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THE CATEGORY OF EVIDENTIALITY IN THE
BALKANS AND THE CAUCASUS
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It is well known that Macedonian and Bulgarian are unique among the
Slavic languages in possessing inflectional devices in their verbal systems
whereby speakers indicate the basis of their knowledge or their attitude
towards that basis or knowledge, viz. the opposition between the synthetic
imperfect and aorist on the one hand (type bere/brato) and the descendants
of the Common Slavic perfect (type berel[е]/brall[е]) as well as later analytic
paradigms (e.g., Bulgarian bil berel/bral, Macedonian imal bereno/brano,
etc.) on the other. The category expressed by this opposition, which Jakobson
(1957) calls evidential, is often said to convey a distinction between wit-
nessed and reported events, but its precise nature remains the subject of
debate. My purpose here is to contribute to that on-going debate by examin-
ing the function of evidentiality in Macedonian and Bulgarian and compar-
ing it typologically with other languages of the Balkans and the Caucasus
with similar categories, viz. Albanian, Turkish, Georgian, and Lak.

The most traditional interpretation of the meaning of the evidential cat-
gory is one of witnessed/reported (or in privative terms witnessed/nonwit-
nessed or reported/nonreported); all the traditional grammars of the lan-
guages in question describe evidentiality in these terms. More recently,
linguists have used broader definitions, e.g., confirmative for witnessed (cf.
Aronson 1967) and distanced for reported (cf. Lunt 1952). The application
of these definitions depends on an understanding of the basic concepts of
invariant meaning, contextual variant meaning, and chief contextual variant.
Despite the many decades that have elapsed since Jakobson’s important
work in this area, it is worth quoting a passage from the published version
of the paper he read at the Fourth International Congress of Slavists in
1958:

Одним из основоположных понятий в развитии современного языко-
знания была проблема инвариантности, впервые осознанная в казанской
школе, на исходе семидесятых годов, одновременно и параллельно с
успехами той же идеи в мировой математике. Если в лингвистике первый
этап этих новых исканий дал начало учению о фонеме, т.е. об инвари-
анте в плоскости звуковых вариаций, то теперь назрела настоятельная
необходимость установить и истолковать инварианты грамматические.
Известна справедливо разграничившия две грамматические области —
ЕКВИДЕНЦИЈА У БАЛКАНИЈИ И НА КАУСУСУ

3. Kaži kako begaše. (Conversation, October, 1973) [M]
Tell how you eloped. [Said of daughter to her mother]

4. No potoa se slučija raboti za koi ne znaev. (N.M.19.VI.74:5) [M]
But after that things happened which I didn’t know about.

In all of these examples, the speakers using the confirmative forms had not witnessed the events they were describing, they simply accepted them as facts and thus stated them with full confirmation. In (1) Zuza introduces a story about Blaže’s recent trip to Moscow using the verbal l-form (descended from the old perfect), since she wishes to emphasize that she was not in Moscow herself. In his response, however, Kosta, who was also not in Moscow with Blaže and therefore has only hearsay evidence, responds with the synthetic past to indicate that he is aware of the fact, i.e., that he knows about it and that there is no question as to its veracity. Similarly in (2), (3), and (4) the speakers use synthetic pasts not because they were witnesses, nor because they wish to pretend they were witnesses, but simply because they feel they can fully vouch for the veracity of the statement.

In arguing against confirmative and in favor of witnessed as the meaning of the synthetic pasts, Gerdžikov (1984:22) cites the following example:

5. Zalagam si glavata, če v tova vreme Petar se e kriel/*kriše v učilišteto. [B]
I bet my eye teeth (lit. ‘head’) that at that time Peter was hiding in the school.

According to Gerdžikov, the synthetic past cannot be used unless there is a transposition (transpozicija), i.e., the use of a confirmative (udostoveritelen) for an inferential (umozaklučitelen) form. It is precisely this so-called transposition, however, which, as can be seen from examples (1)–(4), is not uncommon and is not limited to special marked contexts, that demonstrates that ‘witnessed’ cannot serve as the invariant meaning of the synthetic pasts. In this connection, it is also important to consider examples such as (6):

6. Ne veruvam deka toj go napravil/*napravi toa. [M]
Ne vjarjam če toj napravil/*napravi tova. [B]
I don’t believe that he did it. (Cf. Friedman 1977:42-45)

