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A Contrastive Survey of the German *Konjunktiv* and Bulgarian прензказно наклонение*

Gary H. Toops

Introduction

Both German and Bulgarian exhibit grammatical means of conveying the reported status of a narrated event. These means are provided by special verb forms that encode “reportedness” (albeit not always distinctively) in syntactic environments where, from the standpoint of grammaticality, the corresponding verb forms that are modally or temporally unmarked for “reportedness” are often equally instantiable. Ironically, despite the conspicuous feature of “reportedness” shared by the verb systems of these two languages, German treatments of the Bulgarian прензказно наклонение, or “renarrated mood” (as it has traditionally been called), seldom, if ever, draw parallels between Bulgarian “renarrated” verb forms and their functionally equivalent *Konjunktiv* forms in German (cf. Weigand 1907, Roth 1979).

Exceptionally, Wedel and Savova (1991) did undertake to compare and contrast the morphosemantics of German *Konjunktiv* and Bulgarian “renarrated” verb forms. Nevertheless, their analysis is encumbered by an adherence to traditional “grammar book” notions of the German *Konjunktiv* paradigms as formal expressions of a “subjunctive mood” and of the Bulgarian “renarrated” verb forms as being essentially modal as well. In the present survey, I maintain that the German *Konjunktiv* is more accurately conceived as a “collective” modality whose semantics include “reportedness,” on the one hand, and subjunctive and conditional moods, on the other. Such a conception of the *Konjunktiv* is supported by the fact that each of these three meanings (“reportedness,” “subjunctivity,” and “conditionality”) is associated morphosyntactically with perceptibly different formal distributions. For example, the conditional mood in German is encoded by so-called *Konjunktiv II* forms (see below), but not by *Konjunktiv I* forms. Moreover, in the conditional mood, the (synthetic) *Konjunktiv II* forms can be replaced by analytic “werde + infinitive” tense forms with no change of (temporal) meaning (e.g., er hätte and er würde haben “he would...
have’ are both non-past conditionals). “Reportedness” and the subjunctive mood, in contrast, are encoded by both Konjunktiv I and Konjunktiv II forms, and substituting “würde + infinitive” tense forms for Konjunktiv II forms does result in a change of tense (future vs. present — pace Wedel and Savova 1994:34). With respect to Bulgarian, sentences like the following demonstrate that there cannot exist a “mood” with “renarrative” semantics in the same sense as there exists a mood with conditional semantics (viz., the conditional mood), for here we have a sentence that is both “renarrated” (i.e., “reported”) and unreal-conditional: Каза, че ако били дошли десетина минути по-късно, майка ѝ щяла да ѝ приготви вечер всичко ‘She says that if they had come some ten minutes later, her mother would have already had everything prepared’ (Съменов 1989: 12). By definition, propositions must be predicated in one mood or another (e.g., indicative, subjunctive, conditional, imperative, etc.), but cannot be predicated in two moods simultaneously.

For these reasons, and in order to avoid making the present contrastive survey of German Konjunktiv and Bulgarian “renarrated” forms needlessly cumbersome, I shall refer to the German Konjunktiv and the Bulgarian преназашно наклонение as “modalities” rather than “moods,” in accordance with Roth’s and Panzer’s acceptance of the term originally adduced by Панфилов (1971 [1974]; see Roth 1979: 52-54, Panzer 1991a [1973]). In the conceptual hierarchy proposed by Панфилов, modality precedes, or subsumes, mood, the latter comprising a subset of the former. According to Панфилов, mood is “the speaker’s evaluation of the relationship that exists in a sentence between the grammatical subject and the predicate verb both in terms of its orientation to reality and in terms of the objective relations between agent (or patient) and action” (Панфилов 1974: 211 as cited in Roth 1979: 53). While the concept of modality encompasses the functions of mood, “modality, in contrast, is a logico-grammatical phenomenon and characterizes either the speaker’s evaluation of the sentence content’s degree of certainty or the nature of the objective relations reflected in the sentence. Modality may be expressed by the most varied linguistic means (through phonetic, tonetic, synthetic and analytic forms [including modal forms of verbs], through special auxiliary words [including modal particles], and by syntactic means as well)” (Панфилов 1974: 212 as cited in Roth 1979: 53).

