aronson 1967: 87, 97; Friedman 1977: 24–35, 52–53.)

5 A sentence such as (5) can be grammatically acceptable if the contradiction to confirmation is inflictedious (insincer, nonliteral, v. Austin 1962: 14, Searle 1969: 57–64), i.e. if the speaker does in fact believe that the action has taken place but did not expect it to take place  and is hence greatly surprised and subsequently expresses this surprise by means of a sentence such as (5). Under such circumstances, the actual meaning of the sentence is the opposite of its literal meaning, and thus the meaning of 'confirmation' is not actually contradicted. Exactly the same type of phenomenon occurs in English in sentences such as I can't believe he came! uttered upon seeing that someone whose presence was not expected has in fact arrived.
ally vouched for the truth of the statement by using the definite past, the speaker’s rephrasing constitutes a rejection of the interlocutor’s confirmation. The speaker is in effect saying: “You just said that he arrived yesterday [but I don’t believe it].” In English, this same effect can be achieved merely by repeating the statement with the appropriate intonation. 7

Aside from its reported and dubitative uses, however, the indefinite past can function as an ordinary past tense, especially when there is a first person reference (since reference to the speaker ordinarily implies confirmation) and frequently, but not always, with indefinite or resultative nuances:

(6) a Tatko mi bil mnogu merakljiva za cveka.
My father used to take great pleasure in flowers (Friedman 1977: 54).

b Eh, dosta sme rabotele.
Well, we’ve worked enough (Friedman 1977: 157).

c Sum stanal nokeša vo eden, sum zel lepče, sum mu dal da jade... (Koneski 1967: 462)
I got up at one this morning, I took some bread, I gave him something to eat.

(7) a Baj Ganjo se vurnal ot Evropa... az go vidjax, (Konstantinov 1973: 91)
Baj Ganjo has returned from Europe... I saw him,

b Taka štoto po edno vreme vidjaj če družinata i se izgubila napred (Andrejčin 1938: 68).
It was thus that I suddenly saw that my company had gone on and disappeared up ahead.

d Došul sūm tuk ošte v 7 časa (Andrejčin 1978: 199 [§ 261]).
I came here at 7 o’clock, or I was already here at 7 o’clock.

As was indicated above, the one constant, i.e. invariant, meaning always present when the indefinite past is used is pastness. This is true even when the indefinite past is used for reporting or doubting a statement originally made in the present tense. Consider the following examples:

(8) Čovekov bil od Amerika.
This person is (= said he was) from America (Friedman 1977: 71).

(9) a – Toj povke od tebe znaje za boksiranje.
– Toj povke znajel!
– He knows more about boxing than you do.
– He knows more, indeed! (Friedman 1977: 78)

6 The first person specifies the speaker, the second person generally refers to the addressee, but the third person carries no such specification or reference to participants in the speech event and is thus the unmarked person (cf. Jakobsen 1957: 6, reprinted 1971: 137). Since the speaker ordinarily is vouching for statements made in the first person, the most common implication of the unmarked past in this person is merely indefiniteness (cf. Friedman 1977: 35).

7 It should be noted that the speaker could repeat an interlocutor’s definite past statement in the indefinite past to some third person, even in the interlocutor’s presence, without casting doubt on the original statement if, e.g., the third person had not heard the original statement and the speaker wished to make it clear that, while he did not disbelieve the statement, his information was not based on his own observation. If, on the other hand, the speaker wished to emphasize his belief in the statement regardless of the source, e.g. in order to impress the third person, he could choose to present it in the definite past (cf. e.g. 2, v. also Friedman 1977: 39–40, Andrejčin 1978: 237 [$310]).
b – Az dori ne ja poznavam!
– Ne ja poznavam! Cjal svjat ja poznava, toj ne ja poznaval! (Maslov 1955: 314)
– I don’t even know her!
– He doesn’t know her! The whole world knows her, but he doesn’t know her!

