FOLIA SLAVICA

Volume 4

Numbers 2 - 3

STUDIES IN BALKAN LINGUISTICS

TO HONOR

ERIC P. HAMP

ON HIS SIXTIETH BIRTHDAY

edited by

Howard I. Aronson Bill J. Darden

1981

Slavica Publishers, Inc.

THE PLUPERFECT IN ALBANIAN AND MACEDONIAN*

Victor A. Friedman

In the published version of the text of his report to the Third International Congress on Southeast European Studies, Hamp (1975:96) emphasized the need for a comparative Balkan grammar using features and rules to identify significant convergences and divergences, illustrating the rule component of such a grammar with a brief account of the formation of the future and the placement of the marker of definiteness. Here we will discuss a fragment of the feature component of such a grammar, viz. a comparison of the various pluperfects of the literary Albanian and Macedonian indicative verbal systems.[1] Such a comparison will involve some consideration of virtually all those grammatical categories which are used to distinguish the paradigmatic sets in the conjugation of any given lexically discrete verb: aspect, resultativity, status, taxis, and tense.[2] As this comparison will necessitate reference to other tense forms as well, an inventory of all indicative forms is given in the table. Due to the lack of a consistent grammatical terminology distinguishing the various pluperfect forms, the following convention is used: the name of each form is distinguished by a hyphenated prefix indicating the tense form or aspect of the auxiliary or participle.[3] All the pluperfects in both languages share the following three features: 1) they are formed periphrastically, 2) they involve the relationship between two past events, and 3) they could all theoretically be translated by the English 'I had worked' or 'I had been working.' Our task here will be to show the differences between these forms within each language and the points of comparison between them. We will begin by considering the languages' pluperfects separately, starting with Macedonian.

The Macedonian pluperfects are characterized by having two lexically distinct auxiliaries, viz. *ima* 'have' and *sum* 'be.'[4] The distinction between the two sets of pluperfects is to be found in the fact that those using 'have' are marked for the category of statal resultativity while those using 'be' are marked for anterior taxis, i.e., the forms in 'have' characterize the event as a past state resulting from a previous act, while those in 'be' specify the event as preceding some other past event. This is illustrated by the difference in meaning between the two forms of the following example:

MACEDONIAN		*ALBANIAN*	
SIMPLE			
present	*rabotam*	*punoj*	
imperfect	*rabotev*	*punoja*	
aorist	*rabotiv*	*punova*	
	'HAVE'	NON-ADMIRATIVE	
perfect	*imam raboteno*	*kam punuar*	
im-pluperfect	*imav raboteno*	*kisha punuar*	
aor-pluperfect	---	*pata punuar*	
per-pluperfect	*sum imal raboteno*	*(kam pasë punuar)*	
plu-pluperfect	*[bev imal raboteno]*	*(kisha pasë punuar)*	
	'BE'	ADMIRATIVE	
l-imperfect	*sum rabotel*	*punuakam*	present
l-aorist	*sum rabotil*	*punuakësha*	imperfect
l-im-pluperfect	*bev rabotel*	*paskam punuar*	perfect
l-aor-pluperfect	*bev rabotil*	*paskësha punuar*	im-pluperfect
bil-im-pluperfect	*(sum bil rabotel)*	*(paskam pasë punuar)*	per-pluperfect
bil-aor-pluperfect	*(sum bil rabotel*	*[paskësha pasë punuar]*	plu-pluperfect

Table: 1sg of 'work'

Note: Forms in square brackets are cited in scholarly literature but do not actually occur. Forms in parentheses are dialectal and/or archaic. As such Albanian forms are almost exclusively Geg, the Geg form of the participle (*pasë*) is cited rather than the Tosk form (*pasur*).

(1) *Žiži mi ja pokaža Keti, no jas veḱe ja*
(a) *bev videl*
(b) *imav videno*
Žiži pointed Keti out to me, but I had already seen her (Friedman 1977:105).

Sentence (1a) could only mean that I caught sight of Keti just before Žiži pointed her out to me, while (1b) could only mean that I had seen her on some previous occasion. Thus, while all the pluperfects are markedly past,[5] the forms using 'be' are part of a subsystem marked for taxis while those in 'have' do not enter into a correlation for taxis but rather carry the characteristic double past reference of pluperfects as part of a subsystem specifying a resultative state occurring in the past. (Friedman 1977:114-20).