Preliminaries to Identifying Bulgarian “Renarrative” Verb Forms

For purposes of determining morphosemantic similarities and/or disparities between the German and Bulgarian modalities in question, a grammar of Bulgarian written in German was initially consulted — in this case, Gustav Weigand’s Bulgarische Grammatik (Leipzig 1907). From the perspective of the contrastive survey undertaken here, two features of this grammar are particularly salient. First is the fact that Weigand makes no mention of any преназашно наклонение or renarrative modality (“Erzählmodalität” — Roth 1979: 52ff.). It is perhaps for this reason that more recent Slavists dealing with the question of the Bulgarian преназашно наклонение, e.g., Roth, Aronson (1967), and Friedman, have regularly omitted reference to Weigand’s Bulgarische Grammatik in their publications, although Weigand’s later work, a short article titled “The Admirative in Bulgarian” (The Slavonic Review 2 [1923/1924]: 567-68; published in German as “Der Admirativ im Bulgarischen,” Balkanarchiv 1 [1925]: 150-52) typically does appear in their lists of references. Second is the reason why Weigand does not adduce a renarrative modality, viz., the fact that he recognized — over seventy years before modern-day Slavists — that there is in Bulgarian no formal distinction between indicative perfect tense (or indefinite past, минало неопределено време) and “renarrated” aorist. This second feature of Weigand’s grammar is important, for, ever since the appearance of Андреячич’s influential Основна българска граматика in 1944, it has been a commonplace of subsequent Bulgarian grammars and textbooks that the минало съвършено време of the преназашно наклонение (renarrated aorist or definite past) differs from the the минало неопределено време of the изнезувателно наклонение (indicative perfect or indefinite past) by the absence of the auxiliary verb in the third-person singular and plural, as illustrated in Example 1:

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Внезувателно наклонение</th>
<th>Преназашно наклонение</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Минало неопределено време</td>
<td>Минало съвършено време</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1съм че</td>
<td>1съм че</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1слу</td>
<td>1слу</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1мам</td>
<td>1мам</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1дам</td>
<td>1дам</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1речам</td>
<td>1речам</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1пиша</td>
<td>1пиша</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1мисля</td>
<td>1мисля</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Actually, as indicated in Wedel (1982: 159), the addition of a formal distinction between the indefinite past and the renarrated (reported) aorist can be traced back further to 1938, with the publication of Андреячич’s dissertation Kategorie znaczeniowe koniugacji bulgarskiej (Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejetnosci).
As Example 2, below, demonstrates, when we read the following observations by Friedman (1981), they can be understood only within a context of reaction against the Bulgarian grammatical tradition initiated by Андрейчин, for Weigand had made essentially the same observations regarding the perfect (i.e., indefinite past) tense some seventy-four years earlier. According to Friedman, "[r]eportedness can . . . be said to be the chief contextual variant meaning of the indefinite past . . . Aside from its reported and dubitative uses, however, the indefinite past can function as an ordinary past tense . . . frequently, but not always, with indefinite or resultative nuances" (1981: 14-15). Cf. Weigand:

Example 2

§92. Perfect und Plusquamperfect  

Das Pf. wird gebraucht, um Handlungen der erzählenden Vergangenheit und vollendeten Gegenwart zu bezeichnen, die man nicht selbst gesehen hat, sondern mehr vom Hörensagen kennt. Sein Platz wird also besonders in Erzählungen der Vergangenheit, in Märchen, in fragenden und zweifelnden Sätzen, in Zeitungsberichten, in der indirekten Rede, kurz, in allen Mitteilungen sein, in denen eine gewisse Unbestimmtheit des Mitgeteilten in Betracht kommt.  

(Weigand 1907: 124-25)

Thus, what have struck Slavists in the late 20th century as advances in the study of Bulgarian verbal morphosemantics actually constitute a return to views put forth at the beginning of the century, well before the publication of Andrejechin's grammar. In disavowing a formal distinction between the indicative perfect and the renarrated aorist and thereby postulating "reportedness" as a variant meaning of the former, one must, of course, explain the presence vs. absence of the auxiliary verb in the third persons. According to Friedman, "the omission of the third person auxiliary is essentially facultative. The codified literary Bulgarian norm, however, prescribes its omission for reported speech, and this is the tendency, but not the rule in the speech of educated Bulgarians" (1981: 17). Further, according to Friedman, the two paradigms are to "be treated as a single paradigmatic set in which omission of the auxiliary in the third person is essentially optional but tends to occur most frequently in nonconfirmative contexts" (1981: 17-18). For Weigand, too, the occurrence of the third-person auxiliary is optional, as evidenced by his indiscriminate use of third-person perfects formed both with and without the auxiliary. Consider the following passages from Balkanistika 9 (1996)

§92. Perfect (Indefinite Past) and Pluperfect

The perfect is used to denote actions of the narrative past and completed present that one has not seen as an eyewitness himself, but is familiar with more on the basis of hearsay. Its occurrence is particularly observable in stories from the past, in tales, in interrogative and dubitative sentences, in newspaper reports, in indirect speech — in brief, in all communications in which a certain indefiniteness about the message comes into consideration.  

