an implication derived from that attitude—is the chief contextual variant meaning (Hauptbedeutung) in the Balkan Slavic (i.e. Bulgarian and Macedonian) forms which are usually cited as exemplary, namely the descendants of the Common Slavic perfect. These forms still retain their older nonevidential perfect meanings and have developed simple preterite uses as well; thus, evidentiality cannot be said to function as the invariant meaning (Gesamtbedeutung) in these forms. This distinction between Hauptbedeutung and Gesamtbedeutung is crucial in understanding the structure of the Balkan Slavic (or any language’s) verbal system. Although the forms in question can be used evidentially and often are, the fact that this is not always the case means that evidentiality is not inherent in these forms but results from a combination of whatever meaning is always present when the form is used, which meaning must then be sought, and the surrounding context. These forms are thus not special evidential forms but rather forms contextually capable of expressing evidentiality. In pluperfect forms which developed later, during or after the rise of evidentiality, it appears that an evidential meaning can be treated as invariant, though it need not be treated as a separate grammatical category.

This is to say that in the languages under discussion, evidentiality does not constitute a generic grammatical category on a level with, for example, mood, tense or aspect. Rather, evidentiality is a meaning, whether contextual or invariant, expressed by the generic grammatical category which indicates the speaker’s attitude toward the narrated event. In Jakobsonian and traditional terms this category is labeled mood. Aronson (1977:13–15), however, has argued convincingly that Jakobson’s (1957) definitions of mood and status be reversed, in which case the category in question should be labeled status. The question of the precise label for the generic category to which evidentiality belongs, however, is not at issue here. The investigation of such a question is the task of a separate study of generic grammatical categories. The purpose of this article is to describe how evidentiality is expressed and how these expressions developed in the languages under consideration.

The term EVIDENTIALITY will be used in the paper as a convenient label for the meanings to be discussed, but with the understanding that it is not to be taken as literally descriptive. Comparable but nonetheless strikingly different developments in Albanian, where the inverted perfect developed into a separate set of paradigms with a Gesamtbedeutung very much like the Hauptbedeutung of the Balkan Slavic descendents of the Common Slavic perfect, will also be discussed in view of the light they shed on the synchronic and diachronic facts of Balkan evidentiality.¹

Table 1 illustrates the maximum number of past tense indicative paradigms

¹ Unless otherwise specified, this article will discuss the modern literary forms of these languages, i.e. the speech and writing of educated native speakers since the appropriate dates of codification. All examples whose sources are not specified were checked with native speakers.
Table 1. ISG and 3SG of ‘Do’ in Bulgarian and Macedonian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Definite Past</td>
<td>Indefinite Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AORIST</td>
<td>pravix</td>
<td>sům pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pravi</td>
<td>e pravil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERFECT</td>
<td>pravek</td>
<td>/sům pravil/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pravete</td>
<td>/ e pravil/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUPERFECT (aorist)</td>
<td>bjaks pravil</td>
<td>/sům bil pravil/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beše pravil</td>
<td>/ e bil pravil/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUPERFECT (imp)</td>
<td>bjaks pravel</td>
<td>/sům bil pravil/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beše pravel</td>
<td>/ e bil pravil/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

Slash/es: Forms excluded from the most conservative norm but now generally recognized as part of the literary language.
Square brackets: Forms not mentioned in the grammars but discussed in linguistic literature with examples.
Parentheses: Forms not mentioned in the grammars or linguistic literature but acceptable to some educated speakers and occurring in dialects.

Braces: Forms which either are not truly paradigmatic or do not occur in the literary language although they are mentioned in grammars and handbooks.

which are not totally homonymous in Bulgarian and Macedonian.\(^2\) The aorist/imperfect opposition is an aspectual one similar to but clearly distinct from perfective/imperfective, and will not be relevant to this discussion.\(^3\) The terms DEFINITE PAST and INDEFINITE PAST (Macedonian minato opredeleno, minato neopredeleno, Bulgarian minalo opredeleno, minalo neopredeleno) are traditionally applied to the forms above the double lines. Here the label will be used for the entire column. While ‘definiteness’ and ‘indefiniteness’ cannot be taken as the basic meanings of these forms, as will be seen below, the terms will be used here because they are convenient, well established, and widely recognized labels for the paradigmatic sets to which they are applied.