Within the 'have' series, the distinction between the im-pluperfect and the per-pluperfect is one of status, i.e., the grammatical category specifying the speaker's evaluation of the narrated event (Aronson 1977:13, cf. Jakobson 1957). Elsewhere in the indicative system, the simple imperfect and aorist are marked for confirmative status, i.e., the speaker's personally vouching for the truth of the statement, in opposition to the negative marking of the *l*-imperfect and *l*-aorist (the unmarked pasts) which leads to their having a nonconfirmative *hauptbedeutung* (v. Friedman 1977:33-51). From this it follows that the im-pluperfect, which uses a simple imperfect auxiliary, is also marked for confirmative status whereas the per-pluperfect, which uses an *l*-imperfect auxiliary, is unmarked. It should be noted, however, that whereas the marking for status is genuinely privative in the nonpluperfect forms, e.g., the simple pasts cannot be subordinated to clauses which directly contradict their confirmative meaning, e.g., *ne veruvam deka...* 'I don't believe that...', while the unmarked pasts can occur in any type of context (Friedman 1977:42-6, 54-63), the marking for status in the pluperfects is functionally equipolent, i.e., just as the im-pluperfect cannot occur in nonconfirmative contexts, so the per-pluperfect cannot occur in confirmative ones and is limited to reports, expressions of disbelief, etc. Thus the im-pluperfect cannot even be subordinated to clauses such as *tvrdi deka navodno...*'claims that allegedly...' while the per-pluperfect cannot be used in subordination to clauses such as *vidov kako...* 'I saw that/how...' (Friedman 1977:110). It appears, then, that the double marking for pastness in the

pluperfect causes the *hauptbedeutung* to become the only possible meaning.

The *l*-im-pluperfect and *l*-aor-pluperfect do not enter into status oppositions because the *l*-imperfect of *sum*, 3sg *bil*, does not function as an auxiliary in opposition to the simple imperfect of *sum*, 3sg *beše*, in literatury Macedonian.[6] The distinction between the *l*-im-pluperfect and the *l*-aor-pluperfect is strictly aspectual and parallels the imperfect/aorist opposition in the other tense forms (Friedman 1977: 103).[7]

All Albanian pluperfects are opposed to the rest of the indicative system by their marking for taxis in addition to their marking for past tense. Leaving to one side for the moment the Geg compound pluperfects using the short participle *pasë* 'had' in the auxiliary, the literary Albanian verbal system possesses three indicative pluperfects (v. table). The admirative im-pluperfect is distinguished from the other two by being marked for nonconfirmative status, as are all admirative verb forms. A brief sketch of the arguments justifying this statement is required here (v. Friedman 1981). It has been shown that the traditional definition of the admirative as a mood expressing surprise (e.g., Demiraj 1971:213) cannot explain its use in reported speech, expressions of irony and doubt, etc. (Fiedler 1966, Schmaus 1966, v. also Demiraj 1976:274), and given the definition of mood as the ontological evaluation of the narrated event (Kuryłowicz 1956:26, Gołąb 1964:1), the admirative cannot be opposed to the indicative in the same manner as, e.g., the subjunctive or the optative, since it refers to ontologically real events (cf. Sytov 1979:111). Rather, admirative forms express an evaluation on the part of the speaker and are thus distinguished from other indicative forms by their marking for status. The type of status is indicated by the fact that the admirative is always used in contexts in which the speaker is somehow disassociating himself from the statement by indicating that it is based on a report, by mocking or doubting his interlocutor, by expressing surprise, i.e., by expressing a previous state of disbelief subsequently contradicted by evidence, etc. Thus, expressions of personal opinion such as *mendoj se...* 'I think that...' cannot take a subordinate clause in the admirative. I would propose that the basic meaning of the admirative is nonconfirmativity (cf. Camaj 1969:67), and this marking is sufficient to distinguish the im-pluperfect admirative from the nonadmirative pluperfects.

