

BALKANISTICA

Volume 9 (1996)

General Editor, Donald L. Dyer

Special Edition

BULGARIA

PAST & PRESENT

TRANSITIONS & TURNING POINTS

Studies Prepared for the Fifth Joint Meeting of Bulgarian
and North American Scholars,
Held at the University of Pittsburgh — 25-27 May 1994

Edited by

DENNIS P. HUPCHICK

Wilkes University

and

DONALD L. DYER

The University of Mississippi

© *Balkanistica* 1996

ISSN: 0360-2206

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 75-648409

For information, write:

Donald L. Dyer, Editor

Balkanistica

Department of Modern Languages

The University of Mississippi

University, MS 38677

USA

First published in the United States of America 1996

Printed in the United States of America

Graphic Design by Dennis P. Hupchick

NOTICE — A couple of late production glitches have caused certain textual inaccuracies in this issue. Please note the following that have come to my attention before distribution:

(1) On p. 275 of the article by Toops, the first line of text in *Example 6* on p. 275 should read: *ich tue, du tust, er tut ... ich tâte, du tâtest, er tâte ... ich tue, du tuest, er tue*. Also, *Footnote 6* on p. 287 should have been deleted, and *Footnote 7* on p. 288 should have been renumbered as 6. These mistakes are solely the Editor's and not the author's. The author has my apologies.

(2) On p. 296, line 10 from the top *should* read "... European Studies by the *Department of Slavic Languages & Literatures of Indiana University*."

(3) This volume was printed by *Design Systems Printing* of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. See lines 10-11 from the top on p. 298. — **DL D**

A Contrastive Survey of the German *Konjunktiv* and Bulgarian *преизказно 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 *преизказно 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.¹ 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 "würde + 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).² 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: *Казва, че ако били дошли десетина минути по-късно, майка ѝ щяла да е приготвила вече всичко* 'She says that if they had come some ten minutes later, her mother would have already had everything prepared' (Симеонов 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.³

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 *преизказно 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.⁴ 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 *преизказно 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 *преизказно 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 Andrejčin's influential *Основна българска граматика* in 1944, it has been a commonplace of subsequent Bulgarian grammars and textbooks that the *минало свършено време* of the *преизказно наклонение* (renarrated aorist or definite past) differs from the *минало неопределено време* of the *изявително 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

Traditional Treatment of Indicative Perfect and Renarrated Aorist since Андрейчин 1944 (from Кръстев 1984: 82-83)

чета 'I read'

<u>Изявително наклонение</u> <u>Минало неопределено време</u>		<u>Преизказно наклонение</u> <u>Минало свършено време</u>
чел съм	1st sg.	чел съм
чел си	2nd sg.	чел си
чел е	3rd sg.	чел
чели сме	1st pl.	чели сме
чели сте	2nd pl.	чели сте
чели са	3rd pl.	чели

* Actually, as indicated in Friedman (1982: 152), the adduction of a formal distinction between the indefinite past and the renarrated (reported) aorist can be traced back further to 1938, with the publication of Andrejčin's dissertation *Kategorie znaczeniowe koniugacji bulgarskiej* (Cracow: Polska Akademia Umiejętności).

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 aus 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)

§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)

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 Andrejčin'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

Balkanistica 9 (1996)

Weigand (in Example 3 he analyzes a passage from *Бай Ганьо*):

Example 3

" . . . уверень съмъ, че, шомъ излъзохъ изъ стаята, бай Ганьо е отворилъ похлупцигъ »ich bin überzeugt, daß, sobald ich herausgegangen war, Baj Ganjo die Holzkapsel aufmachte«. Der Erzähler sagt von sich selbst: излъзохъ, aber von Ganjo »е отворилъ« Pf., weil er es selbst nicht gesehen hat."

(Weigand 1907: 125)

" . . . уверен съм, че, шом излязох из стаята, бай Ганьо е отворил похлупците 'I am convinced that as soon as I [had] left the room, Baj Ganjo opened his food container.' Of himself the narrator says излязох, but, in speaking of Ganjo, the narrator uses the perfect е отворил because he himself did not see it happen."