(English translation mine — GHT)

Weigand's view of the auxiliary as optional in the third persons is even more apparent in his discussion of what he calls the "presumptive." This paradigm has formal correspondences in Andrejechin's renarrated perfect/pluperfect and emphatically renarrated aorist (see Roth 1979: 8):

Example 3

"... увчение съ ми, че, нькое издане из статия, вай ганьо е отворил похулиште си би отворил похулиште. 'I am convinced that as soon as I [had] left the room, Baj Ganjo opened his food container.' Of himself the narrator says нькое, but, in speaking of Ganjo, the narrator uses the perfect to express because he himself did not see it happen." (English translation mine — GHT)

Example 4

"The literal meaning of the verb form аз съм бил наказан is 'I have been one who has punished' and thus the form seems at first glance to denote a mere past tense; in opposition to аз съм бил наказан 'I am one who has punished' it is also designated by grammarians as a pluperfect. Its meaning, however, is completely modal: the form is used only when the context of a message is conveyed as supposition rather than fact. For example, учитель аз е бил наказан ученик does not mean 'the teacher had punished the pupil' but rather 'the teacher is supposed [is said, is rumored] to have punished the pupil.'" (English translation mine — GHT)

Weigand (1907: 131) then provides the "presumptive" paradigm for the verb видя 'I see' and cites the third-person forms as той е бил видял, тя е билла видяла, те [са] были видели (i.e., with brackets signaling the optional nature of the auxiliary verb).

Finally, the publications of some modern-day Bulgarian scholars either imply (Wedel and Savova 1991: 25-26) or explicitly state (Симеонов 1989: 110-12) that the absence of the auxiliary verb in the third persons is a formal marker

Balkanistika 9 (1996)
of the strictly “reported” and/or “unwitnessed” status of the narrated event, while its presence marks the verb (to the extent that ordinary [i.e., “confirmative”] past indefinite readings can be excluded) for presumptive, dubitative, or deductive/inferential meaning (“умозрително-обобщителен корелат” — Симеонов 1989: 11; cf. also Wedel and Savova 1991: 26). However, the contrastive survey of textual material undertaken here (see examples 17b and 20) reveals that even considerations of the strictly “reported”/“unwitnessed” vs. “presumptive”/“dubitative”/“inferential” status of a narrated event do not consistently determine the omission vs. instantiation of the auxiliary verb in the third persons. For the moment we may simply observe that even the 1983 Bulgarian Academy Grammar unwittingly concedes the optional occurrence of the third-person auxiliary in “renarrated” verb forms. After insisting that there is a clear semantic distinction between the sentences Той е застанал пред входа, marked as “мин[ало] неопределено,” and Той застана пред входа, marked as “мин[ало] съвършено преим[ах]но вр[еме]” (Граматика 1983: 354-55), the Grammar proceeds to discuss the formal identity of the renarrated future and renarrated future-in-the-past. It cites two examples — one without the auxiliary verb, as expected, but the other, incongruously, with the auxiliary:

Example 5

“Шъл да дойде вчера, но се разболи.”
Казва, че е шъл да дойде утре.

For purposes of the present survey, it will therefore suffice to identify Bulgarian verb forms as encoding renarrative modality (including all the semantic features associated therewith, be they “reported,” “unwitnessed,” “dubitative,” “presumptive,” or “inferential”) on the following basis: those third-person analytic verb forms that consist of an l-participle and do not exhibit the auxiliary verbs e or ca are marked for renarrative modality; all other analytic tense forms consisting of an l-participle are formally unmarked for renarrative modality in and of themselves, and their “renarrative” semantics can be established only morphosyntactically (e.g., in utterances where some past indefinite verb form clearly does not denote a perfect tense, but rather a present or an aorist tense). We may now proceed to consider the formal expression of renarrative (“reported,” “nonconfirmative”) modalities in Bulgarian and German.

Forms and Functions

The formal expression of renarrative modality in German is summarized in Example 6:

Example 6

Formal Expression of Renarrative Modality (“Erzählmodalität”) in German with Temporal Correlations

tun ‘to do’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indikativ</th>
<th>Konjunktiv II</th>
<th>Konjunktiv I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ich tue, du tust,</td>
<td>ich täte, du tätest, er täte</td>
<td>ich tue, du tuest, er tut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ich habe getan, du hast getan, er hat getan</td>
<td>ich hätte getan, du hättest getan, er hätte getan</td>
<td>ich habe getan, du habest getan, er habe getan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUPERFECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ich hatte getan, du hastest getan, er hatte getan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ich werde tun, du würdest tun, er würde tun</td>
<td>ich würde tun, du würdest tun, er würde tun</td>
<td>ich werde tun, du würdest tun, er werde tun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The designation “future” applies to the Konjunktiv II only as a subjunctive and renarrative verb form (see discussion below). The future perfect forms (er würdest getan, er würde getan) are omitted from consideration here.