In these examples, the verbs bil, znael, and poznaval refer to the ontological, i.e. actual, pastness of the report and/or can be said to be agreeing with a deleted or implicit past tense verb of reporting. In the case of (8), a cleaning woman in Skopje was basing her statement on the author’s report Jas sum bd Amerika I am from America while introducing him to some other people. No doubt was implied. The examples in (9) are dubitative and can be said to be agreeing in pastness with the fact that the doubted statement has already been uttered or with a hypothetical clause of the type He just said… The usage in (8) resembles tense agreement in English, e.g. He said he didn’t smoke (as a report of “I don’t smoke”) or Where was the yard sale? (as an elliptical statement meaning “Where did the sign say the yard sale was [= is].”) The usage in (9) is an extension of the type found in (8) on the basis of the principles of dubitative usage discussed above.

At this point, it is necessary to discuss the omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the indefinite past in literary Bulgarian. Although the details of the presentation vary (for the most traditional view, v. Andrežič 1978: 216–244 §§ 281–323), the essential facts relevant to this article can be summed up in the following manner (cf. Aronson 1967: 93). The literary Bulgarian indefinite past always occurs with the auxiliary in the first two persons, but in the third person the auxiliary can be omitted. According to virtually all descriptions of the Bulgarian verb written in the last four decades, this omission signals a special grammatical category of reportedness, i.e. the third person indefinite past with the auxiliary is the unmarked past (Aronson 1967: 90) while without the auxiliary it is marked as signaling (specifies) that the statement is based on a report. There is a considerable amount of evidence, however, which indicates that in both spoken and written usage the omission of the auxiliary is in fact a stylistic device which is most likely to occur in but is neither required by nor restricted to noncommunicative contexts. Examples (7a) and (7b) are auxiliarless and nonreported.8

Consider also the following examples

(10) a …štrentšnaxme edna babička, nosi dva güliža… kupix bi – kazva…

b Gledaj, gledaj kakųv čovek e bil toja, deto e napisal taja kniža! (Vlajkov, cited in Stojanov 1964: 382)
Look, look at what kind of person this is who wrote this book!

(11) i vednaž e pátulal ot Burgas na dolu kům granicata – selo Fakija – i pátulal toj – stignal e večerda ot njakakvo selo s rejs i sled tova trjupali da premine (Roth 1979: 177).
and once he traveled from Burgas down toward the border—the village of Fakija—and so he traveled—in the evening he got to some village with bus service and then he was supposed to go on.

Example (10a) is a clear instance of the auxiliary being used in a reported context, while (10b) shows the same type of admirative usage as in (1), but with the auxiliary. Example (11), in which the informant is telling a story from her father’s youth which she only knows from his report, typifies in its switching back and forth between the use and omission of the auxiliary the colloquial usage of educated Bulgarians which has also been observed by this author in both eastern and western Bulgaria. This suggests that in actual usage the literary Bulgarian situation is similar to that found in, e.g., the Kumanovo dialect of Macedonian (Vidoeski 1962: 148) in that the omission of the third person auxiliary is essentially facultative.9 The codified literary Bulgarian norm, however, prescribes its omission for reported speech, and this is thus the tendency, but not the rule, in the speech of educated Bulgarians.10 For the purposes of this paper, then, the Bulgarian indefinite past and reported will be treated as a single

---

8 It has been argued that such examples are “admirative”. Nevertheless, since their meaning is clearly past, as opposed to true admirative usage, which involves a present meaning, this explanation cannot be accepted.

9 It is also worthy of note that in literary Macedonian and the Western dialects, the auxiliary never occurs in the third person, while in Serbo-Croatian it is ommissible in all three persons but especially in the third, e.g. in emotive contexts (Koneski 1965: 148, Gricket 1954).