(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 Andrejčin's renarrated perfect/pluperfect and emphatically renarrated aorist (see Roth 1979: 8):

Example 4

"Die Verbalform: аз съмъ билъ наказалъ' bedeutet wörtlich: »ich bin gewesen einer der gestraft hat«, sie scheint also zunächst eine bloße Vergangenheit zu bezeichnen; im Hinblick auf: аз съмъ наказалъ »ich bin einer der gestraft hat«, wird sie auch von den Grammatikern als Plusquamperfektum bezeichnet. Die Bedeutung ist aber durchaus modaler Natur, die Form wird nur dann angewandt, wenn der Inhalt nicht als Faktum, sondern als Vermutung ausgesprochen wird z.B. учителятъ [е] билъ наказалъ ученика heißt nicht: »der Lehrer hatte den Schüler gestraft« sondern: »der Lehrer soll [wie man erzählt, wie das Gerücht geht] den Schüler bestraft haben.«" (Weigand 1907: 131)

"The literal meaning of the verb form аз съм бил наказал 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 наказал '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 content of a message is conveyed as supposition rather than fact. For example, учителятъ [е] бил наказал ученика 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] била видяла, те [са] били 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: 10-12) that the absence of the auxiliary verb in the third persons is a formal marker

Balkanistica 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).⁵ 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 застанал пред входа*, marked as "мин[ало] свърш[ено] преизк[азно] 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

Щял да дойде вчера, но се разболял.
Казва, че е щял да дойде утре.

"бъд. в мин. преизк."
"бъд. преизк."
(*Граматика* 1983: 359)

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 *са* 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'		
Indikativ	Konjunktiv II PRESENT	Konjunktiv I
ich tue, du tust,	ich täte, du tätest, er täte	ich tue, du tuest, er tut
	PAST	
PRETERITE ich tat, du tatest, er tat		
PERFECT ich habe getan, du hast getan, er hat getan	 ich hätte getan, du hättest getan, er hätte getan	 ich habe getan, du habest getan, er habe getan
PLUPERFECT ich hatte getan, du hattest getan, er hatte getan		
	FUTURE*	
ich werde tun, du wirst tun, er wird tun	 ich würde tun, du würdest tun, er würde tun	 ich werde tun, du werdest tun, er werde tun

*The designation "future" applies to the *Konjunktiv II* only as a subjunctive and renarrative verb form (see discussion below). The future perfect forms (*er wird getan haben, er würde getan haben, er werde getan haben* 'he will have done') 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 (†hülffest →) helfen würdest, hätte ich nicht so viele Schwierigkeiten (~würde ich nicht so viele 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:

Example 7

*Ich will, daß er kommt (*kämel*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* → *ä, ö, ü*) 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)

правя 'I do, I make'

		Tenses having "reportedness" as a variant meaning
PRESENT	
<i>правя, прави</i>		
IMPERFECT	IMPERFECT PAST INDEFINITE
<i>правех, правеше</i>		<i>правел съм, правел (е)</i>
AORIST (PAST DEFINITE)	AORIST PAST INDEFINITE
<i>правих, прави</i>		<i>правил съм, правил (е)</i>
PAST INDEFINITE (PERFECT)	PERFECT PAST INDEFINITE
<i>бях правил, беше правил</i>		<i>бил съм правил, бил (е) правил</i>
PLUPERFECT	
<i>бях правил, беше правил</i>		
FUTURE	FUTURE PAST INDEFINITE
<i>ще правя, ще прави</i>		<i>щял съм да правя, щял (е) да прави</i>
FUTURE IN THE PAST	
<i>щях да правя, щеше да прави</i>		

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 *ще съм правил, ще е правил* 'I will have done, he will have done') becomes ambiguous (i.e., designating tenses translatable into English as 'I have/had been going to do').