The distinction between the nonadmirative aor-pluperfect and im-pluperfect is not easy to determine. They are sometimes said to be distinguished by aspect in the same manner as the simple aorist and imperfect (Camaj 1969:66). The exact nature of this distinction is still in need of investigation, but it can be observed here that while the aorist, which is generally used for completed acts, is marked with respect to the imperfect in terms of frequency of occurrence, it is also essentially interchangeable with the perfect, which appears to be in the process of becoming an unmarked past, occurring as it does with definite past time adverbs and in sequential narratives (Agalliu 1970:263, Friedman 1981). The imperfect, however, is not permissible with any specification of limited duration, including sequential ordering with an aorist.[8] Demiraj (1976:271), however, points out that just as there is a tendency to confuse the aorist and imperfect of *kam* 'have' and *jam* 'be', so there is a tendency to confuse the two pluperfects which are distinguished only by the aspect of the auxiliary, and Agalliu (1970:276) even goes so far as to claim that the two forms are not differentiated by aspect but are merely variants of one another. Consider, however, the following example:

(2) a. *Shabani ua pati blerë biletat n'orën dy.*
b. *Shabani ua kishte blerë biletat n'orën dy.*
Shaban had bought the tickets at two o'clock.

According to some speakers, the difference between (2a) and (2b) is that the former implies that the speaker witnessed the action while the latter implies that he did not, i.e., some type of status distinction is involved. This would explain why aor-pluperfects cannot be subordinated to clauses of reporting such as *kam dëgjuar* 'I have heard,' *dëgjova* 'I heard,' *tha se...*'he said that...,' etc., although an alternative explanation would be that such subordination would contradict the Albanian rules of sequence of tenses, which require that present and past tense forms be shifted to imperfect and im-pluperfect, respectively, in indirect speech (v. Prifti 1971:431-8).[9] Another possible explanation may have to do with a connection between aspect and modality (cf. Aronson 1977), as Demiraj (1971:195) has pointed out the tendency or aor-pluperfects to occur most frequently in irreal conditions.[10]

This brings us to a consideration of the Geg compound pluperfects. The per-pluperfect is essentially the Geg equivalent of the basically Tosk

aor-pluperfect, a correspondence consistent with the Geg tendency to replace the aorist with the perfect (Agalliu 1970:273, 276; Dodi 1970:262-5; Demiraj 1976: 269), while the plu-pluperfect appears to be used for pre-anterior taxis, i.e., the description of actions preceding those described by pluperfects:

(3) *Është e vetmja brengë, që më mbete—shqiptoi më qartë ai, pasi kishte folur një copë herë, në mënyrë të ngatërruar, për një vajzë të bukur dhe inteligjente, me të cilën e* kishin pasë fejuar *prindët qysh në fëmijëri* (Demiraj 1976:271).
"It's the only trouble I have."—he said more clearly, after he had spoken confusedly for some time about a beautiful and intelligent girl to whom his parents *had engaged* him in (literally: since) childhood.

As these forms are marginal in the literary language and can even be considered as outside the standard system (cf. Byron 1976:46, 86-8), they are only mentioned here in passing.[12]

The grammatical categories of the Macedonian and Albanian pluperfects constitute a microcosm of these languages' indicative systems, and thus a comparison of their pluperfects brings out the most salient points of similarity and difference. The most important differences are in the treatment of status and the use of resultativity, followed by the relative use and position of status and aspect. The first position in the hierarchy of indicative grammatical categories is occupied by status in Albanian, distinguishing the admirative and nonadmirative, and by resultativity in Macedonian, separating the 'have' series from the simple and 'be' series. In both languages the past/nonpast (tense) opposition occupies second place, the pluperfects being markedly past. Albanian lacks the category of resultativity altogether whereas status in Macedonian occupies a position below tense and taxis, occurring only in non-taxic forms. It should also be noted that Albanian and Macedonian status are mirror images of one another: the former markedly nonconfirmative the latter markedly confirmative (Friedman 1981).
It is possible that both languages sharpen their status oppositions in the pluperfect, i.e., that a double past reference is coordinated with the shift of status markings from privative to equipollent. In Albanian, however, this is complicated by problems of aspect and mood. Taxis occupies a limited position between tense and status in Macedonian, distinguishing as it does only two nonresultative verbal forms, while the aspectual opposition imperfect/aorist occupies the last position and is clearly distinguished in the taxic pluperfects. Among the Albanian nonadmirative pluperfects, it is not clear whether aspect really functions as the distinguishing factor, and the more pervasive nature of taxis along with the lack of resultativity and the possible use of the plu-pluperfect for pre-anterior taxis raise questions of the relative positions of taxis and aspect in the hierarchy as well as the possibility of two levels of aspect (imperfect/aorist, aorist/perfect) and/or taxis.[13] From a theoretical point of view, the most important conclusion which can be drawn from the foregoing exposition is that the comparison of grammatical categories, for the most part neglected in favor of other areas in Balkan linguistics, can provide significant insights into similarities and differences between related phenomena in the Balkan languages. In the case of Macedonian and Albanian, a key difference is in the hierarchical ordering of similar categories.

