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Grammatical Categories and a Comparative Balkan Grammar*

In the past half-century since Sandfeld's synthesis of "problems and results" which lead to the establishment of Balkan linguistics as a field within the broader framework of areal and typological linguistics, certain general directions have been more consistently pursued than others. As Masica has observed in the context of areal linguistics in general: "Simply discovering and demonstrating individual instances of convergence has absorbed much of the time and energy of those interested in such phenomena." There is a general consensus that two of the most important goals for Balkan linguistics, whether seen as remedies for a perceived "crisis" or "stagnancy" in the field or as the next natural step in the maturation of the discipline, are a Balkan linguistic atlas (mentioned at least as early as 1934) and a Balkan comparative grammar. In order to achieve these goals, it will be necessary to broaden the scope of the bases of comparison. Until now, the overwhelming emphasis in comparative Balkan linguistics has been on readily perceptible surface phenomena, especially lexical borrowing, calquing, and a relatively small number of phonological and morpho-syntactic features such as the use of schwa or the loss of the infinitive. Even in treating these phenomena, the lack of complete consistency in the facts of their occurrence within the a priori defined linguistic territory has lead scholars to attempt to define "cluster" phenomena, to suggest the
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elimination of some of the often reiterated examples of common features, or to suggest that the Balkans do not even constitute a Sprachbund. Consider in this light ARONSON's paper on English as a Balkan language, in which he points out that English is characterized by loss of case, loss of the infinitive, formation of the future with invariant 'will', presence of stressed schwa, presence of a definite article (preposed as in Greek and sometimes in Albanian and Romanian), etc. The point is not that English is a Balkan language but rather that questions of mutual influence versus internal development must be carefully weighed. There can be no doubt that the languages of the Balkans have influenced one another; this is clear from lexicon and phraseology. The question is how far does this influence extend into the structure of the respective languages. The answer to this question must be sought in a comparative grammar, and that section of the grammar dealing with the comparison of grammatical categories, i.e., those parts of the meaning conveyed by changes in form which do not affect lexical meaning, will be essential in this regard. In order to illustrate the theoretical possibilities of such a comparison, this paper will give a contrastive outline of the grammatical categories of the Standard Albanian and Literary Macedonian indicative systems, showing their basic similarities and differences, their respective hierarchic arrangements, and the significance of these facts for the development of Balkan linguistics.

In beginning our discussion of the treatment of verbal categories in a comparative Balkan grammar, JAKOBSON's pioneering work can serve as a point of departure. Given the ten generic categories identified by him, viz. gender, number, person, voice, mood, status, aspect, tense, taxis, and evidential, this discussion will be restricted to those categories which change between conjunctival paradigmatic sets (hereafter referred to as tense forms) below the level of mood in a hierarchical schema of verbal categories. Thus excluded are the lowermost categories of gender, number, and person, as these only change within a given paradigm, and the superordinate category of voice, as well as the Macedonian aspectual opposition perfective/imperfective, as these are inherent in the verbal stem and thus stand above mood in a grammatical hierarchy. Our first consideration then will be the definition of mood, which, according to JAKOBSON, characterizes the relationship between the narrated event and its participants and the participants in the speech event. This is essentially the traditional definition of mood. An ever increasing number of linguists, however, have pointed out that the feature common to all moods other than the indicative and shared by them with the various forms of the so-called future tense is the fact that they all describe events which are not ontologically real, i.e., they represent an objective evaluation of the reality of an event such that an event described by a present or past indicative has actually occurred or is occurring while an event described by any of the other forms has not actually occurred and is not occurring. On the basis of this, ARONSON has convincingly argued that mood should be defined simply as the qualification of the narrated event without reference to its participants or those in the speech event. He then points out that JAKOBSON defines status as qualifying the narrated event but gives examples involving the speaker's evaluation, e.g., the English assertive using stressed do (e.g., He did go home last night), in which the speaker is editorializing on the truth of the statement. As a result, ARONSON suggests that the term status be redefined to mean the relationship between the speaker and the narrated event. This has two advantages. One is that it places mood and aspect together as the (objective) qualifier and quantifier of the narrated event, a fact which can be used to explain intersections between mood and aspect which, because they involve nonindicative modality, are beyond the scope of this paper. The other is that it is now possible to account for the similarities and differences between modal forms such as the optative, which expresses the speaker's wish for an event which is not ontologically real, and indicative forms such as the Albanian affirmative (to be discussed below), which expresses the speaker's attitude toward an ontologically real event. Both are marked for the category of status but only the former is marked as a nonindicative mood.