The following explanations of the forms in Table 1 are given to orient the reader unfamiliar with Slavic languages. The root which carries the meaning ‘do’ is prav-; the stem vowels -i- and -e- indicate aorist and imperfect aspect, respectively (in this conjugation). The form in -i is descended from a Common Slavic resultative participle and can still be used participially in Bulgarian but not in Macedonian, where it can only be used in the formation of compound tenses. The auxiliaries sům/sum and e are the first and third persons of the present tense of ‘be’; bjaks/bev and beše are the definite past and sům/sum bil and (e) bil are the indefinite past forms of the same persons of the verb.\(^4\) Macedonian also has grammaticalized (paradigmatic) pluperfects using the definite and indefinite pasts of ima ‘have’ and the neuter form of the verbal adjective in -n, which is descended from the Common Slavic past passive participle.\(^5\) These forms can be translated literally by the English ‘had done’.

BALKAN SLAVIC DEFINITE PAST

The definite past in both Macedonian and Bulgarian specifies the speaker’s personal confirmation of the truth of the statement. As the source of this conviction is generally the speaker’s direct experience of the event, the forms are frequently described as marked for witnessing, but numerous examples show that this definition is too narrow (see, e.g. Aronson 1967:87; Friedman 1977:40). Thus, for example, a Bulgarian colleague of mine, discussing which of his colleagues had attended a conference in America which he had not been able to attend, said of one of them:

(1) Beše tanok.
‘(She) was there.’

\(^2\) Macedonian also possesses a present perfect of the type iman praveno, ima praveno which refers to the present results of past actions. For the purposes of this article, i.e. in terms of evidentiality, these forms are neutral and pattern like the unmarked present tense forms (cf. Friedman 1977:82–99), and so they will not be considered.

\(^3\) At one time it was claimed that the imperfect l-participle could only occur in evidential forms (cf. Andrejčin 1944:§295). This was an artificial distinction and was not even observed by those who prescribed it (see Aronson 1967:91 n.12). It is now generally recognized that the imperfect l-participle has at least some of the same nonevidential uses as the aorist l-participle (see, e.g. Penčev 1967; Stankov 1967).

\(^4\) The second person either is identical to the third person or patterns like the first person, and the plural patterns like the singular, so these forms have been omitted to save space and increase ease of comparison.

\(^5\) Bulgarian has similar constructions but they are considered dialectal or marginal, and they are nonparadigmatic (see Georgiev 1957; Teodorov-Balan 1957). In the Bulgarian constructions the subject must be animate and the participle usually agrees with the direct object, and cannot be formed from intransitive verbs; it is still a true past passive participle (see Penčev 1968; V. Kostov 1972:378). It should be observed for the sake of completeness that this adjective or participle is occasionally formed using -i- instead of -n-; the rules are of no concern to this article.
This despite the fact that his only source of information was a report. Consider also the following Macedonian sentence, based on, but not translated from, the Watergate Tapes (p. 188), which appeared in the daily newspaper Nova Makedonija (June 19, 1974, p. 5). Ehrlichman is suggesting what Nixon could say to clean out the ‘cancer growing about the Presidency’:

(2) No podocna se slučija raboti za koji ne znaev.
   but later happened things about which not (I) knew
‘But later things happened that I didn’t know about.’

The definite past verb se slučija refers to actions which the President is specifically denying having known about, much less having seen, at the time they occurred, but whose actual occurrence he must confirm. Hence, the term ‘witnessed’ does not capture the meaning of these forms.

The definite past can also be used, in both Macedonian and Bulgarian, in sentences which do not actually refer to a definite past time, as in the following Macedonian example:

(3) Od najstarite vreminja lužeto veruvaao deka
From oldest times the-people believed (past def.) that
mesčina vlijao vraz životot na zemjata.
moon influences on-the-life on-the-earth
(Nova Makedonija, November 12, 1972).
‘Since most ancient times people have believed that the moon influences life on earth.’

Sentences of the type Ne znaja kogat/kato (Bulgarian) /Ne znam koga/kako (Macedonian) ‘I don’t know when/how’ with a subordinated clause in the definite past also show that ‘definiteness’, while frequently present as a contextual variant meaning, cannot be taken as the invariant meaning of these forms (cf. Friedman 1977:38–39, 148–149). The one restriction on the occurrence of the definite past is in subordination to clauses which directly contradict the meaning of personal confirmation, as in the following example:

(4) *Toj ne veruva deka taa go napravi toa. (Macedonian)
    *Toj ne vjarva če tja napravi tova. (Bulgarian)
he not believe that she it did it
    *‘He doesn’t believe that she did it.’

This sentence is ordinarily understood by native speakers as ungrammatical due to the logical impossibility of both disbelieving and confirming something at the same time. The one possible grammatical reading of (4) is if the speaker is actually confirming that she did it despite his disbelief. Similarly, if the subject of the main clause is changed to the first person—Jas ne veruvam/Aze ne vjar-

---
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vam—the sentence is acceptable only if the speaker actually does believe that she did it, but is displaying extreme surprise at this fact by a nonliteral expression of disbelief, much as in the English I can’t believe she really did it.