10 It has been argued that the imperfect participle in -i is used only as a reported form, i.e. that it occurs only without the auxiliary in the third person and that there is no imperfect indefinite past (v. e.g. Andrežič 1978: 227–228 §§ 294–297). However there are innumerable examples in literary usage which contradict this prescription and show that it is not followed in practice even in the most conservative literary norm. Consider the following typical example:

(i) Ani az pomnja majka mu, bre, tja mi i splitala kosnie na plirski, učela me e pesni da pejja… (Stankov 1967: 341).
Well, but I remember his mother, man, she used to braid my hair in braids, she taught me songs to sing…

paradigmatic set in which omission of the auxiliary in the third person is essentially optional but tends to occur most frequently in nonconfirmative contexts. (For more detailed discussion of this problem, v. Friedman forthcoming.)

We now come to the question of the grammatical category to which the opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative belongs. Taking the work of Goğb (1964: 1) and Kurtyłowicz (1956: 26) on mood, and the work of Aronson (1977: 13) and Jakobson (1957) on status (a term first used by Whorf [1938] to describe certain Hopi verbal categories), it is possible to distinguish between the ontological (objective) evaluation of a narrated event and the speaker's (subjective) evaluation of a narrated event, i.e. the difference between the objective reality of an event and the speaker's attitude toward it. In traditional grammar, both these evaluations are treated as manifestations of the category of mood. However, there is a difference between statements which denote events which are not ontologically real, i.e. which are not happening or have not happened, e.g. the Macedonian Toj bi došol 'He would come' or the Bulgarian Toj šeše da dojde 'He would have come', and events which are real but which are explicitly qualified by the speaker's personal view or editorial comment, as is the case in Toj dojde 'He came [and I vouch for it]' or the English assertive using the auxiliary verb do, e.g. He did come. Using the analyses in the works cited above, the first two Balkan Slavic sentences can be described as marked for mood, i.e. as nonindicative, since they denote events which are not ontologically real, while the third Balkan Slavic sentence is not marked for mood, i.e. it is indicative, since the event described is ontologically real, i.e. it did actually happen, but it is marked for the grammatical category of status since the speaker is expressing his own attitude toward the event, viz. his confirmation of it. Thus verbal forms distinguished on the basis of an opposition of the type confirmative/nonconfirmative are not modal, in the terms used here, but are marked for status.

The Turkish situation is similar to the Balkan Slavic in many respects. As has already been observed in linguistic literature (e.g. Nigmatov 1970: 53–55, Underhill 1976: 170), the past tense in -di is marked with respect to the past tense in -miş, i.e. the di-past specifies something which themiş-past does not, and themiş-past like the Balkan Slavic indefinite past, is descended from an older perfect (Menges 1968: 130). Although in traditional grammar the di-past is called sühadi 'witnessed' while themiş-past is called nakli 'reported', the same types of arguments used to show that the definite past is marked for (specifies) confirmativity as opposed to the indefinite past, which is not so marked, can be brought to bear to show that a similar marking (specification) distinguishes the di-past from themiş-past. Consider the following examples:

(12) Ben baloda yoktum. Bay Ganı gitti (Konstantinov 1972: 65)
I wasn't at the ball. Bay Ganjo went.

(13) Eviyla Celebi 1664 Nisaninda... Viyana'ya giderek epey müddet orada kaldı (Güllıboğ 1949: 382).
Eviyla Celebi, having gone to Vienna in April 1664 stayed there for a rather long time.

(14) Açıktı! (Seyfullah 1968: 113)
We're hungry! (Literally: We were (= have become) hungry.)

(15) *İnâmmyorum ki o geldi.
I don't believe he came.

Examples (12), (13), (14), and (15) are intended to parallel examples (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively, showing that thedi-past, like the definite past, can be used for unwitnessed, historical, and resultative events but not in contexts which actually contradict the notion of confirmation. In connection with example (12), we should also cite Johnson's (1971: 280) statement that conviction of the truth of the event is sufficient to justify use of the di-past regardless of the actual source of information. Example (14) could also be supplemented with numerous expressions using oldu 'became' which are used to describe resultative states and are generally translated with the present in English, e.g. pismam oldum 'I regret it' (literally: I regretted it, I have become sorry). The same entire set of explanations which apply to (5) also apply to (15).

The following examples are intended to parallel examples(6) and (7) in Balkan Slavic:

This morning I counted; it has been exactly 73 nights since my child's burial.