Let us now consider the Macedonian and Albanian tense forms subsumed under the label indicative mood. Both languages' sets of tense forms can be divided into

---

12 R. JAKOBSON, Shifters . . . , p. 4. (p. 125).
14 H. ARONSON, "Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian", Folia Slavica 1, 1, Columbus, 1977, pp. 12–15.
15 An example of such an intersection is the use of the future marker ke with an imperfect in Macedonian to indicate either iterativity (aspect) or an unreal condition (mood), e.g., IIII ke pesma vykacite, toa kapeva "Whatever the guards would say, that's what I would do" but ja vase, ke nemo iznuto "If I had known, I would have said something". ARONSON (op. cit.) labels the category containing this intersection manner.
The first series we shall consider will be the perfects using “have”. The superfi-
cial resemblance between the Macedonian and Albanian forms has been noted at
least since Sandefjord, but these forms play very different roles in the structures
of their respective languages. The Macedonian perfects describe the relationship
between a past narrated event and another event defined by a point of reference
such that the verb presents the event as a state resulting from some previous action.
In the case of the ima-perfect the reference is contemporaneous with the speech
event, i.e., present, while it is anterior to the speech event, i.e., past, for the imashe-
and imal-perfects. The generic verbal categories as outlined by Jakobson and
modified by Aronson do not provide for the resultative relationship, and so this
category, which can be labeled resultativity, must be added to those listed above. It is
the specification of this category which separates the Macedonian “have” perfects
from all other indicative forms, and thus in a hierarchical arrangement of verbal
categories it will come immediately below mood. As the ima-perfect is marked for
present resultativity, it cannot refer to a definite time in the past, a restriction which
does not apply to the Albanian perfect, e.g.,

(1) *Вчера го имам видено во два сватот.
Dje e kam parë n’orën dy.
*Yesterday I have seen him at two o’clock.

In addition to being used for definite past, nonresultative events, the Albanian
perfect can be used in connected narrative for sequential events, and from a compar-
tative point of view, it can correspond to the Macedonian definite and indefinite
pasts in both the aorist and imperfect aspects, as can be seen from these two rep-
resentative examples drawn from a much larger corpus:

(2) Robërve që ishin rreth 15,000, perandori Vasilij ka uredhuar që t’u nxiren
sytë, kurse do t’i lihet njëri sy dhe nën pirje e këtyrevë i ka
dërguar Samoii.
На Фатените што биле до 15,000 души царот Василий наредил да им се
извадат очите, и на секој стоти да му се остави по едно око, и под водст-
вото на свега ги правил ка Самул.
[As for] the prisoners, who numbered around 15,000, the emperor Basil or-
dered that their eyes be put out but that one eye be left in every hundredth
person, and under their leadership he sent them back to Samuil.

be excluded as variants which cannot at this stage be assigned independent meanings,
but which are rather colloquial variants much like the French compound perfect (J’ai eu
travail) used colloquially to replace the past anterior (J’eu travaillé). The compound
admiratives of the type paska pasë punuar and paskësja pasë punuar will be excluded on
similar grounds, to which can be added the fact that they are not mentioned in the Acad-
emy grammar (Sh. Demina, Fonetika ...).

18 K. Sandefjord, op. cit., p. 130.
19 V. Friedman, op. cit., pp. 82-98.
20 M. Qorizi, Ne dhe atdeu yndë, Skopje, 1978, p.158.
21 M. Qorizi, Nie i nasata tatkowina, Skopje, 1980, p. 158.
although such phenomena are said to be more characteristic of colloquial and of northern Albanian, they are nevertheless a common and accepted feature of the literary language. The Albanian perfect, therefore, cannot be marked for resultativity and must be opposed to the aorist and imperfect in some other way. Given the fact that the perfect can be used nonresultatively (1) and for both completed (2) and durative (3) actions, and in view of Demiraj's analysis, we would propose that the perfect neutralizes the aspectual oppositions distinguishing the aorist and imperfect and functions as the unmarked past, as has been the fate of the perfect in many European languages. This leads to the question of the relationship of the aorist/imperfect opposition to the perfect. We would suggest that the situation is as follows. The perfect is clearly closer in meaning and use to the aorist than to the imperfect. The imperfect is distinguished from both the aorist and the perfect by the fact that it can occur with the progressive particle po and cannot express limited duration (v. infra). The aorist is then distinguished from the perfect by the fact that it cannot be used in the type of durative contexts where the perfect is functioning as the equivalent of the imperfect, e.g. with the adverb gjithëkë "always". There are thus two aspectual distinctions: imperfect vs aorist/perfect, for which the imperfect is marked, and then aorist vs perfect, for which the aorist is marked.