The synthetic past is asterisked (i.e., unacceptable) as long as the sentence is interpreted felicitously (cf. Austin 1962:14), i.e., literally. If the speaker does in fact believe that the person in question did the deed in question and is simply expressing surprise at the fact, i.e., if the expression ne veruvam/ne vjarvar is not to be taken literally but rather as in the English I can’t believe I ate the whole thing, then the synthetic past may be used in order to convey the fact that the speaker is indeed convinced that this shocking
event occurred (Blaže Koneski: Personal Communication, 1974). When Mišeska-Tomšić (1984:164) writes that sentences such as (6) are acceptable to native speakers of Macedonian, and then goes on to infer from this that 'confirmative' cannot, therefore, be the basic meaning of the synthetic past, she fails to take into account the meaning of such a sentence. Confirmativity is still invariably present in the form napravi; it cannot be felicitously subordinated to clauses of disbelief.

When discussing the descendents of the Common Slavic perfect, it is necessary to treat Macedonian and Bulgarian separately. In the case of Macedonian, it is quite clear that 'reported' cannot function as the single invariant meaning of forms of the type berel/bral. Thus scholars such as Šanova (1979) and Usikova (1985) must have recourse to totally homonymous paradigms, while Mišeska-Tomšić (1984) supports Koneski's (1965) view that the form is polysynonymous. Lunt (1952) assigns to it the single meaning of 'distanced', which is an attempt to unify the nonconfirmative and resultative meanings of the form. Sentences (7) through (11) illustrate a wide variety of contexts in which these forms can occur and which, taken as a whole, defy any invariant such as 'indefinite', 'reported', 'distanced', 'resultative', etc.

7. Tatko mi bil mnogu meraklıja za cveka (Conversation, December, 1973) [M]
   My father was/used to be very fond of flowers.

8. Vo seloto Bučim, Radoviško, na 20 septemvri 1972 godina se slučila morbidna drama (Počinka 23.XII.72:10; 159) [M]
   In the village of Bučim, Radoviš region, on 20 September 1972, a morbid drama occurred.

9. Sum stanal nošeska vo eden. (Koneski 1967:462) [M]
   I got up last night at one a.m.

10. Sum ti kažal ednaš, se sekaša, koga bevma zaedno na večera, i sega pak še ti kažam (Koneski 1967:462) [M]
    I told you once, remember, when we were at supper together, and now I'll tell you again.

11. Zatoa što formata beše rešeno odgovara na se reši, t.e. na minatoto opredelno vreme, koe go upotrebuvame za označuvanje dejstva što se vreše ili se izvršile vo opredelen moment vo minatoto. (Minova NM 19.XII.84.11) [M]
   It is because the form had been decided corresponds to was decided, i.e., to the past indefinite tense, which we use to indicate actions that were performed or accomplished at a definite time in the past.
Roth (1979) includes an appendix of transcribed narratives in which informants of a wide variety of ages, educational backgrounds, and geographic distribution told stories which they knew second-hand, e.g., how their parents met or what happened to a friend in a foreign country. Although Roth (1979:159) is reluctant to state explicitly the conclusion her data make clear, the fact that the auxiliary fades in and out of these narratives like the Cheshire Cat, even in the course of a single sentence, regardless of the age or background of the speaker, is a clear indication that 'reportedness' cannot be taken as the determining factor in third person auxiliary use, e.g.:

16. Tja stojala po cjal den na izložba—i sled tova večer se e razxoždala. (Roth 1979:180) [B]

She would stand all day at the exhibition and after that in the evenings she would go out.

17. Toj si ja e viždal tam i nakraja se zapoznali na ski—bili sa na ski. (Roth 1979:179) [B]

He saw her there and finally they met one another skiing; they were on a ski trip.

Consider also the presence of the auxiliary in what is clearly a statement based on a report:

18. . . . sretna me edna baba; nosi dva gâlbâ ... Kupix gi—kazva . . .

Momčeto mi e bolno . . . Ti—kazva—kakva si, ne li ti e sram. Daj sam gâlbâte . . . A kato ti e bilo bolno deteto—kazâ Hadži Petâr, nà ti pari da go ceriš (Demina 1959:322n.36) [B]

. . . we met a little old lady carrying two pigeons. . . . I bought them—she says . . . My boy is sick [so she is going to cut the hearts out of the pigeons and have her son swallow them as a cure] . . . You—he says—what are you, aren't you ashamed. Give the pigeons here . . . and since [you said] your child was sick—said Hadži Petâr—here's money for you to heal him.