(17) Ben əmrümde bir katre ağzyma koymamışım (Johansson 1971: 300).
In all my life I haven't put a drop in my mouth.

(18) Uç yüz yirmide doğmuşum (Johansson 1971: 280).
I was born in 1904.

As can be seen from these examples, themiş-past can be used for nonreported events. Nevertheless, as with the indefinite past, themiş-past's chief, most common, meaning, i.e. the one it will be assumed to have unless the context indicates otherwise, is reported. Themiş-past can also be used dubitatively:

(19) − Yer yok! − Ne diye yer yokmus? (Lewis 1963: 110)
− No room! − What do you mean no room? (spying an empty seat)

Thus it can be argued that just as the marking for confirmativity in the definite past leaves the indefinite past unmarked but implying nonconfirmativity, so the di-past's specification of the speaker's confirmation causes themiş-past to be used chiefly, but by no means exclusively, in nonconfirmative statements. There are two major differences between the Turkish and Balkan Slavic phenomena, however, viz. the use of the Turkish enclitics imis and -dir.

Although themiş-past of any nondefective verbal stem is markedly past but not markedly nonconfirmative (the arguments parallel those advanced for the Balkan Slavic indefinite past), it appears that it can be argued that this situation is reversed in the case of the defective enclitic verb meaning 'be', whose form inmiş is never stressed, unlike the truemiş-past, where the suffix is always stressed. It is clear that imis has a wider range of applications than the corresponding Balkan Slavic bil, as can be seen from the following example:

(20) − Yeni Bakım iyi bir adam − Imiş
− The new minister is a good man. − So they say (Lewis 1967: 102).

According to Lewis, the use of imis in this context can express the speaker's noncommitment without any trace of irony. In such a context, bil could not be used except,
perhaps, dubitably. In addition to this, *imis* can be used as an auxiliary attached to any fully conjugated form except the *di*-past, viz. the progressive in -*yor*, the aorist in -*r*, the future in -*cek*, the necessitative in -*meli*, the conditional in -*se*, the subjunctive (optative) in -*e*, and the *mi*-past itself. This is a far wider range of applications than is available to the Balkan Slavic *bil*, which cannot be used as an auxiliary at all in literary Macedonian and which is limited to forming special dubitativas and pluperfect reporteds (as an auxiliary with the participle in -*l* in literary Bulgarian (cf. note 11 below). It would appear that when *imis* does not function as an independent tense form but as an auxiliary, it is chosen precisely for the chief (contextual variant) meaning of the tense form whence it comes, viz. the nonconfirmative of the *mi*-past, and thus must always, under such circumstances, carry that meaning. In such cases, it sometimes appears to be difficult to justify its past tense marking. The argument which explained the use of *bil* in (8), viz. that there is a kind of tense agreement between *bil* and the ontological pastness of the report or a deleted past tense verb of reporting, can also be applied to the use of *imis* in (20), in which case ‘So it has been said’ or ‘So they said’ would be a closer English rendering; and in fact Kissing (1959: 299) has advanced very similar arguments in this connection. A more difficult case is a sentence such as *Gelecekmiş*, which can be translated ‘They say/said he will come’ or ‘He is supposed to come’. As long as the sentence refers to a previous statement of the type *Gelecek* or *Geleceğim*, i.e. as long as *Gelecekmiş* is based on a report, the ontological pastness and/or deleted verb of reporting argument can still be applied. If, however, *Gelecekmiş* is a statement of supposition, the question arises as to whether or not there is a previous statement to refer to. I would argue that even in this use there must be an understood sentence of the type ‘He/They said he was going to come’. (Note the tense agreement in English.) Thus the uses of *imis* are more extensive than those of any Balkan Slavic auxiliary, due to the structure of the Turkish verbal system, which is more dependent on participles and agglutination, and when *imis* is used as an auxiliary the chief meaning of the *mi*-past, nonconfirmative, becomes its exclusive meaning.11