In Example 6, the designation “future” applies to the Konjunktiv II only as a subjunctive and renarrative verb form. In the protasis of a conditional sentence, it functions as an analytic equivalent to synthetic Konjunktiv forms that in contemporary German sound comically archaic. For example, Wenn du mir (hilf) — helfen würdest, hätte ich nicht solvte Schwierigkeiten (— würde ich nicht solvte Schwierigkeiten haben) ‘If you helped (— would help) me, I would not have so many problems.’ More often than not, the term Konjunktiv is misleadingly translated into English as ‘subjunctive.’ However, of the three modalities expressed by Konjunktiv forms — subjunctive, conditional, and renarrative/reported — the subjunctive is the least instantiable. Unlike the subjunctive in contemporary Romance languages and the conditional/subjunctive (“injunctive” — Brecht 1974) in North (i.e., East and West) Slavic languages, the German Konjunktiv is not used in the sentential complements of what Brecht (1974) has termed “will-extending verbs” (including verba dicendi). In such instances German resembles Bulgarian in its use of a restricted indicative paradigm:
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Example 7

Ich will, daß er kommt (*käme* *komme*).
Искам той да дойде.
'I want him to come.' (Literally: 'I want that he comes.')

Moreover, in unreal-conditional sentences Konjunktiv II forms can be used, while Konjunktiv I forms cannot. Thus, from the perspective of a form:function ratio, the largest ratio characterizes the renarrative modality, which can be conveyed not only by both Konjunktiv I and Konjunktiv II forms, but also by indicative forms when governed by a verbum dicendi or verbum cogitandi that is in the present tense (cf. Lohnes and Strothmann 1980: 319):

Example 8

Mein Freund Giovanni sagt,
(a) ... in Italien ist das Benzin sehr teuer (Indikativ)
(b) ... in Italien wäre das Benzin sehr teuer (Konjunktiv II)
(c) ... in Italien sei das Benzin sehr teuer (Konjunktiv I)
'My friend Giovanni says (that) in Italy gasoline is very expensive.'

According to Lohnes and Strothmann, use of the Konjunktiv in Example 8(b) and (c) "does not express any doubt in the veracity of the original statement; it merely signals that the speaker reports this statement as originating with someone else" (1980: 319). Derivationally the two Konjunktiv paradigms differ in that Konjunktiv II is generally formed from the preterite stem of the indicative and is characterized by the umlaut of any non-front stem vowel (a, o, u → ā, ō, ū) in all strong and some irregular weak verbs, while Konjunktiv I is derived from the infinitive stem. Within the renarrative/reported modality, there is no semantic distinction between the two paradigms: the instantiation of one or the other is determined almost exclusively by considerations of homonymy. If the Konjunktiv I forms are homonymous with the corresponding indicative forms — as they always are for all persons of regular weak verbs with the exception of the third person singular —, then the Konjunktiv II forms will most likely be instantiated. Thus, Konjunktiv I forms are most often used when the sentence subject is third person singular, especially as Konjunktiv II forms have the potential, to varying degrees, of being misinterpreted as synthetic conditionals (cf. above).

The formal expression of narrative modality in Bulgarian is summarized in Example 9:

Example 9

Formal Expression of "Reportedness" ("Nonconfirmativity") in Bulgarian with Temporal Correlations (1st and 3rd Persons Singular)

права 'I do, I make'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenses having &quot;reportedness&quot; as a variant meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>правя, прави</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPERFECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>правех, правеше</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AORIST (PAST DEFINITE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>правя, прави</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST INDEFINITE (PERFECT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>бях правя, беше правя</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ще правя, ще прави</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE IN THE PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>щях да правя, щеше да правя</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The terminology can be confusing. If the aorist is alternately called a past definite (or definite past), then we technically have a tense that can be called "past definite past indefinite." If the past indefinite is called "perfect," then we can have both "imperfect perfects" and "perfect perfects," and the term "future perfect" (traditionally used to designate aorist past indefinite, "I will have done, he will have done") becomes ambiguous (i.e., designating tenses translatable into English as 'I have/had been going to').

As unusual as Example 9 may seem from the standpoint of traditional Bulgarian grammars published since the 1940s, it actually represents a logical extension of the more recently developed view that there is no прензизално наклонение, or "renarrated mood;" in Bulgarian, inasmuch as the traditionally labelled indicative perfect and renarrated aorist in reality constitute a single paradigm. Using the term "definite" in the traditional sense of "indicative" (i.e., "non-reported"), Friedman (1982: 155), for example, states (albeit somewhat tautologically): "[I]ust as there is both an aorist and imperfect reported and an
aorist and imperfect past definite..., so there is also an aorist and imperfect past indefinite." These two tenses, aorist and imperfect past indefinite, are reflected in Example 9. The analysis of Friedman, Aronson, and others has simply been carried here to its logical conclusion by including a perfect and future past indefinite as well.