The same type of restrictions apply to the Bulgarian definite pluperfect, i.e. the one contextual restriction is that of anticonfirmation:

(5) Kaza, če bjaxa xodili na plaž. (Conversation)
he said that (they) were gone to beach
He said that they had gone to the beach.’

(6) *Ivan me kaza, če Petër beše došal, no az
   Ivan to-me said that Peter was come but I
   ne vjarvam (Stankov 1967:342).
   not believe
   *‘Ivan told me that Peter arrived, but I don’t believe it.’

Similar restrictions also apply to the Macedonian definite pluperfect, but with an additional sharpening of the opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative from privative to equipollent, and with an unmarked form in between. There also appears to be some sharpening of the opposition in Bulgarian, but this will become clearer after consideration of the indefinite pasts. The main point here is that ‘confirmative’ functions as the Gesamtbedeutung of the definite past forms.

---

**MACEDONIAN INDEFINITE PAST**

Due to questions of auxiliary usage, the Macedonian and Bulgarian indefinite pasts will be examined separately. In Macedonian, this form, which is descended from the Common Slavic perfect, can still be used as a perfect, as an unmarked or indefinite past, and also in definite past contexts. As it is impossible to assign a single meaning which is present in all uses of the indefinite past, i.e. as there is no specific type of restriction on its occurrence as there is for the definite past, it must be treated as unmarked with respect to the definite past. This can be seen from the following examples:

(6) Dosta sme rabotele. (Conversation)
    enough (we) are worked
    ‘We’ve worked enough.’ (One retired man commenting to another on their right to a pension)

(7) Takto mi bil mnogo meraklja za cvék. (Conversation)
    father to-me was very fond for flowers
    ‘My father was very fond of flowers.’

(8) Sum stanal nokéska vo eden. (Koneski 1967:462)
    (1) am got up last night at one
    ‘I got up at one this morning.’
Despite the fact that the indefinite past has these nonevidential uses, however, it will ordinarily be assumed that the speaker is using this form in order to avoid personal confirmation of the information, as with its being based on a report, in the absence of contextual specification to the contrary. Thus, for example, if the dative-possessive pronoun mi 'my' were changed to mu 'his' in example (7), it would normally be assumed that the speaker was basing the statement on indirect information, since there would be nothing in the context such as a first person reference to indicate otherwise.

The opposition between the nonperfective definite and indefinite pasts in Macedonian can be explained in the following manner. The definite past is marked for the speaker's confirmation of the information, as indicated by the fact that the one type of context in which a definite past cannot occur is one which specifically excludes the possibility of such confirmation (4–5). The indefinite past cannot be restricted to a single invariant meaning because it has retained its old perfect uses (6) while at the same time it has developed into an unmarked past (7–8. As in the other Slavic languages, this is indicated by its use with definite past time adverbs and in situations not focusing on present results.). Concurrently the indefinite past has also developed a chief contextual variant meaning of nonconfirmatory, reportedness, or evidentiality, due to its contrast with the markedly confirmative definite past. Thus despite the fact that the indefinite past is statistically less frequent than the definite past, it is unmarked because it is also semantically less restricted.

**BULGARIAN INDEFINITE PAST**

The facts of Bulgarian are essentially the same as those of Macedonian, with one difference: the auxiliary is always absent from the third person of the literary

---

6 It should be noted that even the meaning 'distanced' suggested by Lunt (1952:92; cf. also Aksu and Slobin 1981 on Turkish) cannot cover all the uses of the Macedonian indefinite past. The indefinite past in the following sentence specifically contructs such a meaning:

(i) Jas sum go skril sišto namerno vo dva saatot.
I am it broke the-bottle purposefully at two the-hour

'He broke the bottle on purpose at two o'clock.'

See Friedman (1977:36–37) for further discussion of this point.

7 Some scholars have proposed that the Macedonian verbal system possesses two totally homonym sets of forms: one nonevidential indefinite past and the other markedly evidential or reported. From a diachronic viewpoint it is clear that additional meanings have accrued to a single form, the indefinite past, and that these meanings resulted from or were at least influenced by the actual shift of meaning in the definite past to marked confirmativity. Also, given the fact that the meaning of the indefinite past can only be determined from the context in which it is used, an analysis relying on total homonymy must often employ arbitrary decisions in order to determine which 'paradigm' a given form represents. One could even propose defining as many paradigms as there are contexts. In view of all this, I consider the indefinite past to be a single form with several meanings or uses.