The other major difference between Turkish and Balkan Slavic is in the use of the Turkish emphatic-copulative particle -*dir*, which, while it can frequently be translated by English ‘is’, has a general function of “emphasizing the termination of the predicate—to say, in effect, ‘period’.” (Swift and Agradh 1966: 220.) This emphatic function can frequently be rendered by English adverbs such as *surely* and *certainly*. When this enclitic is attached to the third person of the *mi*-past, i.e. that person which, unless otherwise indicated, will most frequently be assumed to have a nonconfirmative meaning, its emphatic quality cancels out the nonconfirmative chief contextual variant meaning (implication) leaving only the meaning ‘unmarked past’. Thus while *Oğlan gelmiş* will, in an open context, be assumed to mean ‘The boy came [they said]’, *Oğlan gelmiş* will mean simply ‘The boy came/has come’. This construction, which does not involve the speaker’s confirmation but likewise excludes any nuance of nonconfirmativity, is the most common for use in historical narratives and newspaper reporting (Underhill 1976: 208). This same particle can also be suffixed to the first and second persons of the *mi*-past, in which case its emphatic marking combines with the marking for person (cf. note 7) to produce a kind of double marking which usually results in the effect of a supposition, e.g. *Bakmışsim* ‘Surely you have looked’, although this is not necessarily always the case, as can be seen from the following example:

{following a description of an Istanbul street scene} You have entered Tophane’s famous Karabaş quarter.

The use of -*dir* is not limited to the *mi*-past, however, and in its emphatic sense it can be suffixed to any other predicative form which takes the enclitic ‘be’ in any person:

(22) a) Şairimdir.
   I am surely (= must be) a poet (Lewis 1967: 139).
   b) Biliyorsunuzdur.
   You surely know (Lewis 1967: 139).

It has been claimed (e.g. Andrejčin 1952: 40) that the use of -*dir* with the third person *mi*-past parallels the standard description of the use of the auxiliary in the third person indefinite past in Bulgarian, and that the Bulgarian phenomenon of a special reported form may have resulted from Turkish influence. Given the facts presented here, however, it can be argued that this is not the case. As we have indicated, the definite and *di*-past came to be marked for (specify) confirmativity while the indefinite and *mi*-past, both descended from perfects, developed into unmarked pasts whose implications of reportedness resulted from the confirmative marking of the other tenses. These types of developments have occurred in a number of widely separated languages, e.g. the development of the perfect into an unmarked past in French, German, and Russian or the use of perfects in reported or other nonconfirmative contexts in languages of the Baltic, the Caucasus, and Central Asia (cf. Serebrennikov 1974: 206–209, Haarman 1970).12 The Bulgarian phenomenon need not be viewed as a borrowing from or calque on Turkish but rather as the result of a parallel development, viz. marking for confirmativity in the simple preterite, which could have begun before and subsequently received reinforcement from the contact between the two languages.13 The addition of -*dir* in Turkish and the omission of the third person auxiliary in Bulgarian, both synchronically and diachronically, are quite dissimilar phenomena which have come to bear only a superficial resemblance to one another as the result of partial convergence. The Turkish -*dir* is a relatively newly arisen emphatic

---

11 V. Friedman (1977: 112–113) on a similar phenomenon in Macedonian which occurs when the definite past of *ima* ‘have’ is used in forming the markedly reported perfect of the type *inail dojdeno* ‘he has reported come’. Cf. also the use of *bil* as an auxiliary in Bulgarian to form the pluperfect reported or past dubitative, e.g. *Tov bil zel ‘He had [reportedly] read’ or ‘It is mistakenly claimed that’ he read* (v. Aronsen 1967: 92–93). In both these cases it appears that the chief contextual variant meaning of nonconfirmativity has become the only (invariant) meaning due to the extra marking for perfectness or pluperfectness.

12 According to the Sanskrit grammarians, the Sanskrit perfect also had a reported meaning, although Whitney (1967: 295–296) writes that the texts do not provide evidence of this at any period.