A contrastive analysis of the formal means employed by German and Bulgarian for expressing renarrative modality therefore reveals that whereas "reportedness" in German is a variant meaning of modal (or, "modalitative") forms, in Bulgarian it is a variant meaning of temporal ones. The German use of modal forms of verbs to convey "reportedness" is no doubt connected both with the relatively limited functional range of the subjunctive and with the existence of synonymous analytic conditionals alongside the synthetic ones. It is conceivable that these two factors "lighten the functional load" of the German Konjunktiv, thereby allowing it to assume the added function of expressing "reportedness." In Bulgarian, the past indefinite tense has assumed the function of expressing "reportedness." One should, perhaps, speak of past indefinite tenses (plural), for the existence of two I-participles gives rise to imperfect and aorist past indefinite tenses, the former being used to convey, within a renarrative modality, either a present or imperfect (i.e., "present-in-the-past"—Lindstedt 1985: 122-23) tense, the latter to convey an aorist tense. Two additional past indefinite tenses—perfect/pluperfect (i.e., perfect/perfect-in-the-past), on the one hand, and future/future-in-the-past, on the other—are derived by compounding the auxiliary verb. Though it may not be worthwhile to speculate here about factors prompting "reportedness" as a variant meaning of the Bulgarian indefinite past, it is worth noting that both morphosyntactic operations—the use of conditional forms to convey the reported status of an utterance and the compounding of auxiliary verbs—can be found in other languages. In French, for example, newspaper headlines announcing reports of future events are typically in the non-past conditional rather than in the future indicative tense:

Example 10

Le président arriverait demain.
"President to Arrive Tomorrow."

(Possible analysis: "[If the reports that we have received were accurate, then] the President would be arriving tomorrow.")

French also exhibits past tenses with compound auxiliaries (so-called temps surcomposés), as illustrated in Example 11(a) and (b) (cited in Robert 1981: 1893):

Example 11

(a) Je suis parti quand j’ai eu terminé.
"I left once I got finished."
(b) Il serait arrivé quand j'aurais été parti.
"He would have arrived after I would have [already] left ("been gone")."

Of greater relevance to the present survey, however, is the fact that both Bulgarian and French instantiate indicative imperfect tense forms in the protasis of unreal-conditional sentences. Thus, there is precedent in both languages for using temporal rather than markedly modal forms as a means to convey various moods and modalities (e.g., unreal-conditional, nonconfirmative, etc.; cf. Panzer 1991b [1982]).

A contrastive survey of the formal expression of renarrative modality in German and Bulgarian also reveals similarities. German renarrative modality exhibits a complete formal neutralization of past tenses: the preterite, perfect, and pluperfect tenses of the (non-renarrative) indicative are encoded by a single compound tense consisting of a Konjunktiv form of the auxiliary verb haben or sein and the past participle. In Bulgarian, because past-tense verb forms, i.e., those of the indefinite past, are used to convey "reportedness," present and "present-in-the-past" (i.e., imperfect), perfect and "perfect-in-the-past" (i.e., pluperfect), and future and future-in-the-past are, in each instance, not distinctively encoded as they are in the "non-reported," or "confirmative," modality. For some past indefinite forms, "reportedness," or "nonconfirmatively," may not just be the primary variant meaning, but even the overriding one. Thus, in the case of what I have called the "imperfect past indefinite" (following Friedman 1982), its almost exclusive use in renarrative modality has, according to Friedman, misled a number of linguists to conclude that "the imperfect participle only occurs in the reported paradigm and thus its use with the auxiliary is incorrect" (1982: 155). In contrast, the aorist past definite form is often ambiguous and in many contexts it may not be clear whether its instantiation is intended to convey a nonreported perfect or a reported aorist tense. Although for the sake of simplicity the future anterior tense(s) in both German and Bulgarian (Futur II, будешь предварительно время) have been ignored, the present analysis could be extended to those tenses as well.

Contrastive Survey of Textual Material

An examination of textual material afforded by Bulgarian and German works of literature reveals that the frequency of occurrence of verb forms expressing renarrative modality is remarkably parallel in both languages. Examined for the
reported status of a narrated event, but also the unwatched status of an event. A major reason why the frequency counts in the two languages approximate each other so closely is that what Bulgarian refrains from conveying as “reported” in subordinate clauses governed by “reported” (“renarrative”) verb forms (i.e., verbs in some past indefinite tense), German continues to encode as “reported” (i.e., with some Konjunktiv form). Compensatorily, what Bulgarian conveys as “unnoticed” (“nonconfirmative”) by means of the same verb forms (past indefinite tenses), German does not.