---

Macedonian indefinite past (as it is in the west-central dialects on which the literary language is primarily based), but in literary Bulgarian (as in some Bulgarian and Macedonian dialects), it is possible for the third person auxiliary to be present or absent. Due to this alternation, all traditional Bulgarian grammars and linguistic studies published in the last four decades have set up two sets of paradigms which are always homonymous in the first two persons—one with and one without the auxiliary in the third person. The form with the auxiliary, like the Macedonian indefinite past, can be used in all types of contexts and is treated as unmarked (cf. Aronson 1967:89–92). The form without the auxiliary, however, is treated as marked for reportedness, and it is this form which is cited by Jakobson (1957:4) as marked for evidentiality.

As was indicated at the beginning of this chapter, if an invariant meaning is assigned to a given form and the form is said to be marked for a certain grammatical category, then that meaning must be present in every occurrence of the form in question. However, such is not always the case in the Bulgarian third person indefinite past without an auxiliary, which is said to be marked for reportedness. This can be seen from the following examples, which use the indefinite past without auxiliary but do not carry the meaning of reportedness:

(9) Sto na sto bili pokaneni. (Conversation)
100% (they) were invited
'Absolutely, they were invited.'

(10) Togava čak se ogledaxme i vidjame, če sestra then just (we) looked around and saw that sister
mu izbijala. (Dejanova 1970:847)
to-him ran away
'Just then we looked around and saw that sister had run away.'

(11) ... podigna malko oči—i v ottatšnija sokak, i v (he) raised a little eyes and in the next , street and in
po-ottatšnija... plaznali bežanci kato mravenjak.
the-more next swarmed refugees like ant hill
'He looked up a little (and saw that) both in the next street and the one after that refugees swarmed like (ants on) an ant hill.'

(Dejanova 1970:847).

Example (9) requires a clarifying context: it was uttered by a colleague of mine in Sofia during the course of a discussion as to whether a certain delegation had been invited to a congress. My colleague was convinced that they had been invited, although his conviction was not based on any kind of direct or indirect evidence, i.e. the statement was not based on a report or even a deduction, but only on the speaker's assumptions and expectations regarding the normal conduct of such matters. It is clear from their own contexts that (10) and (11) also do not involve reported actions.
The data from a recent study by Roth (1979) can be added to these examples. Among other things, this study contains fourteen pages of transcribed narratives based on reported information which document what I myself have observed in Sofia and elsewhere in Bulgaria: different speakers will omit or include the third person auxiliary to varying degrees, but reportedness (or any other form of evidentiality) cannot be said to function as the determining factor. Thus, in Roth’s texts the speakers switch back and forth between forms with and without the auxiliary in the same narrative, based on the same information, as in the following examples:8

(12) I se súbrali momčeta pokraj rjakakáv ogán i
and gathered lads by some kind of fire and
sa započvali razni istorii za samodivi i za
(they) are began various stories about fairies and about
takiva. (Roth 1979:177)
such
‘And the lads gathered around a fire and began stories about fairies and the like.’

(13) Toj si ja e višdal san i nakraja se zapoznali
he to-himself her is saw there and in-the-end they met
na ski —bili sa na ski. (Roth 1979:179)
on ski (they) were on ski
‘He saw her there and finally they met one another skiing—they were on a ski trip.’

(14) Tja stojala po cjal den na ižlozbata —i sled
she stood for whole day at the-exhibition and after
tova večer se e razxoždana. (Roth 1979:180)
that evening (she) is strolled
‘She would stand (on duty) at the exhibition all day, and in the evenings she
would go out for a walk.’

In each of these examples forms with and without the auxiliary are used for events which are identical in terms of evidentiality.

On the basis of data such as these, supported by the historical and dialectological facts given immediately below, I would propose that omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the Bulgarian indefinite past is not the marker of a separate evidential paradigm but rather part of the process of total auxiliary loss in the third person. This process is well attested in numerous Slavic languages and dialects (e.g. Russian, where the auxiliary was lost in all three persons, beginning with the third [Buslaev 1959:363]; and the Macedonian dialect of Kumanovo, about 50 kilometers from the Bulgarian border, where the third person auxiliary is entirely facultative [Vidoeski 1962:218, 234]). The question can be raised as to whether auxiliary omission in Bulgarian can be treated as semantically distinctive in any systematic fashion such as, for example, signaling a difference between backgrounding and foregrounding or between scene-setting or stative events and plot-advancing actions. The data do not appear to support such a distinction, but the question of the semantics and degree of systematicity of third person auxiliary loss in Bulgarian is in need of a special study which has yet to be undertaken. It is clear, however, that the traditional explanation based on evidentiality is contradicted by the data presented here.9 For the purposes of this article, two observations are sufficient: (a) omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the Bulgarian indefinite past is a syntactic phenomenon which does not justify the establishment of independent paradigms; (b) whatever the semantic value or conditioning contexts of auxiliary omission, if any, it cannot be treated as a signal of marking for evidentiality.10 Thus the opposition between the nonpluperfect definite and indefinite pasts in Bulgarian is of essentially the same type as in Macedonian; the definite past is marked for conformativity while the indefinite past, with or without its auxiliary in the third person, is unmarked and therefore implies, but does not specify, nonconformativity.