These examples, when taken with facts from the dialects and the development of the Common Slavic perfect in various Slavic languages, as well as the fact that until Andrejczin (1938) Bulgarian scholars themselves gave radically different interpretations of the significance of an omitted auxiliary suggest a different explanation for absence of the auxiliary. The situation in Literary Bulgarian usage is much like that in the Macedonian dialect of Kumanovo spoken about 65 km from the Bulgarian border (cf. Videskis 1962). The third person auxiliary is in the process of being lost, a process completed in dialects further west and south, and is currently facultative. While it tends to be omitted most readily in nonconfirmative contexts, this is by no means a rule; it is rather a tendency in free variation. The phenomenon is a syntactic process, not a paradigmatic relationship. As I have stated elsewhere (Friedman 1982a) and as Mišeska-Tomiš has also pointed out (1984:166), the omission of the auxiliary in Serbo-Croatian described by Gric (1954) is similar to that found in Bulgarian, but it has never been suggested that Serbo-Croatian therefore possesses a separate auxiliary-less paradigm.

There are three uses of the analytic past that appear to have present meanings which must be accounted for if it is in fact markedly past. These uses can be given their traditional labels: the admiring, the dubitative, and the present reported. Here, too, given what we have said above, we can treat Macedonian and Bulgarian together. The so-called present reported, i.e., uses of the analytic past to report a statement originally made in the present tense, always refers to a previous speech act as in examples (19) and (20):

19. Čovekov bil od Amerika (Conversation, May 1974) [M]

This guy [said he] was from America.


*He'll say he didn't know.

*He'll say he doesn't know.

The so-called present reported is thus a type of tense agreement, cf. English She forgot to tell me she didn't eat meat or She asked if I was the new girl and I said I guessed I was. Admiring and dubitative usage both express a type of nonconfirmation. Admiration is a use of the analytic past to express surprise at a newly discovered and previously unsuspected fact:

21. Ti si bil Rom! Ne sum znael (Conversation, November 1973) [M]

Why, you're a Rom! I didn't know.

22. Toj ne bilo zlatno! Nikakvo zlato ne e. (Andrejczin 1938:68) [B]

Why, it's not gold! It's not gold at all!

The dubitative is used to express irony at the statement of another:

23. —Toj poeveke od tebe znae.—Toj poveke znael! (Friedman 1977:78) [M]

—He knows more than you do.—He knows, indeed!

24. —Ti si star! —E, az sâm bil star! (Conversation, June 1978) [B]

—You're old! —Oh, I'm old, indeed!

Both of these usages have past references. In the case of admiring usage, the verb is almost always 'be' or 'have' (sometimes 'know'), i.e., it refers to a state whose veracity the speaker would have been unwilling to confirm before the moment of discovery. Thus, for example, it is incorrect to shout Begal [M] or Bjalal [B] if you see a person limping on crutches suddenly
drop them and begin to flee the police. In the case of dubitative usage, there must always be some previous statement which is being mocked by repetition, either real or implied. Thus, in all three usages, there is a type of nonconfirmation referring to a past speech event of previous state of affairs.

In diachronic terms, those forms which developed in Macedonian and Bulgarian after the Common Slavic period show overt marking for that meaning which became attached to the perfect (but not the pluperfect) as its chief contextual variant meaning as the analytic past became restricted to confirmative contexts. Thus, while the inherited pluperfect of the type *beše bral* (and also the later *beše berel*) is neutral with respect to status (evidentially), all other constructions with the i-form, e.g., *imal bereno/brano, ke berel/bral, bil berel/bral*, etc. are markedly nonconfirmative. They are only used when the speaker is explicitly denying responsibility for the statement, usually because it is based on a report. They cannot be used in contexts of overt confirmation such as subordination to verbs of direct perception.

The nature of this shift is especially clear as we move southwest on Macedonian linguistic territory. In Ohrid, the analytic past (old perfect) is strictly limited to nonconfirmative contexts (Olga Mišeska-Tomki, Gordana Bošnakoska, personal communication), and the absence of the first person of this paradigm in Prespa (Šklofo 1979) can be attributed to this same development. In the Kostur region, the old perfect and pluperfect have been completely or almost completely replaced by the forms with *ima 'have' (ima brano/imaste brano)*. For example, in the village of Kosine only the old perfect of 'be' (bil, etc.) occurred, and only when discussing reputations, e.g., when a marriage was contemplated:

25. Čupata bila bolna. [Da ne ja zememe za nevesta.] (Mito Mievski: Personal communication) [M]

[It has been said] the girl is sick[ly]. [Let’s not take her for a bride.]