The University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

NOTES

*I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to the American Philosophical Society for a grant from the Penrose Fund which enabled me to travel to Kosovo and conduct some of the research essential to this article. I am also indebted to the Sekretariati Krahinor i Informatave i KSA të Kosovës, the Sekretarijat za Informacii za SR Makedonija, the Makedonska Akadenija na Naukite i Umetnostite, and the Insitut za Makedonski Jazik for their consistent support of my research by sending me essential materials. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank those Albanians who were so kind as to be my informants, answer questions, or otherwise aid me in my research: Idriz Ajeti, Elez Bibaraj, Eqrem Çabej, Shaban Demiraj, Rexhep Ismajli, Peter Prifti, Afërdita Segal, and Fadil Sylejmani. The opinions and conclusions expressed here are my own and do not necessarily reflect those of my informants. I also wish to thank the Research Council of the University of North Carolina for a grant subsidizing the publication of this article.

[1]This comparison will eventually form part of a larger study. Due to limitations of space, it will not be possible to present many of the arguments and examples forming the basis of this article's analyses. The discussion here will therefore be restricted to the most salient points, with references to more complete sources.

[2]The categories of gender, number, and person change within a given paradigmatic set and are thus excluded. Voice is inherent in all the paradigmatic sets of a lexically discrete verb and so is also excluded. As this study is limited to the indicative, marked modal forms are not considered.

[3]The prefixes are *im-* 'imperfect', *aor-* 'aorist', *per-* 'perfect', and *plu-* 'pluperfect'. In Albanian, these prefixes always refer to the tense form of the auxiliary. This is also true of the Macedonian 'have' series, although *sum imal* is a perfect only in diachronic terms; synchronically it is an *l*-imperfect. The diachronic label is used for the sake of symmetry and to avoid awkwardness. The prefix in the Macedonian 'be' series refers to the aspect of the *l*-participle.

[4]In Albanian, the use of *jam* 'be' as an auxiliary is limited to its replacement of nonenclitic *kam* 'have' in the medio-passive, and is thus part of the phenomenon of voice, which is outside the scope of this study. While the discussion here will use verbs of the active voice, the conclusions will be equally applicable to the medio-passive.

[5]See Friedman (1977:87-8) on the relationship and distinction between tense and reference.

[6]Pluperfects using *bil* are extremely rare and archaic, in addition to being nonliterary (Koneski 1967:482). They occur in extreme eastern dialects (Vidoeski 1962/3:97) as well as in dialectal and literary Bulgarian, all of which lack 'have' pluperfects. The relationship between pluperfects using *bil* and *beše* in those systems having the opposition appears to parallel that between *imal* and *imaše* in literary Macedonian. No system has both. The hypothetical pluperfect using *beše imal* would act like the Albanian plu-pluperfect (v. p. 7), but this form is potential rather than actual (Friedman 1977:15-6).

[7]As I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1977:30-3), the imperfect is marked for durativity with respect to the aorist.

[8]See Demiraj (1976:264:8) for a general treatment of the uses of the imperfect and aorist in Albanian.

[9]It should be noted that if the speaker wishes to stress that the reported statement is still in effect at the moment of speech, tenses may be retained unshifted.

[10]The simple aorist can also be used with the conjunction *po* 'if' to render real conditions (Demiraj 1976:267).