This in turn brings us to the question of the opposition imperfect/aorist. In Macedonian, as I have argued elsewhere, the imperfect is the marked member of the opposition (the most commonly held opinion, based on its greater semantic and syntactic limitations and lesser frequency of occurrence) and that the feature for which it is marked is absolute duration. In Albanian, I would argue, the imperfect is marked for unlimited duration while the aorist, in opposition to the perfect, is marked for completeness or wholeness. There is one important context in which the Macedonian imperfect cannot be translated by the Albanian — if the event is limited and fills those limits without going beyond them:

(4) Grevë zgjat 48 orë.
    The strike lasted 48 hours.

(5) Popijit e Jugosllavisë jetuan në këtë menyrë plot 23 vite, gjer në vitin 1941.
    The peoples of Yugoslavia lived this for 23 whole years, until 1941.

In Macedonian, the fact of the duration of the action itself is what is of significance, and so the imperfect is used. In Albanian, the specification of a time limit completely filled by the event is incompatible with the type of durability expressed by the imperfect, and so only the aorist is acceptable. In examples such as these, the aorist is being used for durative actions because they are conceived of as completed wholes.

Since the Macedonian imperfect/aorist opposition is the same in all the sets of tense forms in which it occurs, we will now consider the opposition between the definite and indefinite pasts in comparison with the Albanian opposition adverbial/nonadverbial. As I have presented the comparison of these categories in detail elsewhere, only the outlines of the argument will be given here. The Macedonian imperfect is sometimes said to be marked as coordination, but examples such as Kazi ishte e kërcimes së pancëta "Tell the story of how you elapsed" show that the imperfect can be used to describe an event as taking place over many points in time, i.e. duratively, without referring to any coordinated event. The Macedonian imperfect can also be used in sequences with aorists with which it is not coordinated. Hence, coordination is a contextual variant meaning.

The other feature for which the Macedonian imperfect is sometimes said to be marked is coordination, but examples such as Kazi ishte e kërcimes së pancëta "Tell the story of how you elapsed" show that the imperfect can be used to describe an event as taking place over many points in time, i.e. duratively, without referring to any coordinated event. The Macedonian imperfect can also be used in sequences with aorists with which it is not coordinated. Hence, coordination is a contextual variant meaning.

31 The other feature for which the Macedonian imperfect is sometimes said to be marked is coordination, but examples such as Kazi ishte e kërcimes së pancëta "Tell the story of how you elapsed" show that the imperfect can be used to describe an event as taking place over many points in time, i.e. duratively, without referring to any coordinated event. The Macedonian imperfect can also be used in sequences with aorists with which it is not coordinated. Hence, coordination is a contextual variant meaning.
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37 We should note here that iterative actions, for which the aorist can also be used if they are conceived of as a limited whole, involve a type of broken duration in time, and thus iterativity is a variant of durativity.
38 V. Friedman, op. cit., pp. 52-53, 103.
donian definite past specifies the speaker’s personal commitment to the truth of the statement as evidenced by the fact that the only context in which a definite past can never occur is one which directly contradicts this confirmative meaning, e.g., subordination to a verb of disbelief as in the following example:

(6) *Не верувам дека той го направи тоа.
I don’t believe that he did it.

The indefinite past can occur in any kind of past context, confirmative or nonconfirmative, definite or indefinite, resultative or nonresultative, etc. Here we will cite just one witnessed, definite, nonresultative example:

(7) Сум станал нокеска во еден, сум зел лепче, сум му дал да јаде.40
I got up at one this morning, got some bread, and gave him something to eat.

Thus the indefinite past is unmarked with respect to the definite past, i.e., it specifies pastness only. Nonetheless, because the definite past specifies confirmativity, the indefinite past most frequently implies nonconfirmativity, e.g., reported speech, irony, etc.41 This implication is not invariant, however, as can be seen from (7). The Albanian opposition admirative/nonadmirative is a mirror image of the Macedonian opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative.42 The admirative is used to express irony, doubt, supposition, reported speech, and surprise, which last refers to a time in the past when the speaker would not have vouched for the truth of the event whose subsequently revealed veracity evokes the surprise.43 Additional evidence that the admirable specifies nonconfirmativity is to be found in the fact that it cannot be subordinated to clauses indicating the speaker’s personal opinion.