Similarly in the Macedonian dialects spoken near Korča the old perfect and pluperfect have disappeared completely except in admirative and dubitative usages in folk tales and other genres employing archaic language, e.g.,


Hey, compadre, is this where you are? Why did you hide?

27. “Ot gje znjё toj koj e kashjёvo toj”?

—“Am ka ne znjёll? To znjё shço čini Gospo a ne poznava kasheiti togovi?” (Mazon 1936:314) [M]

—“How’s he supposed to know which is your piece?”

—“But how can he not know? He knows what the Lord is doing but he doesn’t know his own pieces?”

The Balkan Slavic treatment of status (evidentiality) can be summarized as follows. Diachronically, the synthetic aorist and imperfect have acquired a marking for speaker confirmation while the perfect has moved into the position of unmarked past with a parallel aorist/imperfect subordinate aspectual opposition, and with a chief contextual variant meaning of nonconfirmative. Synchronically, the unmarked (nonconfirmative) past has nonconfirmative usages such as admirative, dubitative, and reported, and it can also be used in extended narratives, e.g., in folk tales. Literary Bulgarian is distinguished from Literary Macedonian by two features. First, Literary Macedonian, like the western dialects on which it is primarily based, never uses an auxiliary in the third person of the unmarked (nonconfirmative) past while Literary Bulgarian has prescribed a distinction based on the presence versus the absence of that auxiliary. Second, Bulgarian has developed a series of new paradigms using ‘be’ while Macedonian has developed new paradigms using ‘have’. The new paradigms of Bulgarian are based on the old perfect (bil) and hence nonconfirmative, whereas the new paradigms of Macedonian use various tenses of ‘have’ and only those based on the old perfect (*imal*) are nonconfirmative.

How does the Balkan Slavic category compare with similarly described categories in other languages of the Balkans and the Caucasus? Limitations of time and space do not permit us to analyze the other systems in equivalent detail, and so their presentation is restricted to those salient facts and features of relevance to a typological and areal comparison with Balkan Slavic. For Albanian this means the so-called *habitore* ‘admirative’ of the type pres. *mbledhka*, perf. *paska mbledhur*, impf. *mbledhkësh*, plup. *paskësh mbledhur*; for Turkish the *di-past/miş-past* opposition of the type *topladi/plamıs*, and derived forms; for Georgian the aorist/perfect opposition of the type *[se]kro/sekuria*, and for Lak the opposition nonassertive/assertive in the present, *bataj/batajssar*; imperfect, *batajva/batajvassar*, etc., and the aorist/perfect opposition of the type *baqunni/baqunu ur*, etc.).