[11]Demiraj (1976:269), however, treats the per-pluperfect as a variant of the perfect referring to the distant past, in which case it would not necessarily be a true pluperfect and the plu-pluperfect would be parallel to the im-pluperfect. Example (3) could also be explained as a shifted im-pluperfect in indirect speech.

[12]We are excluding the plu-pluperfect admirative from consideration, as it is not actually attested (Lafe 1972:472). Presumably it would also be marked for some type of pre-anterior taxis. The per-pluperfect admirative appears to be a Geg variant of the im-pluperfect admirative, but aside from its peripheral nature, its exact position in the system is unclear (v. Lafe 1972:482 n.8).

[13]Macedonian has the additional aspectual opposition perfective/imperfective above the hierarchy of indicative categories being considered here. The complexities of the relationships between the two types of Macedonian aspect and Albanian aspect(s) are beyond the scope of this discussion, but a principle source of difference is the fact that Macedonian has aspectual distinctions at opposite ends of its hierarchy of verbal categories whereas Albanian has them only relatively low in the hierarchy. See Aronson on subordinate and superordinate aspect in this same volume.

REFERENCES

Agalliu, Fatmir. 1970. "Observations sur les sens de certaines formes temporelles." *Deuxième Conférence des études albanologiques*, vol. 3, 271-278. Tirana: Universiteti i Tiranës.

Aronson, Howard I. 1977. "Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian." *Folia Slavica* 1,1.9-32.

Byron, Janet. 1976. *Selection among Alternates in Language Standardization: The Case of Albanian.* The Hague: Mouton.

Camaj, Martin. 1969. *Lehrbuch der albanischen Sprache.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Demiraj, Shaban. 1971. *Morfologjia e gjuhës së sotme shqipe.* Prishtina: Universiteti i Prishtinës. (Originally published by the University of Tirana in 1967.)

_____, ed. 1976. *Fonetika dhe gramatika e gjuhës së sotme shqipe, II, Morfologjia.* Tirana: Akademia e shkencave e RP të Shqipërisë. (Chief editor of the series: Mahir Domi.)

Dodi, Anastas. 1970. "De la valeur du passé composé de l'indicatif en albanais." *Deuxième Conférence des études albanologiques,* vol. 3, 253-269. Tirana: Universiteti i Tiranës.

Fiedler, Wilfried. 1966. "Zu einigen Problemen des albanischen Admirativs." *Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx-Universität Leipzig: Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe, Heft 3,* 561-6.

Friedman, Victor A. 1977. *The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative.* Columbus: Slavica.

_____. 1981. "Admirativity and Confirmativity." *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 17, 12-28.

Gołąb, Zbigniew. 1964. "The Problem of Verbal Moods in Slavic Languages." *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 8.1-36.

Hamp, Eric P. 1975. "Current Tasks in Grammar and Phonology." *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 20,2.93-103.

Jakobson, Roman. 1957. *Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb.* Cambridge: Harvard University. (Reprinted: 1971. *Selected Writings* , vol. 2, 130-147. The Hague:

Mouton.)
Koneski, Blaže. 1967. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik.* Skopje: Kultura.
Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1956. *L'Apophonie en indo-européen.* Wrocław: Polska Akademija Nauk.
Lafe, Emil. 1962. "De l'admiratif albanais et de quelques-unes de ses formes." *Akten des Internationalen Albanologischen Kolloquims. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft Sonderheft 41.)*, 471-483. Innsbruck: Universität Innsbruck.
Prifti, Stefan. 1971. *Sintaksa e gjuhës shqipe.* Prishtina: Universiteti i Prishtinës. (Originally published by the University of Tirana in 1962.)
Schmaus, Alois. 1966. "Beobachtung zur Bedeutung und Gebrauch des albanischen Admirativs." *Beiträge zur Südosteuropa-forschung*, ed. by A. Schmaus and H. Beck, 103-124. Munich: Trofenik.
Sytov A.P. 1979. "Kategorija admirativa v albanskom jazyke i ee balkanskie sootvetstvija." *Problemy sintaksisa jazykov balkanskogo areala*, ed. by A.V. Desnickaja, 90-124. Leningrad: Akademija Nauk SSSR.
Vidoeski, Božo. 1962/3. "Makedonskite dijalekti vo svetlinata na lingvističkata geografija." *Makedonski jazik* 13/14.87-108.