13 V. Wijk (1933) on evidence for the Bulgarian development in Old Church Slavonic, although Mirčev (1958: 211) is not in agreement with this view.
ic particle (from the 3sg aorist durtur ‘stands’) which can be attached to any person in a number of tenses and whose emphatic meaning cancels out the chief contextual variant meaning (i.e. the ordinary implication) of nonconfirmativity in the third person mii-past leaving only the meaning ‘unmarked past’. The Bulgarian phenomenon, which is well attested in various forms in many other Slavic languages, is one of omission of an auxiliary or addition of a particle, and is limited to the third person of the indefinite past. It is, in practice, a facultative phenomenon which tends to occur in nonconfirmative contexts and which does not necessarily affect meaning. In Turkish, a new particle is spreading, while in Bulgarian an auxiliary verb is being lost.\textsuperscript{14}

That part of the Albanian verbal system which concerns us here is significantly more complicated than the parts of the Balkan Slavic and Turkish systems which we have considered thus far. The Albanian adorimative is transparently derived from an inverted perfect (Demiraj 1971: 32, Çabej 1979: 18) and comprises four paradigmatic sets: present, perfect, imperfect, and pluperfect. In addition to expressing the speaker’s surprise, the adorimative is also used for reported speech, irony, and doubt (cf. Fiedler 1966, Schmaus 1966, and Camaj 1969: 67):

\begin{itemize}
  \item [23] Në lidhje me pohimin që forma analitike e përmbysur e tipit ‘që ndonjë kam’ pasku pasur dikur vleren e së ardhmes, (Demiraj 1971: 34)
  \item [24] In connection with the idea that the inverted analytic form of the type ‘qënd kam’ was supposed to have had at one time the value of the future,
  \item [25] Dhe kur dëgjoj unë emrin ‘kozak’, më zënu ethet.
  \item [26] - Ehet të zënkani, ë? (Konstantinov 1975: 107)
  \item [27] - And when I hear the name ‘Cossack’ a fever shakes me.
  \item [28] - A fever shakes you, eh?
\end{itemize}

Example (1) at the beginning of this article showed a typical example of Albanian adorimative usage. In example (23), the author is using the perfect adorimative paska pasur in a quotative fashion which emphasizes his nonacceptance of the truth of what he is reporting without irony or sarcasm. This is determined by the context of the article, however, and the sentence taken by itself could just as easily indicate noncommitment without nonacceptance. Sentence (24) is a typical dubitative, much like (9) and (19). The adorimative is clearly marked with respect to the perfect, which shows signs of becoming the unmarked past. This can be seen from the fact that the Albanian perfect can occur with definite past time adverbs (as opposed to many marked perfects, whose resultativity, i.e. reference to the present, precludes their being bound to a definite time in the past) and, at least in the speech of some speakers, it can also be used in connected narratives (cf. Dodi 1970: 265):

\begin{itemize}
  \item [29] E kam parë n’orën dy
  \item [30] I saw him at two o’clock.
  \item [31] Kam qënë grua e tre pashallarëve me radhë, pastaj kam shërbyer si dëdë nëpër hareme (Jakova 1976: 42).
\end{itemize}

It is interesting to note that while the adorimative can occur in almost any context in which an ordinary indicative can occur, there is one type of sentence which is unacceptable, viz. when the adorimative is subordinated to a verb indicating the speaker’s personal opinion:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [32] *Mendoj se ai e bëka këtër punë.
  \item [33] I think that he is doing this job.
\end{itemize}