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 *преизказно 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): "[J]ust as there is both an aorist and imperfect reported and an

orist and imperfect past definite . . . , so there is also an orist and imperfect past indefinite." These two tenses, orist 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 *l*-participles gives rise to imperfect and orist 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 orist 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 partie.*

'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 "nonconfirmativity," 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 orist past definite form is often ambiguous and in many contexts it may not be clear whether its instantiation is intended to convey a non-reported perfect or a reported orist tense. Although for the sake of simplicity the future anterior tense(s) in both German and Bulgarian (*Futur II*, *будеще предварително време*) have here 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

present survey was Weigand's 1908 bilingual (Bulgarian-German) edition of Aleko Konstantinov's *Бай Ганю* (*Baj Ganju*), which includes only the first seven of the original twelve episodes. The Bulgarian original exhibits 47 occurrences of past indefinites expressing renarrative modality; Weigand's German translation of the work exhibits 49 occurrences of *Konjunktiv* forms in the same function. Occurrences of *Konjunktiv* forms in the subjunctive mood totaled only 7 and were not included in the tally. Alternately, a corresponding amount of textual material originally written in German and recently translated into Bulgarian was also examined. This material consisted of Franz Kafka's short story "Betrachtung" as well as the first two and part of the third chapters of Kafka's novel *Der Prozeß* (*The Trial*). Again, the frequency of occurrence of verb forms expressing renarrative modality was virtually the same in both languages: 42 occurrences of *Konjunktiv* forms expressing "reportedness" in the German originals vs. 44 occurrences of past indefinites — all without third-person auxiliaries — in the Bulgarian translations. Occurrences here of the German *Konjunktiv* as conditional and subjunctive verb forms amounted to only 2 and 1, respectively, and, again, were not included in the tally. The foregoing figures are summarized in Example 12:

Example 12

Occurrences of Verb Forms Expressing Renarrative Modality in Bulgarian/German Texts and Their German/Bulgarian Translations

	German <i>Konjunktiv</i>						Bulgarian Past Indefinites			
	Present		Past		Future		Imperf.	Aorist	Perfect	Future
	I	II	I	II	I	II				
Bulg—>Germ:	26	7	14	1	1	0	3	43*	1	0
Germ—>Bulg:	23	6	5	1	3	4	26	12	0	6

*5 of these 43 occurrences exhibit the auxiliary verb in the third person.

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

reported status of a narrated event, but also the unwitnessed 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 "unwitnessed" ("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 telephonisch verständigt worden, daß am nächsten Sonntag eine kleine Untersuchung in seiner Angelegenheit *stattfinden würde*. Man machte ihn darauf aufmerksam, daß diese Untersuchungen regelmäßig, wenn auch vielleicht nicht jede Woche, so doch häufiger einander *folgen würden*. Es *liege* einerseits im allgemeinen Interesse, den Prozeß rasch zu Ende zu führen, andererseits aber *müßten* die Untersuchungen in jeder Hinsicht gründlich sein und *dürften* doch wegen der damit verbundenen Anstrengung niemals allzulange dauern. Deshalb *habe* man den Ausweg dieser rasch aufeinanderfolgenden, aber kurzen Untersuchungen *gewählt*. Die Bestimmung des Sonntags als Untersuchungstag *habe* man deshalb *vorgenommen*, um K. in seiner beruflichen Arbeit nicht zu stören. Man *setze voraus*, daß er damit einverstanden *sei*, *sollte* er einen anderen Termin wünschen, so *würde* man ihm, so gut es *ginge*, entgegenkommen. Die Untersuchungen *wären* beispielsweise auch in der Nacht möglich, aber da *sei* wohl K. nicht frisch genug. Jedenfalls *werde* man es, solange K. nichts *einwende*, beim Sonntag *belassen*. Es *sei* selbstverständlich, daß er bestimmt erscheinen *müsse*, darauf *müsse* man ihn wohl nicht erst aufmerksam machen. Es wurde ihm die Nummer des Hauses genannt, in dem er sich einfinden *solle* . . .