The Albanian admirative, based on an inverted perfect, is described in traditional grammars as being used to convey precisely the same meanings as a marked nonconfirmative: surprise, doubt, reports. Weigand (1925) compared the Albanian admirative of the type *paska* to the Bulgarian perfect of the type *imal* [e]. The comparison was inaccurate, however (cf. Friedman 1982b, also Gerdzikov 1984:120). The Albanian present admirative is nonpast and rarely corresponds to Bulgarian perfect usage. Thus, for example, in the Albanian translation of the Bulgarian novel *Baj Ganjo*, of the 59 Albanian admiratives only 6 corresponded to a Bulgarian perfect (or related form) the rest were plain presents (44) or noncorresponding free
translations (9). Also, it is precisely in the context of Balkan Slavic ad- 
vocative usage, i.e., the analytic past used with apparent present meaning, that 
Albanian, too, can use a markedly past tense form to intensify the surprise. 
Thus, for example, two occurrences of (28a) are translated by (28b) and 
(28c), while elsewhere we also find (28d) (Friedman 1982b): 
28a. Brej, hepten magare bil tozi čovek. [B] 
What an ass that guy is! 
28b. Ore, fare gomar paskësh gënë [plup] ky njeri! [A] 
28c. Brel gomar i madh paska gënë [perf] ky neri! [A] 
28d. Ama njerëz fare pa mend qënëshin [impf] këta . . . [A] 
What fools are these . . . 
Elsewhere qënka [pres] is also used. 
The Albanian adverbal is markedly nonconfirmative but not markedly 
modal according to the definition given in note 3. Additional evidence of 
this can be seen in the fact that the adverbial takes the indicative modal 
markers nuk and së rather than the modal negator mos (cf. Fiedler 1966). 
The diachronic situation in Albanian is comparable to some extent to the 
Balkan Slavic developments. In Balkan Slavic, the synthetic past developed 
a meaning of confirmativity in opposition to which the analytic past became 
the unmarked past with a chief contextual variant meaning of nonconfirmative, 
which became invariant in the new forms that developed on the basis of the old perfect. In Albanian, an inverted perfect developed 
it is attested in Buzuku and Ukrainian dialects without a nonconfirmative 
meaning) and then the semantics of the perfect split; the analytic past 
developing into an unmarked past (still in process) and the inverted perfect 
developing into a new nonconfirmative paradigmatic series (cf. Demiraj 
1971). The Albanian synthetic pasts, however, are not markedly confirmative. Rather, the perfect is in competition with the aorist as can be seen 
from the fact that both can be used in connected narratives. Another dif- 
ference between Albanian and Balkan Slavic is that Albanian has a series 
of rules of tense agreement similar to those found in English, but augmented 
by the presence of the adverbal series. In Albanian, the present and perfect 
are shifted to the perfect and pluperfect, respectively, in indirect speech. 
The substitution of the present and perfect adverbal convey nonconfirmative 
reported speech, while a shift to the pluperfect and imperfect 
adverbal is markedly dubitative (cf. Friedman 1981/82). This last is com- 
parable to the use of the nonconfirmative pluperfect (type bil bral/bil berel) 
in Bulgarian. 

Turkish resembles Balkan Slavic in that it has a confirmative/noncon- 
firmative opposition marked by the verbal desinences -di and -miş (subject 
to the laws of vowel harmony and voicing assimilation). The finite forms 
of the types soldu/solmuş are similar in their behavior to the Balkan Slavic 
synthetic and analytic past equivalents. Thus, for example, (29) can only be 
used if the speaker is in fact quite certain that the deed was done and is 
simply expressing incredulity at the fact (cf. example 6); 
29. İnanmıyorum ki o adam bunu yaptı. [T] 
I don’t believe that man did this. 
In (30), the speaker uses the aorist (di-past) although he has only his 
interlocutor’s word for the veracity of the statement: 
30. —Yooo, dün seni Halklar Tiyatrosuna girmek dörtün ve 
hefen sona eczaneden çıkarken gördüm de hastasın sandım da . . .
—Eee, aşkolsun de biradder, beni tiyatroya girezi gerdün de . . .
(Birlik I.II.86:21) [T] 
—Noooo, yesterday I saw you go into the National Theater and 
right afterwards I saw [you] coming out of the pharmacy and I thought you were sick . . . 
—Well, good for you, buddy, so you saw me going into the theater 

Examples (31) and (32) show the plain perfect (miş-past) in clearly confirmative 
contexts: 
31. Üç yüz yirmide doğmuşum. (Johanson 1971:280) [T] 
I was born in 1904. 
32. Bu sabah hesabettiim, küçücükğüm toprağa düşeli tam yetmiş üç gece 
ölümü. (Johanson 1971:284) [T] 
This morning I counted; it has been exactly 73 days since my little 
one was buried. 

Most of the time, however, the plain perfect (miş-past) will be taken as 
nonconfirmative, and it has the same types of reported, adverbal, and 
dubitative uses as the corresponding Balkan Slavic form, e.g., the Turkish 
of example (28a) (Friedman 1982b): 
33. Vay anasımsım, bu herif hepten de eşekmiş be! [T] 
Like Balkan Slavic and unlike Albanian, the present adverbal use of -miş 
is limited to expressions of state, viz. ‘be’. Thus the Turkish translation of 
Baj Ganjo has only 7miş-forms corresponding to the 59 Albanian present 
adverbials. 

Historically, -miş is a perfect marker. When confirmative -di is suffixed 
to it (cf. gürüştüm in example (30)), it is unmarked, like the Slavic old 
pluperfect (type beše bref). When -miş itself is used in forming compound 
tenses, e.g., sollmuşm, solacakmiş, etc., it becomes a pure nonconfirmative. 
Turkish also has an emphatic copulative marker -dir. When this is suffixed
to the third person perfect it renders it neutral, e.g. _solmuştur_. This has sometimes been compared to Bulgarian auxiliary retention (bral e) but Bulgarian is losing the auxiliary whereas Turkish is adding the particle and can add it to any person and any predicate, where it can actually have the effect of rendering the statement less certain (cf. Friedman 1978):

34. Şairimdir. [T]  
I must be a poet.