In Example 13, below, a lengthy passage from Kafka’s The Trial (Der Prozeß, Процесът), we see that in strictly reported contexts (i.e., in indirect speech), there is in fact a nearly perfect correspondence between German Konjunktiv and Bulgarian past indefinite verb forms:

Example 13

K. war telefonisch verständigt worden, daß am nächsten Sonntag eine kleine Untersuchung in seiner Angelegenheit zu erfolgen würde. Man machte ihm darauf aufmerksam, daß diese Untersuchungen regelmäßig, wenn auch vielleicht nicht jede Woche, so doch häufiger einander folgen würden. Es lag eineinhalb im allgemeinen Interesse, den Prozeß rasch zu Ende zu führen, andererseits aber (würde) die Untersuchungen in jeder Hinsicht unerwünscht sein und (dürfte) doch wegen der damit verbundenen Anspannung niemals anliegen. Deshalb habe man den Ausweg dieser rasi aufzunehmend, aber dennoch die Untersuchungen gedacht. Die Bestimmung des Sonntags als Untersuchungstag habe man deshalb vorgenommen, und K. in seiner beruflichen Arbeit nicht zu stören. Man sagte, daß er damit einverstanden sei, solle er einen anderen Termin wünschen, so würde man ihm, so gut es erginge, entgegenkommen. Die Untersuchungen würden beispielsweise auch in der Nacht möglich, aber da sei wohl K. nicht frisch genug. Jedenfalls würde man es, solange K. nichts geringeres, beim Sonntag beibringen. Es sei selbstverständlich, daß er bestimmte einnehmen müsste, darauf müsste man ihm wohl nicht erst auferkommens machen. Er würde ihn die Nummer des Hauses genannt, in dem er sich einfinden solle...

(FK 1966: 283-84)

Although the frequency of occurrence of verb forms expressing “reportedness” is almost the same in the two languages, the discourse factors prompting their instantiation are perceptibly different. In other words, it is not at all the case that the Bulgarian and German texts exhibit a one-to-one correspondence in verb forms expressing renarrative modality. As the textual material reveals, the term “reportedness” as applied to German is to be understood sensu stricto (i.e., as the attribution of a narrated event to a source other than the speaker). In Bulgarian, however, renarrative modality may signal not only the
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In the foregoing example, German Konjunktiv and Bulgarian past indefinite verb forms are italicized; additionally, italicized verb forms whose occurrences in both languages correspond to each other exactly are underlined. In only one instance is the "reportedness" of a German Konjunktiv form not reflected in the Bulgarian translation, viz., in the subordinate clause of the sentence Man setze voraus, daß er damit einverstanden sei / laß mal sagen, ob er damit einverstanden sei. "They assumed that he was in agreement..." One other "mismatch" occurs inasmuch as the German original exhibits an unreal-conditional sentence which, because its "non-renarrative" analogue is expressed by means of Konjunktiv II forms, cannot be formally marked further for "reportedness." The occurrence of the verb form sollen 'should' in the sentence... sollte er einen anderen Termin wünschen, so würde man ihm... entgegenkommen '... should he desire another date and time, they would oblige him' precludes the possibility of interpreting the verb form as expressing a desire other than the expressed one. Consequently, the instantiation of the Konjunktiv II forms sollte and (analytic) wäre entgegenkommen cannot be considered to have been primordially prompted by considerations of "reportedness." In contrast, the Bulgarian translation (и българи съм, кажи ми... да удовлетворят желанието ми) is unambiguously marked for "reportedness," but, if considered in isolation, is ambiguous with respect to real- vs. unreal-conditional semantics (i.e., it may represent either the "reported" analogue to the real condition... и българи съм, кажи ми... да удовлетворят желанието ми 'if he desires another day, they will satisfy his wish' or the "reported" analogue to the unreal condition... и българи съм, кажи ми, че ико и... да удовлетворят желанието ми 'if he desires another day, they will satisfy his wish'). This is because Bulgarian imperfect past indefinites (see Example 9), when used to express "reportedness," have temporal correspondences both to the present and imperfect ("present-in-the-past") tenses in "non-reported" contexts (i.e., пожелаое [вс] <--- пожелаое пожелаие, шеел [са] <--- ше = шека). (For a more detailed discussion, see note 3, this work).