(FK 1966: 283-84)

Уведомиха К. по телефона, че за следната неделя *било насрочено* кратко съдебно следствие по неговата работа. Обърнаха му внимание и върху обстоятелството, че тези следствия *щели да се водят* редовно едно след друго нанстина може би не всяка седмица, но все пак често. От една страна, общият интерес *налагал* да се приключи процесът бързо, от друга страна обаче, следствията *трябвало* да бъдат във всяко отношение задълбочени, но поради свързаното с тях напрежение не *бивало* да продължават прекомерно дълго. Ето защо *взели* решение тези следствия да се редуват бързо едно подир друго, но да бъдат кратки. А за следствен ден *определили* неделята, за да не пречат К. в професионалните му задължения. *Предполагали*, че е съгласен, но ако *пожелал* друг ден, *щели* — стига да *било* възможно — да *удовлетворят* желанието му. *Можедо* например следствията да се водят и нощем, но К. тогава навярно *нямало да бъде* достатъчно бодър. Във всеки случай *спирали се* на неделята, докато К. не *подадал* възражение. *Разбиращо* се от само себе си, че *трябвало* непременно да се явява, едва ли *било* дори потребно да обръщат вниманието му върху това. Казаха му номера на къщата, където *трябвало* да се яви.

(FK 1993a: 34)

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 . . . / Предполагали, че е съгласен . . .* ‘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 *sollte* ‘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 this sentence as a real condition expressed as “reported” by means of *Konjunktiv II* forms, since in German (as also in English) it is only in unreal conditions that the protasis can be formulated by means of the auxiliary verb *sollte* ‘should.’ Consequently, the instantiation of the *Konjunktiv II* forms *sollte* and (analytic) *würde entgegenkommen* cannot be considered to have been primordially prompted by considerations of “reportedness.” In contrast, the Bulgarian translation (. . . *ако пожелаел друг ден, щели . . . да удовлетворят желанието му*) 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 . . . *ако пожелае друг ден, . . . ще удовлетворят желанието му* ‘if he desires another day, they will satisfy his wish’ *or* the “reported” analogue to the unreal condition . . . *ако пожелаеше друг ден, щяха . . . да удовлетворят желанието му* ‘if he desired another day, they would 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.*, *пожелаел [e] <—> пожелае ≈ пожелаеше, щели [са] <—> ще ≈ щяха*). (For a more detailed discussion, see note 3, this work).

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

Example 14

Das . . . Mädchen erzählt . . . , daß Baj Ganju sich tütlich an ihr vergriffen hatte, er hatte sie gepackt und nicht nur das,

Момата . . . ми разправи, че бай Ганю я оскърбил съ дѣйствиe, похваналъ я и не само я похваналъ, ами си извъртелъ

sondern hatte auch mit zusammengepreßten Zähnen versucht, die Hand um sie zu schlingen. (AK 1908: 74)

и ржката съ стиснати зѣби.

(AK 1908: 7)

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)

Стекълъ се градѣтъ, дошли хора отъ селата да просрещнатъ братята-българи, довели музика, дошелъ хоръ, наредили се сума момичета съ букети въ ржка . . . да ги поздравятъ . . . (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 мое отсъствие* ‘in my absence’ makes it clear that the narrator did not witness the event in question:

Example 16

In meiner Abwesenheit **photografierte** man die teuern Gäste und am folgenden Tag erschien die ganze Gruppe in einer illustrierten Zeitung. (AK 1908: 104)

Въ мое отсѣствие *фотографирали* скѣлите гости и на другия день въ единъ илюстрованъ вѣстникъ се появи цѣлата група. (AK 1908: 34)

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) Не съмъ бe, братко, какво съмъ и направилъ? (AK 1908: 7)

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

- (b) Dumm **sollen** die Bulgaren sein, was? (AK 1908: 83) Прости били българи, а!

(AK 1908: 13)

‘So Bulgarians are supposed to be dumb, eh?’

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, er *habe* irgend einen Verstoß gegen Baj Ganjus Geschmack *gemacht*.
(AK 1908: 106)

... мисли, че *е сторилъ* нѣкоя грѣшка противъ вкуса на бай Ганя.
(AK 1908: 36)

'... 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 сторил*). Since the subjects of both clauses are coreferential, the German translation actually reveals a marked first-person use of the *Konjunktiv I* (*er habe gemacht*), which prompts either the "inferential" reading 'he *must* have committed' or the potential reading 'he *might* have committed.'⁶

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 hätte Ihnen *gedroht*?« (FK 1946: 47)

«И без това няма да забравя, че ме заплашихте.« »Какво, аз *съм* ви заплашвал?« (FK 1993b: 23)