**BALKAN SLAVIC PLUPERFECTS**

The situation in the pluperfects seems to involve the sharpening of the privative confirmative/nonconfirmative opposition to equipollent oppositions. Of the forms labeled pluperfect in Table 1, only those using the definite past of ‘be’ and the aorist l-participle (3SG beše pravil) were inherited from the older system; the others are all later developments. Aside from the spread of the aorist/imperfect aspctual opposition, which need not concern us here, Macedonian has two new pluperfects using the definite and indefinite pasts of ‘have’ (3SG imaše praveno, imal praveno) while Bulgarian has new pluperfects using the indefinite past of ‘be’ with and without its own auxiliary (3SG e bil pravil, bil pravil).

The equipollent sharpening of the opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative in the pluperfects results in a set of restrictions which are truly evidential in

---

8 For those unfamiliar with Bulgarian, it should be noted that se is an enclitic marker of intransitivity (as it is in Macedonian) and does not affect the occurrence of the auxiliary. The 3PL auxiliary of the indefinite past is se.

9 As was observed in note 1, the term ‘literary language’ is used here to refer to actual usage rather than the prescriptions of standard grammars. If a literary language is defined as being whatever the standard grammars say it is, then any counterexamples to those prescriptions are by definition, merely mistakes.

10 Cf. Aronson (1967:93, especially n. 14) on the neutralization of evidentiality in Bulgarian. The type of analysis which employs a theory of total homonymy such as that mentioned in note 7 with regard to Macedonian has been carried even further in most Bulgarian grammars and other works, but essentially the same arguments apply against it.
nature—witnessed/nonwitnessed in Macedonian and confirmative/nonwitnessed in Bulgarian. Thus in Macedonian the definite pluperfect cannot be subordinated to verbs of reporting, while the indefinite pluperfect cannot be subordinated to verbs of witnessing and direct perception but can only be used for reports and, rarely, deductions and suppositions. The third type of pluperfect, the original one (3SG beše pravil), is neutral with respect to these distinctions in the speech of most younger and some older speakers. 11 So, for example, sentences (15) and (16) are unacceptable because they violate these restrictions, while sentences of the type illustrated by (6), mutatis mutandis, are acceptable (see also example ii, note 11):

(15) *Toj reče deka tie ja imaa svaršeno rabotata. (definite he said that they it had finished the-job pluperfect)  
*He said that they had finished the job.*

(16) *Jas vidov kako/deka toj go imal napraveno too. (indefinite I saw how/that he it had done that pluperfect)  
*I saw how/that he had done it.*

In Bulgarian the sharpening of these distinctions is not as rigid, insofar as the definite pluperfect (which in Bulgarian is the inherited form) can be used for reported actions just as the definite past can (example 5). The key issue here is the significance of the omission of the present auxiliary in the third person indefinite pluperfect. It appears that while the form with the present auxiliary is neutral, that without the present auxiliary may actually be limited to reports.

11 The Macedonian pluperfect with the definite past of 'be' (3SG beše) is felt by some older speakers to have the same restrictions as that with the definite past of 'have' (3SG imale) due to the fact that both use definite past auxiliaries. Younger speakers and other older speakers, however, will accept sentences such as the following:

(ii) Ivan reče deka tie ja beea svaršile rabotata pred da stasav
Ivan said that it were finished the-job before that arrived
jas, no ne veruam vo too.
I but not believe in that
'Ivan said that they had finished the job before I arrived, but I don't believe it.'

The picture is further complicated by the fact that the forms using 'have' are not native to the dialects spoken east and north of the river Vardar, which runs from northwest to southeast roughly through the middle of Macedonia, while forms with the t-participle become increasingly rare as one moves southwest of the Vardar and eventually disappear altogether in southwestern Aegean (Greek) Macedonia. Since the establishment of the literary language in 1944, the spread of education has been leveling these dialectal distinctions within Yugoslavia, but they still influence usage and judgments, especially in older speakers. In terms of tense form usage, the literary language follows the dialect of the west-central town of Prilep most closely, but even here speakers differ in their judgments on the acceptability of sentences such as (ii).
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deductions, statements of doubt and disbelief, etc. This phenomenon can be analyzed as a stricter semantic-syntactic conditioning of auxiliary loss, however, rather than as the basis for a separate paradigm.