In order to convey uneventful events that have occurred before the moment of the narrated event, German, like English, often has recourse to the plural indicative, while Bulgarian employs past indefinites, as in examples 14 and 15:

Example 14

Das... Mädchen erzählit... daß Haj Danju sich tatsächlich an ihr vergriffen hatte, er hatte sie gepackt und nicht nur das.
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Example 15

Die Stadt war zusammengelaufen, Leute aus den Dörfern waren gekommen, es hatten sich eine Menge Jungfrauen, mit Blumensträußen in der Hand, aufgestellt, ... um sie [die Brüder] zu begrüßen ... (AK 1908: 96)

(AK 1908: 27)

In other contexts, the unwitnessed status of the narrated event may simply remain grammatically unmarked in German, as in Example 16, where the phrase in meiner Abwesenheit / в моё отсутствие 'in my absence' makes it clear that the narrator did not witness the event in question:

Example 16

In meiner Abwesenheit photographierte man die teuern Gäste und am folgenden Tag erschien die ganze Gruppe in einer illustrierten Zeitung.

(AK 1908: 104)

The dubitative/presumptive semantics of Bulgarian renarrative modality are typically expressed in German by means of the auxiliaries sollen and wollen. The former ascribes the truth of a given statement to what others say (e.g., er soll reich sein 'he is supposed to be [said/rumored to be] rich'), while the latter ascribes the truth of a given statement to what others say specifically about themselves (e.g., er will reich sein 'he claims to be rich'). (Cf. Example 17, below.)

Example 17

(a) Ich doch nicht, Bruder, was sollte ich ihr denn getan haben? (AK 1908: 74)

'Not me, brother. Just what am I supposed to have done to her?'

(b) Dumm sollen die Bulgaren sein, was? (AK 1908: 83)

'Prosti били българи, а!'

'So Bulgarians are supposed to be dumb, eh?'
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Finally, referring to renarrative modality (as understood here) by the Jakobsonian term "evidentiality," Wedel and Savova (1991: 28) state that "Bulgarian evidentiality, being ... a speaker-oriented phenomenon, can express the speaker's attitude toward the event and not simply that the event has not been witnessed by the speaker. Thus, if we assume the narrow interpretation, viz. the 'renarrative,' the evidential is bound to be restricted to the third person uses because one can hardly imagine a situation in which a speaker will be reporting what he himself said, or what the interlocutor said in the presence of the speaker, and not be able to vouch for the veracity of what is being said." However, it is precisely the use of renarrative modality in situations where it is "hardly imaginable" that, in both Bulgarian and German, appears to extend its semantic range to include inferential and dubitative meanings. Consequently, in (non-third-person) contexts exhibiting what may be regarded as a sort of "displaced reportedness," German Konjunktiv forms are not necessarily limited to expressing "reportedness" exclusively, but, to the extent that they occur in indirect speech, can additionally express inferences and doubts in much the same way as Bulgarian past indefinites can (i.e., without the use of modal auxiliaries [inter alia, sollen and wollen — see above]). (Cf. Example 18, below.)

Example 18

... er denkt, it habe irgend einen Verstoß ... misli, che е стопи ре някоя грешка gegen Baj Ganju Geschmack genannt, gegen вкуса на бай Гани.

(AK 1908: 106)

'... he thinks he must (or, might — Wahrig 1982: 154) have committed an offense against Baj Ganju's taste.'

In Example 18, above, Aleko Konstantinov, who, as narrator of the story, is privy to the thoughts and words of his characters, has a character (in this case, a barber) thinking in the indefinite past tense (е стопи ре). Since the subjects of both clauses are coreferential, the German translation actually reveals a marked first-person use of the Konjunktiv I (er habe genannt), which prompts either the "inferential" reading he must have committed or the potential reading he might have committed.16

In examples 19 and 20, below, the speaker's reporting the statements of his interlocutor in renarrative modality represents a marked second-person use of Konjunktiv forms; these, like the functionally equivalent Bulgarian past indefinite tense forms, induce a "dubitative" reading of the reported statements:

Example 19

»Immerhin werde ich mir merken, daß Sie mir gedroht haben.« »Wie? Ich habe Ihnen gedroht?« (FK 1946: 47)

' — I am still not going to forget that you threatened me. — What? (How can you say) I threatened you?'

Example 20

»Sie sagen, Ihre Natur ruft Sie, mit mir in dieser Weise zu reden. Wirklich?« »Твърдите, че природата ви призовава да разговаряте с мен по този начин. Нима?« (FK 1993b: 23)

'You say that your nature forces you to talk to me in this way. Really now?'

Conclusions

Renarrative modality is characterized in Bulgarian by a greater variety of syntactic environments and a broader semantic range than it is in German. The traditionally labelled прензаказано наклонение is not restricted to indirect speech and has, inter alia, admiring, presumptive, and nonconfirmative ("unwitnessed") uses. In German, renarrative modality is confined to the predication of narrated events in indirect speech. Nevertheless, within the confines of indirect speech, renarrative modality in the two languages exhibits remarkable functional and morphosyntactic similarities. In neither language is renarrative modality, by and large, distinctively encoded by special verb forms: in Bulgarian renarrative modality is expressed by means of specific verbal tense forms (the past indefinite tenses), while in German it is expressed by means of modalitative verb forms (Konjunktiv I and II) — forms which, in both languages, are inherently ambiguous with respect to the meaning of "reportedness" and whose specific semantics are disambiguated essentially by morphosyntactic means. Consequently, renarrative modality in both Bulgarian and German is accompanied by a neutralization of certain temporal, modal and modalitative oppositions (e.g., Bulgarian present/imperfect, perfect/pluperfect, future/future-in-the-past; Germanpreterite/perf ect/pluperfect; Bulgarian real/unreal conditions; German "reported"/"non-reported" unreal conditions).