Given the uses of and restrictions on the literary Albanian adorimative\textsuperscript{15}, I would propose that it has a basic meaning (specification) of nonconfirmativity (cf. Camaj 1969: 67). This means that when speakers choose adorimative forms they are either refraining from vouching for the truth of the assertion by expressing doubt, irony, or by attributing the statement to someone else’s words, or they are expressing the fact that at some time in the past they did not expect the statement to be true and that they are therefore surprised.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, in the terminology being used in this article, the adorimative is not marked for modality, i.e. it is not a mood, rather it is an indicative form which, unlike the ordinary indicative, is marked for status. Having now considered the relevant verbal forms independently, there is one additional set of facts for which it is more appropriate to consider all four languages together. A careful study of all the uses of the Balkan Slavic indefinite past with unambiguously present meanings expressing surprise at a newly discovered fact reveals that this usage is limited almost exclusively to the stative verb bi ‘be’ and the semantically closely related imal ‘have’.\textsuperscript{17} The rare examples which employ other verbs all express a state or general truth and thus correspond to or, hypothetically, could be transformed into noun phrases with bi or imal, as can be seen from the following examples in which (a) represents the actual occurrence and (b) indicates the possible transformation:\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{itemize}
  \item [34] (i) Pëstaj tande rakan nji të madhën Rasie.
  \item [35] Potom naži pribi na velikuju Rossiju (Vorolina 1959: 18).
\end{itemize}

14 It is impossible to predict if or how these changes will continue to develop, but the synchronic and diachronic facts available to us justify the presentation of these phenomena as processes regardless of the future.

15 The uses of the adorimative in Epic epic poetry and various dialects such as those of the Ukraine and Dibër (Vorolina 1959, Çabej 1979: 16–18) indicate that they are not true adorimatives but rather metrical devices and/or remnants of the inverted perfect whose the adorimative later developed, as in the following example from the Ukraiene:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [36] (ii) Pëstaj tante rakan nji të madhën Rasie.
  \item [37] Potom naži pribi na velikuju Rossiju (Vorolina 1959: 18).
\end{itemize}

16 It is interesting to note that even the present adorimative has retained something of its original past meaning (cf. Desnickaja 1968: 17), since it always refers to some past act, i.e. the event which is being reported or doubted, or to a past feeling of the speaker’s, i.e. the ignorance or disbelief which, when confronted with evidence, leads to surprise. Even the use of the present adorimative in future constructions with do të has a past reference, either to a previous speech event or to the speaker’s lack of expectation prior to the moment of speech, as in the following example:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [38] (iii) Pa le, tani edhe yput do të shkoken në shkolë! (Lafe 1972: 474).
\end{itemize}

17 V. Benveniste (1966) on the close relationship between ‘be’ and ‘have’.

18 In generative terms, the (b) examples could be taken as deep-structure representations of some intermediate stage in the derivation of the (a) examples.
In clearly nonstative situations, admirative usage is impermissible. So, for example, if someone with a broken leg suddenly drops his crutches and begins to run, a witness of the event cannot at that moment exclaim *Begali* or *Biagali*. Similarly, this type of usage is limited in Turkish to *imiz* or stative *miz*-pasts. In Albanian, however, the situation is quite different. In Balkan Slavic and Turkish, the phenomenon we are considering, viz. admirativity, is a single use of a paradigmatic set which, as the unmarked past tense, has many other uses as well. The Albanian admirative is a morphologically distinct set of forms. In Balkan Slavic and Turkish, only the unmarked pasts referring to states can be used admiratively with a present meaning, whereas in Albanian every verb has a distinct present admirative form which can be used. The Balkan Slavic and Turkish phenomenon is one of usage while the Albanian phenomenon involves an independent category. As might be expected given these facts, in translations between these various languages the majority of Albanian present admiratives do not correspond to admirative usage in Balkan Slavic and Turkish, rather they correspond to simple presents. Thus, for example, out of the 59 admiratives in the Albanian translation of *Baj Ganjo*, over 66% correspond to simple presents in the other languages while the corresponding number of admirative uses is only 10-15% (depending on the language). There is a special use of *past* admirative forms, however, which, to the best of my knowledge, has only been partially observed once (Fiedler 1966: 563) and which has never been connected with the Balkan Slavic and Turkish phenomena, viz. any past admirative form – perfect, imperfect, or pluperfect – can be used in precisely the same manner and with virtually the same restrictions as the Balkan Slavic indefinite past, i.e. with a present meaning to express surprise at a newly discovered state existing prior to and during the moment of speech, but only with the verbs *jam* 'be' and *kam* 'have', as in the following examples from *Baj Ganjo*:22

22. Expressions such as *Vrmo! Valjalo! 'It's raining' cannot be used as it begins to rain but only after the rain has already begun, i.e. they describe the event as an already existing state.