The question of syntactic rules vs grammatical categories is particularly vexed in instances such as Bulgarian auxiliary loss. The fact that evidentiality does seem to serve as a conditioning factor for auxiliary loss in the pluperfects but clearly cannot do so in the nonpluperfect indefinite pasts suggests that the difference between rule conditions and grammatical categories is one of degree rather than kind. 12 A more detailed study of conditioning factors must be conducted, however, before any definite conclusions can be reached in this area.

**DIACHRONIC EXPLANATION**

The Balkan Slavic synchronic situation which has been described here—a marked confirmative definite past, an unmarked indefinite past whose Hauptbedeutung is nonconfirmative, and a series of pluperfects in which this nonconfirmative Hauptbedeutung becomes a type of Gesamtbedeutung in opposition to marked confirmative and unmarked forms—has two possible diachronic explanations, which are themselves not mutually exclusive. The first possibility is that as the semantic field of the definite past became restricted to contexts in which the speaker personally confirmed the information being conveyed, the semantic field of the old perfect expanded to include nonconfirmed, nonperfect contexts. The second possibility is that the current situation resulted from the fact that the perfect, due to its indefiniteness and its focus on the results of a past action rather than on the past action itself, has a natural tendency to be used for conveying reported and other nonwitnessed information (Lohmann 1937:43); it also has a tendency to develop into an unmarked past, as it did in all the other Slavic languages, where it has completely replaced the synthetic (definite) pasts (except in Lusitan and some varieties of Serbo-Croatian, where the synthetic pasts survive as marked forms).

Regardless of whether one or both of these explanations apply to the nonpluperfect developments, it is clear that the pluperfect forms have become paradigmatically more complex since the dissolution of Common Slavic (during the same period in which the indefinite past developed its evidential Hauptbedeutung) and have sharpened the opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative from privative to equipollent. Those pluperfects which arose during the period when the meanings associated with evidentiality also developed have more rigid marking restrictions than earlier pluperfects. Thus the newer and more highly marked forms reflect a sharpened, more extreme semantic-syntactic development than the older, less marked forms.

12 Suggested to me by Johanna Nichols (personal communication).
Table 2. ISG Indicative of ‘Have’ in Albanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Aditrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kant</td>
<td>paskam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>paskam pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>pasksesha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect (imp.)</td>
<td>pasksesha pasur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>pata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Pluperfect (aor.)</td>
<td>pata pasur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excluded from this table are the compound pasts using the Geg short participle as these are marginal in the modern literary language.

**THE ALBANIAN ADITRATIVE**

The Albanian verbal system provides an instructive contrast to Balkan Slavic in its treatment of evidentiality. Albanian possesses two series of indicative tense forms, traditionally labeled mënyrë dëftore 'indicative mood' and mënyrë habtore 'aditrative mood', which will be referred to by the labels NONADITRATIVE and ADITRATIVE. Historically, the aditrative is derived from an inverted perfect with a truncated participle (Demiraj 1971:32), as can be seen in Table 2, which gives the ISG of kant 'have' in its nonaditrative and aditrative indicative forms by way of illustration.

Although the aditrative is traditionally defined as a mood expressing surprise, it is also used to express irony, doubt, reportedness, etc. In all its uses the aditrative somehow refers to the speaker’s present or past nonconfirmation of the truth of the statement. This is obvious when the aditrative is used to express irony or doubt (as in example 18), but it is also the case when the aditrative is used for surprise (as in examples iii and iv, note 14) or reported speech (as in example 17). Surprise results from a past state during which the speaker would not have accepted the truth of some subsequently discovered fact or event. In this manner, doubt/irony and surprise are two facets of the same type of noncommitment; one refers to a state continuing into the moment of speech, the other refers to the real or hypothetical existence of such a state rejected at the moment of speech. It should be noted that surprise is not to be limited to expressions of strong amazement. Any expressive relation of the speaker to the speech event in which there is some nuance of the unexpected can be included in this use of surprise (cf. the use of terms such as ‘unprepared mind’ in Aksu and Slobin, this volume, ‘new information’ in Akatsuka 1981, and also Lunt’s ‘distanced’).

Albanian has a rule of sequence of tenses for ordinary reported speech very much like that of English, so that if a report is rendered using the aditrative the speaker is expressing noncommitment to the truth of the information, either due to uncertainty or disbelief, or because it is somehow surprising. In addition to examples (iii) and (iv) of note 14, the first of which expresses disbelief/surprise and the second of which expresses pure, or believing, surprise, the following examples illustrate the use of the aditrative to express doubt and reportedness:

(17) Një farë prifti nga Trikalla, i quajtur Dionis, u vu one kind of priest from Trikalla called Dionis put-himself

13 It has been argued by Sytov (1979:110–111) and Friedman (1981) that the aditrative is not a nonindicative mood for a number of reasons: (a) it refers to ontologically real events (cf. Aronson 1977:13); (b) it ordinarily takes the indicative negators nuk and s’ rather than the modal negators mos, (c) when functioning modally it is subordinated to the special modal participle nuk. Sytov suggests that a Jakobsonian category such as ‘evidential’ might provide a better label. Following Aronson (1977:13), I suggest that it is marked for a form of status (Friedman 1981). Regardless of the concrete solution, it is clear that the aditrative is not a mood like the optative, subjunctive, or conditional, but is opposed to them, together with the nonaditrative indicative, as unmarked for such modality.