40 B. Koneski, op. cit., p. 462.
41 It should be noted that when the indefinite past is used to render a report of a statement originally made in the present tense, this is a form of tense agreement with a deleted verb of reporting or the ontological pastness of the original statement. Similarly, the dubitative or ironic use of the indefinite past refers to a previously uttered statement. Z. Šanova’s ([Glagol’nye formy dlya peresказывания v makedonskom literaturnom jazyke], in Problemy sintaksisa ..., pp. 128-133) recent attempt to define a separate category of reported speech in Macedonian is impossible without accepting the notion of assigning different grammatical meanings to identical paradigms (cf. especially p. 128). Also v. n. 48.
42 We are omitting from consideration nonstandard uses of the admirable, e.g., in Geeg poetic and in the dialects of Bulgaria and the Ukraine, where the form corresponding to the standard present admirable appears to continue to function as an inverted, perhaps expressive, perfect. These represent usages from systems which differ significantly from the standard one and which are thus beyond the scope of this paper. Cf. also M. Camaj, Lehrbuch der albanischen Sprache, Wiesbaden, 1969, p. 67.

(8) *Мendoj se e bëka këtë punë.
I think he’s doing this job.

As can be seen from the foregoing, the Macedonian and Albanian oppositions under discussion here are manifestations of the same type of category. Sytov44 has observed that the admirable, which is traditionally defined as a mood,45 is not like other Albanian moods in that it denotes ontologically real events and takes the indicative negators nuk and s’ rather than the modal negator mos, and he suggests the possibility of using some category inspired by Jakobson’s evidential to account for it. Jakobson exemplifies this category by means of the Bulgarian forms used for reported speech, another phenomenon which has been treated as a mood unlike other moods46 and one which has been compared to the Albanian admirable. Leaving aside the Bulgarian question, which I have treated in detail elsewhere47, it can be seen from the foregoing discussion of the distinction between status and mood that since the Macedonian definite past specifies the speaker’s evaluation of the narrated event as personally confirmed while the Albanian admirable specifies the speaker’s present or past unwillingness to do the same, both these phenomena can be said to be marked for status. But since they render ontologically real events, they are unmarked for mood, i.e., they are indicative. In this manner, it is unnecessary to speak of different types of modality, and the difference between these two types of grammatical category can be made clear.

As was mentioned above, the admirable has four tense forms: present, perfect, imperfect, and pluperfect. The first two are vastly more common than the second two. The present admirable, like the Albanian nonadmirative present and the Macedonian present, is unmarked for (past) tense, i.e., it does not specify the narrated event as preceding the speech event. Among the past admiratives, the imperfect can be taken as marked for durative aspect in opposition to the perfect, which is clearly unmarked, while the pluperfect is distinguished from both by its marking for anterior tais, which brings us to the consideration of that category.

44 A. Sytov, „Kategorija admirativa v albskonom jazyke i ee balkanskoe sootvetstvije“, in Problemy sintaksisa ..., pp. 109-111.
45 Sh. Demiraj, „Rečti kategorije...“, pp. 102-104.
47 V. Friedman “Reportedness in Bulgarian: Category or Stylistic Variant?” to appear in a festschrift for Edward Stankiewicz as a special supplement to the International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics.
48 The so-called admirable use of the Macedonian indefinite past, e.g., Toj fazë berë “My, but he’s rich!”, is actually limited to verbs of state such as ‘be’ and ‘have’ and expresses the speaker’s surprise at a state which has come to pass in the past, i.e., it refers to a past event which the speaker would not have confirmed before the moment of speech. This usage does not correspond to the Albanian present admirable but to the same use of ‘be’ and ‘have’ in all four admirable tense forms as well as the nonadmirative perfect. Cf. my forthcoming article in Zeitschrift für Balkanologie as well as Fielder, op. cit., p. 563.
JakoRson\(^4\) defines taxis as the category expressing the relationship of two narrated events to one another, so a form marked for anterior taxis specifies the action described by the verb as having taken place before some other past action or point in time, which is the standard definition of a pluperfect. In Macedonian, the imaše- and imal-perfects, which are in effect pluperfects, are marked for both past reference and resultativity, i.e., they present the event as a state in the past resulting from some previous event, and thus do not need an additional specification for taxis. Taxis is only needed to distinguish the beše-pluperfect from the indefinite past. The difference between the anterior taxiic and past resultative tense forms of Macedonian can be seen in the following example:

(9) Таа ми го покажа, но как веќе го (a) бев видел.  
(b) има видено.