35. Bilyorsunuzdur. [T]  
Surely you know.

The Georgian imperfect, aorist, and perfect each belong to different series such that the aorist and perfect are described as being marked for the grammatical category of _sakme_ 'action', the aorist as _naxuli_ 'witnessed' the perfect (in Georgian _turmeobiti_ from _turme_ 'apparently') as _unaxavi_ 'unwitnessed', while the imperfect, which is based on the present stem, is entirely outside this system of oppositions. The aorist and perfect do not always carry these meanings, however, i.e. they are not invariant. Thus, for example, in negated sentences the perfect is normally the unmarked choice. The use of an aorist in such a context implies volition, i.e., purposeful nonperformance of the action. This is consistent with a confirmative marking for the aorist:

I didn’t buy that shirt [perfect: because I lacked time or money/aorist: because it was ugly or too expensive]

On the other hand, Georgian shows a marked difference from all the other languages in that it does not use the perfect in connected narratives, and only Georgian and Albanian do not use the perfect in the standard fairy tale opening line as in (37):

37. Bilo ne bilo (1malo edno vreme) [M/B]  
Ishte se na çishte [A]  
Bir varmus bir yokmus [T]  
IQo da ara IQo [G]  
IVkun ur, qvavkun ur [L]  
Once upon a time . . .

It could be suggested that this is connected with the fact that Georgian has a special quotative clitic, _-o_, which is attached directly to finite verb forms and is used for marking direct, indirect and even semi-indirect speech, as in example (38):

38. Vanom ra mindao? (Kim Braithwaite, personal communication) [G]  
What did Vano _say_ he wanted? [Literally: Vano what I-want-he said?]

This particle differs from quotative words such as Bulgarian _kaj_ or Albanian _gjoja_ not only in its clitic nature but also because it is attached to forms which are not shifted for person. When used ironically, _-o_ can function dubitatively.

Like the other languages, the Georgian perfect can function admiringly, as in (39), but it also functions in performative clauses, as in (40) and (41). This latter usage does not appear in the other languages (cf. Friedman 1979):

39. Ra lamazi gogo _qopilsar_. [G]  
What a beautiful girl you are! (literally: have been)

40. Momilcovas! [G]  
Congratulations! (literally: I have congratulated you.)

41. Es ar şeşizleba, Galaktion, ar şeşizleba _metvams şentvis_! (Peikrišvili 1974:55) [G]  
It’s not possible, Galaktion, not possible, _I tell_ you! (literally: I have said it)

In Georgian, as in the other languages, the perfect combines resultative and nonconfirmative meanings. Unlike the languages we have considered thus far, however, the perfect does not occur in extended narratives (e.g., tales, cf. example [37]). The relative freedom of the Georgian aorist and restriction of the perfect makes the aorist appear to be less marked than the perfect. Another difference between Georgian and other languages is the fact that the corresponding pluperfect has not developed an evidential marking but is rather taking over the function of a conjunctive. On the other hand, the perfect of 'be', _qopila[m]_, functions as a reported or nonconfirmative marker in a manner reminiscent of the Turkish use of _imis_ in some Georgian dialects, e.g., Ingilo and Xavsur (cf. Harris 1985:298). In diachronic explanation, there is disagreement among Georgian scholars regarding which meaning of the perfect—resultative or evidential—was original, but evidence here as elsewhere appears to favor resultative (cf. Harris 1985:326, Schmidt 1985).

Of all the languages considered here, Lak has the most distinctive developments. The four most important are the opposition assertive/nonassertive, heterogeneous conjugations, analytic tenses, and quotative particles. The distinction assertive/nonassertive has been compared to the English assertive in _do_ (Burçuladze 1979:244):

42. Na čagars čiçara/čiçajssara. [L]  
I write/do write a letter.

I have argued (Friedman 1984) that the meaning of this category is 'objec-
tive assertion", in some ways comparable to that of the Turkish emphatic copula -dir. Thus, for example, the assertive is the normal choice in neutral expository prose, bureaucratese, journalese, etc., but in colloquial usage this same categorical, objective quality gives a coloring of personal emphasis. Examples (43)-(45), taken from a Lak school grammar (Murqilinskij 1981:117), implicitly support this analysis. Example (43), using the assertive, introduces the contrast between examples (44) and (45) and explains that (44) would be used in an official report and (45) in an informal conversation. The form in (44) is the marked assertive, while (45) is the aorist.