14 For more detailed discussion see Friedman (1981).

15 Akatsuka’s argument that ‘new information’ is, in a sense, unreal for the speaker, creates a bridge between the category evaluating ontological reality (‘mood’ in Aronson’s terms) and the category expressing speaker attitude (‘status’ in Aronson’s terms). While this description of the aditrative makes it sound very similar to the Turkish forms in -mi (see Aksu and Slobin 1981), there are significant differences in their uses, as can be seen from comparing the following sentences taken from Albanian and Turkish translations of the Bulgarian novel *Baj Ganjo*:

(iii) *Nga e paske marrë vesti ti që unë jam* whence it have gotten ear that I am liberal? (Albanian; Konstantinov 1975:118)**
**liberal**

*Liberrallerden olduğuumu sana kim söyledi?* (Turkish; Konstantinov 1972:182)

‘Where did you hear that I am a liberal?’ or ‘Who told you that I am liberal?’

(iv) Çudi qysh e kengëri ji gilliën, fare pa buke!—tha wonder that it eat you the-soup completely without bread said baj Ganau i çëditur. (Turkish; Konstantinov 1975:58)

Mr. Ganu amazed

*Siz ekmesiz mi içworsunuz su çorbatı yahut diye de you breadless? âre-drinking this soup! saying and şasar Bay Ganü. (Albanian; Konstantinov 1972:79)**

wonders Mr. Ganu

‘My goodness, why you’re drinking the soup without bread!’ said Baj Ganjo in amazement.

In both examples Albanian uses aditratives, but Turkish does not use -mi forms in either. Cf. also example (18) where the Turkish equivalent of the Albanian present aditrative *u prika* ‘is met, awaited, treated’ is the so-called aorist (*geniş zaman*) kargylnap aşgelanır ‘be met and treated as a guest’ (Konstantinov 1972:84).
In example (17), the author is casting doubt on Dionis’s claim, while in (18) the form *dashka* is a mocking report of what someone else has said, while *u priinka* expresses surprise at the actual treatment. Thus, the major uses of the Albanian adjectives—surprise, disbelief, and reportedness—correspond to the three major types of nonconfirmative use of the indefinite past in Balkan Slavic.16

**COMPARISON OF ALBANIAN AND BALKAN SLAVIC**

In some contexts, these nonconfirmative uses of the Balkan Slavic indefinite past appear to have a present meaning, and this has sometimes been taken as evidence that the nonconfirmative uses of these forms constitute a separate, tenseless paradigm marked only for evidentiality. As will be seen, however, all such uses in Balkan Slavic have some type of past reference. Since Weigand’s (1923/4) comparison of the Bulgarian indefinite past with the Albanian present adjective, which he erroneously treats as a synchronic inverted perfect, it has been commonly assumed that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the Albanian adjective and the nonconfirmative uses of the Balkan Slavic indefinite past. In actuality, as can be seen from comparisons of translations (See Friedman 1982), the vast majority of Albanian present adjectives correspond to Balkan Slavic simple present, while most Balkan Slavic indefinite past correspond to Albanian nonadmirative past tense forms. Thus, for example, the Balkan Slavic equivalent of present adjectives *hëngërka ‘you eat’ in example (iv) of note 14 is the present tense form *jadete* (Konstantinov 1973:58, 1967:50), while that of present adjective *u priinka ‘is met’ in example (18) is Bulgarian *se posrêta* and Macedonian *se prêcekava* (Konstantinov 1973:60, 1967:54), which are also present tense forms.

Those few examples in which an Albanian present adjective corresponds in translation to a Balkan Slavic indefinite past refer to some ontologically past state or event and usually employ the verbs ‘be’ or ‘have’. Thus, the form *dashka ‘loves’ in example (18) corresponds to the Bulgarian indefinite past *obical* and the Macedonian *sekal* (Konstantinov 1973:60, 1967:54), but the speech event being mocked by these words took place in the past. It is impossible to use an indefinite past with a present reported meaning unless there is a past speech event to which it refers, as can be seen from the following example:

(19) *Ivan *sâ *kaî *ce *ne *znael. (Bulgarian)
    *Jovan *te *reêca *deka *ne *znael. (Macedonian)

  John will say that he didn’t know
  ‘John will say that he doesn’t know.’