20. * Başkan* (1968: 7) cites the one example known to me of what appears to be true admirative usage of a verb other than *imiz*:

(iv) Bu ebise doğruşu çok yakışmış
This suit actually suits you well (* Başkan* 1968: 7).

This treats the event as a resultant state, and is thus in line with our explanation. Cf. also n. 19 above.

21. The remaining examples do not have regular correspondences due to differences in the styles of translation.

22. On rare occasion, even the ordinary perfect or imperfect of *jam* and *kam* can be used in this fashion:

(30) Brej, xepten magare bil tozi čovek! (Konstantinov 1973: 88)
Brez, epten magare bil tožecč! (Konstantinov 1967: 91)
Vay namussuz vay! Bu herif hepten de esekimiš be! (Konstantinov 1972: 144)
Ore, fare gomar paskiš čene ky njeri! (Konstantinov 1975: 98)
What an ass that guy is!

(31) Brej! Xepten magare bil tozi čiljak! (Konstantinov 1973: 89)
Brez, epten magare bil tožecč! (Konstantinov 1967: 91)
Vay anasin! Bu herif hepten de esekimiš be! (Konstantinov 1972: 146)
Bre! gomar i madh paska čene ky njeri! (Konstantinov 1975: 99)
Hey, what an ass that guy is!

(32) Ama njerëz fare pa mend qënkeshin ketha austriakan! (Konstantinov 1975: 24)
What fools these Germans are! (The other versions have noncoresponding idioms.)

As can be seen from this data, Balkan Slavic and Turkish usage corresponds structurally to the same type of use of the Albanian past admiratives rather than to the present Albanian present admiratives, although there is some functional overlap with the present admiratives of *jam* and *kam*, which can also correspond to Balkan Slavic and Turkish admirative usage on occasion.

Let us now return to the two questions raised at the beginning of this article. ONE) Admirative usage of the unmarked, i.e. indefinite and *miz*-pasts of Balkan Slavic and Turkish, although provoked by a realization taking place in the present, actually refers to a state of affairs which existed in the past (cf. Andrejcin 1938: 68). It can only refer to a state which has continued to exist from some time in the past up to the moment of speech, and the surprise on the part of the speaker also refers to a past state of ignorance or disbelief during which the speaker would not have vouched for the truth of the statement. Thus admirative usage in its stativity and in its relation of the past to the present preserves part of the meaning of the perfects from which the unmarked pasts are descended while at the same time carrying some of the nonconfirmative nuance which these forms have acquired during the course of their development in contrast to the development of marking for confirmative status in the simple perfect. In this way, admirative usage in Balkan Slavic and Turkish does not contradict the past tense marking of the indefinite and *miz*-pasts and is also in accord with their chief contextual variant meanings of nonconfirmativity. This view is supported by the situation in Albanian, where it is precisely the markedly past admirative forms which also permit the type of usage found in the Balkan Slavic and Turkish unmarked pasts.23 TWIN) The relevant part of the Albanian verbal system represents a sort of

23. The similar use of the Albanian imperfect and perfect and the fact that the latter also appears to be in the process of becoming an unmarked past should also be remembered here. In addi-
mirror image of the Balkan Slavic and Turkish phenomena. Whereas the Balkan Slavic and Turkish perfects developed into unmarked pasts with chief contextual variant meanings of nonconfirmatvity, the Albanian perfect has split: the ordinary perfect has become or is becoming the unmarked past, while the nonconfirmative nuances became attached to the inverted perfect which subsequently developed into its own series of paradigmatic sets marked for nonconfirmative status: the confirmative. Thus it can be seen that in the investigation of grammatical problems in one language of the Balkans, related phenomena in other Balkan languages can be used in suggesting solutions.

Victor A. Friedman
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