43. Iširal stîl'danuvu asar kêçilgan çulu buvssia maqru, kalîmarttugu îsla qadafisar. [L]

In business style, emotive and decorative words and phrases are not used.

44. Âkinassaksa maşinarttu baqqasîvrinj buvnu, cila çumal qus įajla qqa-
durkssar. [L]

Due to the absence of necessary cars, the goods were not sent in time.

45. Haçiinu čanssa maşinarttu bija. Qus įajla dukkan zušsa qqa-
x-urna. [L]

There were too few cars today. We didn’t send the goods.

The Lak assertive is also unique in that it is not restricted to past paradigms but occurs in the present, future, conditional, etc.

Heterogeneous conjugation is a mirror image of the development of the old perfect in Prespa Macedonian. Certain Lak paradigmatic sets have assertive or confirmative forms only in the first person. Thus, for example, the assertive future illustrated in (46), as well as the assertive intransitive perfect, have only first person forms. In the other two persons they borrow forms from other paradigms, i.e. there is suppletion.

46. Ina x-uliuxgu aveçunu, xxarâţiangu durhunu dâ?vaö, jâlamur na banna.

(Xalilov 1976:221) [L]

You, stand at the door holding a dagger and curse, I will do the rest.

Lak has an extensive system of quotative and nonconfirmative particles (xxaj, tar, kunu, tôj etc.), but no admorative or dubitative usage. It also has a complex system of compound perfects used for reporting, folk tales, etc., (cf. example (37) and Friedman 1984).

From a synchronic areal point of view, the most salient features unifying and separating Balkan Slavic and the other languages can be summarized in the form of typological isoglosses given in the Schematic Map below.

The Caucasian languages are separated from the Balkans by the presence of quotative clitics and the possibly correlated absence of dubitative usage. In the extreme west, Albanian is distinguished by the absence of a marked confirmative, while at the opposite end of the area, Lak is distinguished by the absence of admorative usage. Bulgarian, Turkish, and Georgian form a central group in opposition to the other languages due to the association of the perfect of ‘be’ with specially marked nonconfirmative sets or expressions. It is interesting to note that in past tense forms in proverbs Lak usually uses the assertive and Georgian the aorist with a quotative particle, while Turkish uses the miş-past, Bulgarian and Macedonian the analytic past, and Albanian the aorist. In other words, those languages with quotative particles or lacking marked confirmative/nonconfirmative opposition and no quotative particles tend to avoid the marked confirmative forms in those same contexts.

Diachronically, all the languages show a tendency to develop nonconfirmative paradigms out of their perfects either as unmarked pasts opposed to other, markedly confirmative, forms or as marked nonconfirmatives in their own right. The parallels between Balkan Slavic and Turkish are, on the one hand, not as uniform as they might first appear, given the differences between the Turkish copulative particle -dir and Slavic auxiliary loss. On the other, the parallels are not so unique in view of developments in the rest of the area. Considering the similarities and differing combinations of features in each of the individual languages treated here, it seems likely that
the development of status (evidentiality) in Balkan Slavic was the result of a natural tendency (cf. Wijk 1933), which tendency was no doubt reinforced by contact with Turkish (cf. Lohmann 1937).

Viewed as a whole, evidentiality in the Balkans and the Caucasus represents a complex phenomenon integrated into each language's verbal system in a unique way. Although the basic meaning of speaker confirmation/nonconfirmation is common to all the languages, the presence or absence of quotative and emphatic particles, the creation of new nonconfirmative forms, and development of specific uses for the category such as expressions of surprise and irony, show the different ways it can be utilized. In their combinations of these features and developments, Bulgarian and Macedonian show both typical and unique characteristics with respect to other languages of the Balkans and the Caucasus.
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NOTES

1. This work was made possible through the assistance of a research grant for East European Studies from the American Council of Learned Societies financed in part by the National Endowment for the Humanities and The Ford Foundation. A Category A Fellowship for Research from the National Endowment for the Humanities enabled me to do some of the earlier work on which this article draws. I also wish to thank the University of North Carolina Arts and Sciences fund for financial support in the production of this article. I am also grateful to the following organizations that have supplied me with materials essential to my research: the Central National Library of the Georgian Academy of Sciences, the Center for Bulgarian Studies of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, the Committee for Information of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Institute for the Macedonian Language, the Kosovo Academy of Arts and Sciences.