She pointed him out to me, but I had already seen him.

The taxic pluperfect (a) means that I spotted him just before she did, e.g., on the street, whereas the resultative pluperfect (b) can only be used if I had seen him on some previous occasion, i.e., if having seen him was a kind of state resulting from a previous action.\(^5\) Within the beše-pluperfect the imperfect/aorist distinction is of the same nature as for the other relevant past tense forms, while the distinction between the imaše and imal-perfects is the same status opposition found in the definite and indefinite pasts, but with one modification. Although nonconfirmativeness is the chief contextual variant but not the invariant meaning of the indefinite past, it appears that the double marking for past reference and resultativity causes nonconfirmativeness to become the only meaning for the imal-perfect. Thus, while it is acceptable to say Яц ВИДИВ како ТОЈ ГО НАПРАВИЛ ТОА "I saw how/that he did/had done it", it is not acceptable to substitute има НАПРАВИЛ to render a purely resultative pluperfect, only имаше НАПРАВЕНО could be substituted here in subordination to the verb of witnessing.

The Albanian indicative has only two pluperfects (excluding the compound forms mentioned in note 17), and they are distinguished formally by the aspect of the auxiliary (v. page 4 supra). These forms are sometimes said to be distinguished by the same aorist/imperfect opposition occurring in the synthetic forms,\(^6\) although it has also been said that due to the blurring of the aspectual differences in the verbs "be" and "have" the two pluperfects are virtually synonymous.\(^7\) If the distinction is in fact the process of being lost, in which case one would expect one of the forms to be disappearing, which appears to be true of the aor-pluperfect, then it would be difficult to find a consistent criterion of distinction. It has been sug-

\(^4\) R. JakoRson, Shifters . . . . , p. 4 (\(=\) p. 135).
\(^5\) V. FRIEDMAN, The Grammatical Categories . . . . , p. 120.
\(^6\) ibid., p. 110.
\(^7\) M. CAMAJ, op. cit., p. 66.
\(^8\) Sh. DEMIRAJ, Fonetika . . . , p. 271.

gested\(^4\) that the aor-pluperfect is limited to witnessed or nonreported events, in opposition to the im-pluperfect, and it is true that a number of speakers reject aor-pluperfects in subordination to clauses such as ĐeRjo a and Kam ĐeRjua a "I heard/have heard that", but consider the following examples:

(10) Më e madhja, Pashua, tha se i ge nxirët eje dhe shpërtheu në lote.\(^5\) The older one, Pasho, said that her life had been ruined (lit. extracted) and burst into tears.

(11) Mbëse patën ardhur aty, që në kohën e Skenderbeut. Të tjerë thonë se . . . .\(^6\) [Speculating on the origin of the mountain villages of Sul] Perhaps they had come there in Skenderbeg's time. Others say that . . .

If the distinction is in the process of shifting from the category of aspect to that of status, however, then inconsistencies in usage are to be expected. Regardless of the nature of the distinction, one thing is certain: the aor-pluperfect is marked with respect to the im-pluperfect.

This concludes our comparative survey of Macedonian and Albanian indicative verbal categories. Let us now consider the respective hierarchical arrangements of the generic categories. In Macedonian, the top position below mood in the hierarchy is occupied by resultativity, which sets off the "have" perfects from the rest of the system, whereas in Albanian, which lacks resultativity altogether, this position is occupied by status, which separates the admiring forms. Tense (or reference, in the resultative forms) is the next category in both systems, as none of the nonpast (presents) need be marked for any other category. The third position in Macedonian is occupied by status, which is the only other category needed for both resultative and nonresultative forms, whereas in Albanian this position must be occupied by taxis in order for the remaining relevant aspectual distinctions to apply to the pluperfects. The lowest two positions in the hierarchy have four sets of oppositions in both languages, but in Macedonian these consist of one opposition for taxis and three for one type of aspect whereas in Albanian there are two pairs of different aspectual oppositions. It should be noted that Macedonian, too, has a second aspectual opposition, but it is one which is superordinate to mood (v. page 82 supra). The greater use of taxis and aspect in Albanian can be accounted for by its lack of resultativity, which in Macedonian distinguishes the perfect and two of the pluperfects, but the most crucial difference between the two hierarchies is the position of status. Graphically, these relationships can be illustrated as shown in Tables I and II.