' — 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 *zwingt* Sie, mit mir in dieser Weise zu reden. Wirklich?« (FK 1946: 48)

»Твърдите, че природата ви *принуждавала* 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 *приказно наклонение* is not restricted to indirect speech and has, *inter alia*, admirative, 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 morphosemantic 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; German preterite/perfect/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 sentence subjects 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

* 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 sänge 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 "non-reported" 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-

junction *wenn* 'if' increases for the recipient of the message the likelihood that the original utterance was formulated as an unreal condition; consider in this regard the "reported" real condition *Sie sagte, sie hätte [-habe] alles schon vorbereitet, da sie etwa zehn Minuten später gekommen wären [-seien]* 'She said she had already had everything prepared since they had come some ten minutes later.' With respect to the cited Bulgarian sentence, the "non-reported" analogue, according to Симеонов (1989: 12), is the unreal-conditional sentence *Ако бяха дошли десетина минути по-късно, майка ми щеше да е приготвила вече всичко* 'If they had come some ten minutes later, my mother would have already had everything prepared.' Here, too, it is primarily the conjunction (*ако* 'if') that signals the likelihood that the reported utterance is an unreal condition; *cf.* *Понеже са дошли десетина минути по-късно, майка ми ще е приготвила вече всичко* 'Since they have come some ten minutes later, my mother will have already had everything prepared,' which prompts the instantiation of the same "reported" verb forms as the unreal condition when conveyed in renarrative modality (*Казва, че, понеже били дошли десетина минути по-късно, майка ѝ щяла да е приготвила вече всичко*).

— It could be argued that, since Bulgarian here does not exhibit specifically marked conditional (*i.e.*, modal) forms for the expression of an unreal condition, the Bulgarian expression of unreal conditions in a putative "renarrated mood" is not actually tantamount to the counterintuitive predication of a proposition in two moods simultaneously. That is to say, one could argue that it is actually the conditional semantics that are basically (formally) temporal and the semantics of "reportedness" that are modal. A solution to the quandary raised by such argumentation (at least as concerns the apodosis of the Bulgarian unreal-conditional sentence) is afforded by Aronson (1977: 15), who states that "since the marked modal categories denote the nonreality of the narrated event, it follows that any narrated event which is viewed as occurring (*i.e.*, which will occur) *after* the moment of the speech event is nonreal and therefore a category such as 'future tense' (if the language in fact has such a formal category) will be a modal rather than a temporal category. . . ." Moreover, if we transpose the sentence considered here into a *non-past* unreal condition (*Ако дойдеха десетина минути по-късно, майка ѝ щеше да приготи всичко навреме* 'If they were coming [-were to come] some ten minutes later, her mother would get everything prepared in time'), we see that re-expressing the apodosis by means of virtually synonymous conditional (*i.e.*, formally encoded modal) verb forms (. . . *майка ѝ би приготвила всичко навреме*) precludes any possibility of its reformulation by means of "reported" verb forms. In Bulgarian, in contrast to German (see above), this is not because modal morphology cannot be "superimposed," as it were, on morphology that is already modal, but because the Bulgarian marked conditional forms (*бих, би, би, etc.* + *I*-participle) are *temporally* restricted.

4. In other words, all moods are modalities, but not all modalities are moods.

5. According to Friedman (1982: 151-52), this view actually reflects that originally formulated by Б. Цонев as early as 1911 in his article "Определени и неопределени форми в българския език" (*Годишник на Софийския университет. Историко-филологически факултет* 7: 3-18).

6. The ambiguity of Bulgarian past indefinite verb forms with respect to "(non-)reportedness" is illustrated by Friedman himself (1982: 156-57). In a lengthy passage, "a little old lady" (*една бабичка*) says to someone called *хаджи Петър*, "Момчето ми е болно" ('My boy is sick'). To this *хаджи Петър* ultimately responds, ". . . като ти е било болно детето, . . . на ти пари да го целиш," which Friedman glosses as ". . .

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 било болно* should be construed here as "reported" (normative grammars prescribe *бъдело* rather than *[е] било* as renarrated present in any case — cf. Кръстев 1984: 79). In my opinion, *е било болно* represents here a typical use of the ("non-reported") perfect tense: 'since your child has been sick (and still is) . . .'