2. The examples are all imperfective. The aspectual opposition perfective/imperfective does not affect the questions under discussion and so will not be indicated. Likewise, superordinate aspectual oppositions in Georgian (perfective/imperfective) and Lak (plain/progressive/iterative) will be omitted. The initial examples cited to illustrate the types are all from verbs meaning 'gather'.

3. With regard to the term evidential we can note that traditional Bulgarian and Albanian grammars use terms meaning 'mood' Bulg. naklone, Alb. mënyr. Traditionally oriented twentieth century Macedonian, Turkish and Lak grammars use terms meaning 'tense' (Macedonian vreme, Turkish zaman, Lak fun), but in this usage the terms are essentially the equivalent of 'paradigmatic set' rather than referring to a specific type of relationship between the speech event and narrated event (cf. Jakobson 1957). In Georgian grammar, this category is described by a special term sakme or aksi 'action, deed' (Sanidze 1973:211). Jakobson (1957) uses the term evidential as a tentative label for a verbal category that relates a speech event, a narrated event, and a narrated speech event, viz. the alleged source of information about the narrated event. Another of Jakobson's proposed universal generic categories is status (a term borrowed from Whorf), which he defines as the qualification of the narrated event. Jakobson defines mood as the relationship of the participant in the speech event to the narrated event and its participants. Aronson (1977) argued that the definitions of status and mood be reversed. Whereas there is no need to refer to the participant in the speech event to define the meaning of the modal forms in, e.g., *He would have gone had he had the time*, the English affirmative status in stressed *dó, e.g., He does believe in ghost*, clearly involves editorial comment on the part of the speaker, i.e., a subjective evaluation of the narrated event. Aronson accepts the definition of mood proposed by Kuryłowicz (1956), Janakiev (1962), and Golab (1964), among others, as the ontological evaluation of the narrated event (marked modal forms denoting ontologically nonreal events), and thus proposes that it is mood which qualifies the narrated event and status that specifies the speaker's relation to it. In other words, mood represents the objective evaluation of the narrated event and status represents its subjective evaluation. As we shall argue, the verb forms labeled as evidential do not reflect the source of information but rather the speaker's attitude towards that information and thus reflect status in Aronson's terms.

4. For convenience, the following abbreviations will be used to indicate the language of examples at the end of the cited sentence: A=Albanian, B=Bulgarian, G=Georgian, L=Lak, M=Macedonian, T=Turkish.

5. For example, Conev (1911) claimed that the auxiliary was omitted if the evidence was either witnessed or reported and retained if the evidence was a deduction (cf. also Părvan 1975).

6. It is necessary to distinguish here between usage and the norm. If Literary Bulgarian is defined as the language described by the academy grammar and related works, than all phenomena not fitting that description are by definition not Literary Bulgarian. I am, however, taking educated usage as the definition of Literary Bulgarian (cf. Nayler 1980).

7. Mileška-Tomík (1984:166) fails to mention, however, that the Serbo-Croatian phenomenon affects all three persons of the paradigm. This would strengthen the Serbo-Croatian claim to a separate paradigm as opposed to a syntactic process. It is significant that no such claim has ever been advanced.

8. We are including Turkish here with the Balkans. Although Turkic languages extend into the Caucasus, Turkish proper does not, whereas it has been and still is a vital element in the Balkan linguistic picture. The relationship of Caucasian Turkic to the other languages of the Caucasus merits further study.

9. It may be that the Georgian aorist is, strictly speaking, unmarked rather than markedly confirmative. Nonetheless, the fact that the meaning 'witnessed' is traditionally ascribed to it is sufficient to place Georgian with the other languages as opposed to Albanian, in which no such meaning is ever ascribed to any form.

10. The Lak use of usa 'being' [pres. pt.] in nonconfirmative constructions could place it with the other languages, in which case Macedonian and Albanian would pattern together as distinct from the rest, but this matter requires further investigation (cf. Friedman 1984).

REFERENCES


Birlik
N.M.—Nova Makedonija.
Počinka.