The primary meaning of renarrative modality in indirect speech is that of "reportedness." On both pragmatic and intuitive grounds, "reportedness" is typically (albeit not always) associated with third-person predication (cf. Wedel and
Savova 1991: 28, cited above). It is precisely the third-person verb forms used to express "reportedness" that tend to receive, so to speak, special "marking" in both Bulgarian and German: in Bulgarian this is represented by the normal omission of the third-person auxiliary verbs, while in German this is reflected in the arguably greater frequency of occurrence of Konjunktiv I forms with third-person (singular) subjects. In those relatively less frequent instances when propositions involving first- and second-person subject sentences are predicated in renarrative modality, inferential and dubitative meanings may be expressed in German, as in Bulgarian. For German, however, these meanings must be viewed as context-specific extensions of the basic semantics of "reportedness" in indirect speech.

**Notes**

4 Because of some unresolved technical incompatibility between certain option font commands and the electronic typesetting software used to produce this volume, the stress markers originally found in some Cyrillic words used in the text, and in many of the examples illustrating the text, could not be reproduced in the following study. Both author and reader have our sincere apologies in this matter. — DPH, DLD

1. Friedman (1982: 150) expresses the same misleading view of the German Konjunktiv when he states: "When the source of information is specified morphologically rather than lexically or syntactically, i.e., if there is an inflectional means of specifying the source of information which is not merely a use of some broader category as is the case in the German use of the subjunctive in indirect speech, then the language can be said to possess a grammatical category expressing this meaning." (Emphasis added).

2. The temporal difference between the synthetic Konjunktiv II and the analytic "würde + infinitive" in the subjunctive mood is often slight, but nonetheless perceptible, cf.: Ich wollte, er singe nicht so laut 'I wish he didn't sing (-weren't singing) so loud' vs. Ich wollte, er würde nicht so laut singen 'I wish he wouldn't sing so loud.' Note that unlike "reportedness," which can be expressed equally by Konjunktiv I and Konjunktiv II forms and where the choice between the two is dictated for the most part by considerations of homonymy, the subjunctive mood in the example cited here cannot be expressed by the corresponding Konjunktiv I form (Ich wollte, er "singe nicht so laut").

3. In German it is impossible to distinguish formally between "reported" and "unreported" unreal conditions, while in Bulgarian it is impossible to distinguish formally between "reported" real and "reported" unreal conditions. In German this is due to the fact that the same Konjunktiv (specifically, Konjunktiv II) paradigm performs the dual function of expressing "reportedness" and the conditional mood (cf. "reported" Sie sagte, sie hätte alles schon vorbereitet, wenn sie etwa zehn Minuten später gekommen wären 'She said she would have already had everything prepared if they had come some ten minutes later' vs. "non-reported" Sie hätte alles schon vorbereitet, wenn sie etwa zehn Minuten später gekommen wären 'She would have already had everything prepared if they had come some ten minutes later'). In this example, only the subordinating con-

---

_Balkanistica 9 (1996)_
since your child is sick (i.e., since you said your child was sick), ... here’s money for you to heal him.’ However, it is actually unclear why е было больно should be construed here as “reported” (normative grammars prescribe бьде rather than е было as renarrated present in any case — cf. Кръстев 1984: 79). In my opinion, е было больно represents here a typical use of the (‘non-reported’) perfect tense: ‘since your child has been sick (and still is) . . .’

In its present indicative forms, the verb denken ‘to think,’ like German verba cogitandi in general, typically governs sentential complements predicated with indicative, not Konjunktiv, verb forms. Only when German verba cogitandi occur in some past tense or in the conditional mood do they govern sentential complements exhibiting Konjunktiv verb forms (typically, Konjunktiv II rather than Konjunktiv I as in the example cited here). Conceivable here is an alternate analysis of example (18), whereby er denkt actually represents a präsens historico (i.e., a past-time use of a present-tense verb form), and the sentential complement with Konjunktiv I forms accordingly results from a temporal transposition: . . . er denkt, er habe irgend einen Verstoß gegen Baj Ganjus Geschmack gemacht ← . . . er dachte, er hätte irgend einen Verstoß gegen Baj Ganjus Geschmack gemacht.
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