The form *ne znael* cannot report the speaker’s anticipation that John will say *Ne znam ‘I don’t know’, because in such a context there is no past event—neither the saying nor the knowing—for *znael* to refer to. Hence the indefinite past cannot replace a present tense form, i.e. it cannot have a ‘present’ meaning, unless it actually has some type of concrete past reference. Sentence (19) could be used to mean ‘John will say he didn’t know’, but in that case *ne znael* must refer to a time in the past when, as John will claim, he did not know. Thus the use of the indefinite past to render reported speech events with an apparently present meaning (as in the Slavic translations of 18) actually represents a type of sequence of tense usage similar to the English *He said he loved Bulgarians* as a report of *I love Bulgarians*.

Most Balkan Slavic examples with ‘be’ and ‘have’ corresponding to an Albanian present adjectives represent a use of the indefinite past to refer to a state which has been true before but was only discovered by the speaker at the moment of speech:

(20) *Ama *ce *si *bil *prost *êcovek. (Bulgarian; Konstantinov 1967:83)
    *Ama *si *bil *prost *êcovek. (Macedonian; Konstantinov 1967:87)

  but that (you) have been simple person
  ‘My, what a simpleton you are!’

Here the statement refers to a state which existed before the moment of speech but only became apparent to the speaker at the time of speaking, so it has the force of ‘as it turns out, it has been true all along that . . .’. English normally uses a present tense in such contexts, and Albanian could use the present adver-

---

16 As was indicated earlier, the Bulgarian indefinite past generally lacks the third singular auxiliary in these usages, but this is not always the case (see, e.g., Stojanov 1964:§407, Demina 1959:322–323 n. 36).
Balkan Slavic usage can still be said to refer to the past time during which the state was in existence but unsuspected by the speaker. The actual translation of (20) in the Albanian version of *Bajganjo* illustrates the difference between this type of usage and ordinary Albanian admisitive usage, for it is in precisely such contexts, with the verbs ‘be’ and ‘have’ referring to states which existed for some time before the speech event, that Albanian can also use an admisitive perfect, as well as a nonadmisitive perfect or an admisitive imperfect or pluperfect. All these possibilities are illustrated in the Albanian translation of *Baj Ganjo*, but the actual translation of sentence (20) used a perfect admisitive:

(21) *Ama:* i humbur fare paske genë. (Konstantinov 1975:92)
but lost completely (you) have been

These facts show that the Balkan Slavic admisitive phenomenon, which is a special use of a past tense form of ‘be’ or ‘have’ to refer to a pre-existent but unsuspected state discovered at the moment of speech, actually corresponds to a phenomenon of exactly the same type in Albanian and cannot be equated with the Albanian series of admisitive paradigms. The Balkan Slavic and Albanian construction with ‘be’ and ‘have’ is a type of usage, while the Albanian admisitive is a morphologically distinct set of grammatically marked paradigms.

Although the Balkan Slavic system does not correspond exactly to the Albanian system, the comparison is instructive insofar as the new nonconfirmative meanings which became associated with the Balkan Slavic indefinite past are very similar to those which became associated with the Albanian inverted perfect, which subsequently developed into a paradigmatically distinct set of marked forms.

**CONCLUSIONS**

On the basis of the material presented here, the following statements can be made about evidentiality in the Balkans. First of all, the forms under consideration...
crucial in determining the choice of forms, as was seen in examples (1), (2), and (4). The perfect, however, also retained its old resultative nuances while expanding into contexts vacated by the definite past. Thus, as in the rest of Slavic, the perfect has become the unmarked past in Balkan Slavic by virtue of the fact that it cannot be assigned a single invariant meaning and applies to the widest range of contexts.

In the pluperfects, however, the development of the opposition confirmative/nonconfirmative coincided with the development of new forms. Here the opposition became equipollent rather than privative, with new forms being both markedly confirmative and markedly nonconfirmative. This is to say that what was added on to an existing form as its Hauptbedeutung could become the Gesamtbedeutung of newly developed forms. The implication that the speaker’s attitude is based on the source of the information has been virtually grammaticalized in these newer forms, as seen in examples (15) and (16).

In Albanian, the type of nonconfirmative meanings which appear as the chief contextual variant meanings of the Balkan Slavic descendants of the old perfect became attached to an inverted perfect which then broke off and formed a separate set of paradigms without the development of any marked confirmative forms.19

Thus, evidentiality in the Balkans actually involves the speaker’s attitude toward the truth of the statement. The languages considered here display a pattern in which nonconfirmative evidential meaning appears as invariant only in newly developed forms, i.e. those which developed during the rise of evidentiality itself, while confirmative meaning occurs where nonconfirmativity is also present as a chief contextual variant meaning.
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