Let us now turn to the meanings of those generic categories which the two systems have in common. Tense has the same meaning for both (past vs nonpast),

\(^5\) Personal communication by Rexhep Ismajli of the University of Pristina.
\(^7\) ibid., p. 76.
and taxis may represent the same type of anteciority in both systems, but given its complicated relationships with resultativity and aspect, this point is in need of further investigation. The two types of aspect are clearly very similar but just as clearly not identical. We have suggested the distinction between absolute and unlimited duration for the Macedonian and Albanian imperfects, but the problem of relating the Macedonian perfective and the Albanian aorist, which aside from their similar markings for completeness and wholeness also show some strikingly similar modal functions\textsuperscript{58}, must be left for future work. The category of status is at once the most and least similar in the two languages. Not only are the Albanian admimative and Macedonian confirmative mirror images of one another, which has resulted in the structurally inappropriate comparison of the Macedonian unmarked not-confirmative with the Albanian marked admimative, but if the Albanian aor-pluperfect is developing some sort of nonreported meaning, then both Macedonian and Albanian have secondary markings in one of their pluperfects (Macedonian \textit{imad}-pluperfect, Albanian aor-pluperfect) which is the opposite of the marking of their primary status distinctions.

In investigating the concept of comparing the meanings and hierarchies of grammatical categories in a comparative Balkan grammar, we have seen that differences in hierarchical ordering correspond to essential differences in the respective systems, and that aside from position, inventory and relative exploitation of generic grammatical categories, there can be basic differences in the meanings of categories which on the surface appear to resemble one another. To return to our statement at the beginning of this paper on the role of grammatical categories in a comparative Balkan grammar in determining the depth of resemblances in the Balkan \textit{Sprachbund}, we can say that in this realm of grammar, the theory of independent internal development leading to some superficial convergence bears at least as much weight as that of mutual influence. This fact by no means detracts from the concept of a Balkan \textit{Sprachbund}, however, but rather emphasizes the necessity of distinguishing those features which should be attributed to mutual influence from those features which should not. The comparison of features of independent origin is also an important and valid goal for Balkan linguistics in its contribution to general and typological linguistics. Our understanding of such generic categories as resultativity, aspect, and status can be greatly enhanced by our comparison of their treatment in the Balkan languages, since the similarities are close enough to assure us that we are actually comparing members of the same generic category while the differences are deep enough to demonstrate different possibilities for the development of the same category. Thus the methods of Balkan linguistics need not all be directed toward the demonstration of a real phenomena. Our goals must include the comparison of the divergent as well as the convergent.

\textsuperscript{57} A similar version of this diagram appeared in V. FRIEDMAN, \textit{The Grammatical Categories} ..., p. 116.

\textsuperscript{58} E.g. these forms are commonly used to express conditions after the appropriate particles and conjunctions. On similar Bulgarian phenomena, v. H. ARONSON "Interrelationships ...".
Remarks to the Discussion

I would like to begin my remarks by thanking all of my colleagues for their valuable and perspicacious comments. I am both very gratified and a bit overwhelmed by the number and variety of responses, and I shall do my best to answer them all as thoroughly as possible. Nevertheless, limitations of time and space will necessitate my abbreviating some answers and referring to other works with more detailed treatments, as otherwise my responses would constitute papers in themselves.

I would like to add to Prof. Rosetti's comment that Balkan dialects of Turkish and Spanish also display loss of the infinitive with substitution of the optative or subjunctive.

With regard to Prof. Feuillet's comments, I would like to make the following three points:

1. Whether the grammatical distinctions discussed are treated as representing generic categories or sub-divisions of generic super-categories, the oppositions must nonetheless be accounted for independently of one another. I am not in principle averse to the idea that taxis or resultativity can be included in a more ad hoc definition of tense and aspect, but the essential differences and concepts will remain the same. Similarly, an expansion of a definition of mood to include status is not impossible, but ultimately the distinctions will have to be made, whether as categories or sub-categories.

2. I agree that the so-called perfect of Bulgarian (type [e] ispiš) is not resultative. It is comparable to the unmarked pasts of French, German, and Russian, as well as those of Macedonian and Albanian. In my discussion of resultativity, however, I was referring to the Macedonian forms with imas, which do not constitute fixed paradigms in the Bulgarian literary language (v. Georgiev 1957, Aronson 1967, Teodorov-Balan 1957), as opposed to Macedonian, where they do.

3. The so-called reported/indicative distinction in literary Macedonian has no morphological marker whatsoever, since there is never any auxiliary in the third person of the indefinite past. I have discussed the Bulgarian problem in an article to appear in a forthcoming issue of Folia Slavica dedicated to Edward Stankiewicz, but I could add here that in actual use, this distinction does not occur as it is described in the grammars, as can be seen from the data in Roth (1979). (Please see also note 41 in my paper.)