7. 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 *praesens historicum* (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*.

References

- Aronson, H.I. 1967. "The Grammatical Categories of the Indicative in the Contemporary Bulgarian Literary Language." *To Honor Roman Jakobson*, vol. 1. The Hague: Mouton, 82-98.
- Aronson, H.I. 1977. "Interrelationships Between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian." *Folia Slavica* 1, no. 1: 9-32.
- Brecht, R.D. 1974. "Tense and Infinitive Complements in Russian, Latin and English." *Slavic Transformational Syntax*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 193-218.
- Friedman, V.A. 1981. "Admirativity and Confirmativity." *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 17, no. 1: 12-28.
- Friedman, V.A. 1982. "Reportedness in Bulgarian: Category or Stylistic Variant?" *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 25/26: 149-63.
- Граматика 1983 = Българска Академия на Науките. Институт за български език. *Граматика на съвременния български книжовен език*, т. 2: Морфология. София: Изд-во на БАН.
- Кръстев, Б. 1984. *Морфологията на българския език в 187 типови таблици*. София: Наука и изкуство.
- Lindstedt, J. 1985. *On the Semantics of Tense and Aspect in Bulgarian*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press.
- Lohnes, W.F., and F.W. Strothmann. 1980. *German. A Structural Approach*. 3rd ed. New York/London: Norton.
- Панфилов, В.З. 1971. *Взаимоотношение языка и мышления*. Москва: Наука. (Reprinted: Panfilov, V. Z. 1974. *Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Sprache und Denken*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.)
- Panzer, B. 1991a. "Modalitäten und Modi in der Linguistik," in his *Studien zum slavischen Verbum*. Frankfurt a.M. et al.: Peter Lang, 180-92. (Originally published in *Otázky slovanské syntaxe III* [Brno, 1973], 63-72.)

- Panzer, B. 1991b. "Tempora in modaler Funktion im Bulgarischen," in his *Studien zum slavischen Verbum*. Frankfurt a.M. et al.: Peter Lang, 71-80. (Originally published in *Die slavischen Sprachen* 1 [1982], 49-59.)
- Panzer, B. 1991c. "Tempora, Aspekte und Modi im heutigen Bulgarischen," in his *Studien zum slavischen Verbum*. Frankfurt a.M. et al.: Peter Lang, 53-70. (Originally published in *Einundzwanzig Beiträge zum II. Internationalen Bulgaristenkongress, Sofia 1986*, 201-21.)
- Robert, P., comp. 1981. *Le Petit Robert. Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de la langue française*. Paris: Société du Nouveau Littérature.
- Roth, J. 1979. *Die indirekten Erlebnisformen im Bulgarischen. Eine Untersuchung zu ihrem Gebrauch in der Umgangssprache*. Munich: Otto Sagner.
- Симеонов, Й. 1989. "Из проблематика на съвременната българска глаголна система." *Език и литература* 44, no. 1: 10-20.
- Wahrig, G., comp. 1982. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 1980 ed. Munich: Mosaik Verlag.
- Wedel, A.R., and M. Savova. 1991. "Bulgarian Evidential, German Subjunctive and the Category of Person." *Germano-Slavica* 7, no. 1: 25-41.
- Weigand, G. 1907. *Bulgarische Grammatik*. Leipzig: J.A. Barth.

Literary Sources

- AK 1908 = Константинов, Алеко. *Бай Ганю*. Translated and edited by G. Weigand. Leipzig: J.A. Barth.
- FK 1946 = Kafka, Franz. "Betrachtung," in his *Gesammelte Werke. Erzählungen*. 3rd ed. Edited by M. Brod. New York: Schocken, 23-50.
- FK 1966 = Kafka, Franz. *DIE ROMANE Amerika, Der Prozeß, Das Schloß*. Reutlingen: S. Fischer Verlag.
- FK 1993a = Кафка, Франц. Translated by Д. Стоевски. *Процесът*. София: Фама.
- FK 1993b = Кафка, Франц. "Съзерцание," in his *Завръщане у дома. Разкази, фрагменти, скици*. Translated by Г. Фъркова and И. Иванова. София: Народна култура, 7-25.