This brings me to some of the comments by Profs. Duridanov and Asseleva. The most salient differences between the literary Macedonian and literary Bulgarian indicative systems in the context of my paper are the following:

1. The lack of the three types of 'have' perfects as analytic paradigms in Bulgarian as referred to above.

2. The total absence of the auxiliary in the third person of the indefinite past in Macedonian, also mentioned above.

3. The use of the indefinite past of 'be' as an auxiliary in Bulgarian (e.g. Toj bil dosuli), which does not occur in literary Macedonian. It is also worthy of note that the use of the imperfect l-participle with the past definite of the auxiliary 'be', e.g. beše pravel, is permissible in Macedonian but never mentioned in the standard grammars of Bulgarian (only the aorist l-participle, e.g. beše pravi, is used in these forms), and many, but not all, speakers of Bulgarian will reject such forms.

The so-called admittance of the use of the Bulgarian indefinite past first observed by Censo (1910/11) and first compared with Albanian by Weisgard (1923/4) is not identical with the Albanian. The Albanian admittance is a complete set of morphologically distinct paradigms in both the present and past, whereas the Bulgarian phenomenon is just one use of a single past tense form and is in fact highly restricted. Thus for example, in the Albanian translation of Baj Ganjo by Aleksandar Konstantinov, two-thirds of the Albanian present admiratives correspond to simple presents in the Bulgarian original. The only real correspondence between Albanian and Bulgarian in this regard is in the use of static verbs, almost exclusively 'be' and 'have', in any of the Albanian admittance tenses and in the indefinite past in Bulgarian to refer to the present realization of a state which already existed in the past. Thus the Bulgarian Toj bil bogat meaning 'He is rich [much to my surprise]' corresponds not only to the Albanian Ai qenka i pasur but also to Ai paska genë i pasur, Ai qenëk që is pasur, Ai qenëk që is pasur, and even Ai ka genë i pasur. (I have treated these matters in greater detail in my article Admissiveness and Confirmative, which is scheduled to appear in vol. 17 of Zeitschrift für Balkanologie. See especially examples 30-32 in that article.) What we have here in Bulgarian is the special use of a past tense to refer to a pre-existent state, and the resemblance to Albanian is due to a correspondence of usages, not a correspondence of categories.

The Greek and Bulgarian examples with the particles tha and ste cited by Prof. Asseleva involve modal forms, according to the definitions suggested by Janakiev (1962), Golab (1964), and others, and are thus not part of the indicative system to which my paper was limited. While it is certainly true that in the Balkan grammar, to use Prof. Hammar's term from his comment, it will be necessary to discuss lexical, marked modal, and other means of expressing doubt and other forms of speaker involvement, the phenomenon I discussed here, viz. the morphologically marked indicative, i.e. non-modal, expression of speaker involvement, for which I have used the term status, does not occur in Greek and Romanian, and thus these languages cannot enter this particular aspect of the grammar.

I use the term confirmative for the definite past rather than the term dubitative for the indefinite past because I am referring to an invariant meaning which is al-
ways present in the definite past (hence example 6), as opposed to a contextual variant meaning which is not always present in the indefinite past (as shown by example 7). Example 7 shows that the so-called indefinite past is really an unmarked past, as it can in fact be definite as well as non-resultative (i.e., non-perfect) and non-reported. The question in my paper is the definition of morphologically marked grammatical categories. Any meaning of a form which is dependent upon context for its definition, i.e., any meaning which can only be identified on the basis of the context in which the form occurs, cannot be taken as invariant and thus cannot suffice to distinguish a morphologically marked grammatical category.

With regard to Prof. Menges’ comment, I should like to suggest that the evidence indicates that the Turkish past tense in -di, like the Balkan Slavic definite past, is marked for speaker’s confirmation while the past tense in -miş, which has both reported and non-reported functions, must be treated as the unmarked past (see Underhill 1976: 170). Profs. Hază and Tietze draw a distinction between the perfect participle in -miş, which can be non-reported, and the reported maş past. It seems to me, however, that in an example such as Bu sabah hesabettim, küçüküm topaşı düşüeti tam 73 gece olmuş (Johanson 1971: 284) the form olmuş must be treated as a finite form and therefore a confirmative use of the unmarked maş past. (Please see also examples 16-18 in my article to appear in vol. 17 of Zeitschrift für Balkanologie.) The Georgian perfect (turmeobiti) also has non-reported uses, although its relationship to the aorist (çevetii) is more difficult to define than in the Balkan Slavic case. It should also be noted that there are significant differences between the Georgian and Balkan Slavic phenomena. Thus, while the perfect of qobna ‘be’ can be used admiratively, e.g., Ra lamazi gogo qopikar = Sıta si bila ubava molal, the Georgian perfect cannot be used in the dubitative function, i.e., to express sarcastic disbelief as in the following example from Macedonian where Speaker 1 says: ’Tov poveke od tebe znae za bokisranje’ and Speaker 2 replies with sarcasm: ’Tov povekove znaeli!’ Here Georgian could not use the perfect scodnia where Macedonian has the indefinite past znael. Also, Georgian uses the perfect for performative acts where Balkan Slavic, like English, uses the present, e.g., Momilovaca! (Congratulations!) (literally: ’I have congratulated you’). It should also be noted that Lithuanian also has uses of its past active participle which correspond to some of the reported functions in the languages under consideration here, which lends weight to Lohmann’s (1937) suggestion that perfects tend to develop these types of uses by their very nature (as opposed to, e.g., external influence).

With regard to the comments by Profs. Steinke and Duridanov that it is also necessary to point out similarities and examine historical aspects of these phenomena, I should like to say that in certain cases, such as admirativity and reportedness, too much attention has been paid to the similarities and not enough to the differences. Comparisons of similar categories and usages must be based on their functions within their respective systems. The question of the degree of validity of superficial resemblance as opposed to structural difference is of crucial importance and a key issue for the further development of Balkan linguistics. As for the use of diachrony in a strictly synchronic analysis such as the one I have attempted here, I think that historical considerations must be restricted to peripheral explanations and commentary, otherwise we run the risk of mixing levels of description and confusing conjecture with fact.

With regard to Profs. Birnbaum’s, Steinke’s, and Reiter’s comments on the use of Jakobson’s theoretical framework and the question of generic grammatical categories: I am in agreement that the system as defined by Jakobson, and here I am taking Shifters as my starting point, my reference to Zur Struktur in note 10 having been for historical purposes, is in need of modification, and I suggested some directions in my paper. This is, however, a matter which requires further theoretical as well as practical investigation. (Cf. also point 1 in my response to Prof. Feuillet.)

Prof. Birnbaum’s question regarding the Balkan as opposed to the purely comparative aspect of the matters considered in my paper was treated in the comment by Prof. Hamp. I would only like to add that one of the points I wished to stress was the fact that in Balkan linguistic theory, its application, relevance, and relationship to general linguistics is a goal deserving of greater attention.

Profs. Rohr’s and Reiter’s comments on pragmatics, differences between narrative and discourse, writing and speech, are well taken. Nevertheless, what I have been aiming for is a description of that system common to both speech and writing and explicitly limited to the literary variant. The difference in the use of the French aorist and perfect (passé simple and passé composé) is better compared to the situation in Croatian and North Serbian (cf. Meillet and Vaillant 1952: 174, 178; Stefanovic 1967: 628) and Romanian (outside of Oltenia). In Albanian, the difference between the uses of the perfect and the aorist is not so much a function of written vs spoken or narrative vs discourse as it is a question of whether the speaker has Geg or Tosk, and which variety of Geg or Tosk, as the base over which the literary standard has been lad. The problem of the relationship of literary and dialectal Geg and Tosk substrata to the modern standard is crucial in a description of Standard Albanian, and yet the fluctuating state of usage and normative prescription at the present stage of development makes it extremely difficult if not impossible to define, except in terms of general or even temporary tendencies.

Prof. Reiter’s comparison of the category of status with lexical particles such as the German doch is certainly cogent from the functional point of view. What is significant here, however, is that the Balkan languages under consideration are capable of using unmodified verb forms where languages such as German and English must use lexical modifiers to express the same meanings. The pragmatic and contextual are used to identify semantic variants from which the supra-pragmatic and supra- contextual semantic invariant is to be extracted.

The related problem of real vs linguistic time raised by Prof. Rohr is also extremely important and the subject of much debate. It can be argued that the two are really quite different entities and that the connection between them will vary
depending on the system of the given language. This entire problem is in need of further investigation, especially insofar as it relates to Balkan linguistics.

I would like to conclude my remarks by thanking my colleagues once again and by expressing my gratitude to Prof. Reiter, The Free University of Berlin and the Southeast European Society of Munich for this invaluable opportunity to participate in such a fruitful and worthwhile discussion.
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