Many treatments of Slavic aspect make the explicit or implicit assumption: “What's good for Russian is good for everyone else!” Such treatments even go so far as to use the terms Russian and Slavic interchangeably. To a lesser extent, accounts of aspect in other Slavic languages assume the same type of general validity. In like manner, the close relationship of Bulgarian and Macedonian has led some scholars to treat them as virtually identical linguistic systems, an approach which is reinforced by official Bulgarian political attitudes. In this article, therefore, I shall focus on the differences in the uses of verbal aspect in Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Russian. Ultimately, the study of such differences will not only serve to provide a better understanding of the language-specific meaning of aspect in the individual Slavic languages; it will also contribute to the definition of what is truly Slavic about Slavic aspect—that which the various Slavic languages do, in fact, share.

The data upon which this study is based have been drawn from a variety of sources and my own fieldwork, but the examples presented here are all taken from M. Šoloxov's short story Sudba čeloveka ["The Fate of [a] Man"] in its original Russian and in Bulgarian and Macedonian translations. The colloquial narrative style of this literary work allows a wide variety of constructions to occur, and the fact that Russian has the fewest morphologically marked verbal distinctions makes it the most suitable starting point. The comparison of translations is particularly felicitous for this type of study, given the minimal system of Russian and the fact that the use of the perfective/imperfective distinction is indeed very similar in all three languages. For while identical usage might, on occasion, result from the influence of the original, deviation from the expected correspondences must be attributed to conscious choices motivated by differences in the structures of the respective languages.

For the purposes of this article, I will take the view of perfective/imperfective aspect as a single, superordinate grammatical opposition whose meaning is inherent in the verbal stem. Questions such as the relationship of derived to nonderived imperfectives will be irrelevant to the considerations of this article. Biaspactual verbs—those for which the perfective/imperfective opposition is neutralized, such as Russian žeňits'ja 'get married', Macedonian mine 'pass', Bulgarian pljuja 'spit'—will not be discussed here; aside from these, all verbs in all three languages are marked for one aspect or the other and, in consequence of this marking, are subject to certain morphosyntactic rules. Thus, for example, the perfective cannot occur after certain verbs meaning 'begin', 'continue', 'finish'; nor can it denote ongoing (actual) present events in all three languages; the Russian perfective cannot form the analytic future in byr 'be'; the Macedonian perfective nonpast cannot occur outside of subordination to a limited set of particles; the Bulgarian perfective cannot form the present participle or adverb nor can it occur as a negated imperative (Lunt 1952:102, Maslov 1959:217, Forsyth 1970:230, Kramer 1983).

In addition to superordinate aspect, which is expressed through the opposition perfective/imperfective, three other grammatical categories will be of relevance for this article, specifically tense, mood, and subordinate aspect. The temporal opposition is the standard past/nonpast as defined, for example, in Jakobson 1957/71. The definition of nonindicative, marked mood as denoting ontologically nonreal events—or (objective) qualification of the narrated event, in Jakobson's terms—is based on Golab's work (1964) on verbal moods in Slavic (see also Kuryłowicz 1956, Aronson 1977). I use the term SUBORDINATE ASPECT for the imperfect/aorist opposition of Bulgarian and Macedonian and the determinate/indeterminate opposition of Russian. The Macedonian and Bulgarian imperfect/aorist opposition, which is limited to past-tense forms, is very close in meaning to the imperfective/perfective opposition. Thus, aorists are usually perfective and imperficts are usually imperfective. The existence of the perfective imperfect and the imperfective aorist, however, demonstrates that these must be treated as independent, interacting aspectual oppositions. While the precise meaning and relationship of the imperfect/aorist opposition is the subject of as much debate and controversy as that surrounding the perfective/imperfective, for the sake of the reader's general orientation I will say here that, just as the standard textbook view of the perfective/imperfective opposition is that the perfective is privatively marked for some meaning such as completion or totality, so in the imperfect/aorist opposition the imperfect is generally characterized as privatively marked either for a meaning relating to durativity or for one related to coordinated action (see Friedman 1977:24-33, 190 for further details). The determinate/indeterminate opposition of Russian can likewise be treated as a subordinate aspectual opposition although it is limited to fourteen imperfective verbs of motion but not limited to past-tense forms. The perfective-like quality of the determinate is well-known, and will prove relevant to the cross-linguistic comparison.
In comparing the noncorrespondences among Russian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian aspectual usages, the three categories of tense, mood, and subordinate aspect defined above serve to distinguish three sets of differences. These differences can each be represented as a gradation expressing the relative degree of frequency and/or acceptability in the choice of perfective vs. imperfective aspect in a given type of context in the three languages. For this article, I have distinguished eight types of contexts which clearly display such gradations: one temporal, three subordinate-aspectual, and four modal. In the discussion which follows, I will illustrate each of these contexts, after which I will present a summary of the comparative gradations of aspectual noncorrespondence, which in turn will suggest some of the ways the various Slavic languages differ in their use and interpretation of aspect.

The first context will be the temporal one of the so-called historical present, the use of the present to narrate events from the past. The basic definition and function of the historical present is the same in all three languages, as well as in many others (see, for example, Mutaščiev 1964 and Silva-Corvalán 1983), and yet there are significant differences in the actual patterns of its use. In all three languages, the historical present neutralizes the perfective/imperfective opposition: given a past-tense narrative using both perfective and imperfective forms, the past-tense forms will all become imperfective if the narrative is shifted to the historical present (see Maslov 1959:241-242, Comrie 1976:75). In literary texts, however, there is a significant difference in the frequency with which this technique is employed. It cannot be said that such a noncorrespondence is grammatically motivated since there is never a context which requires that a past tense form be neutralized to the present. The effective, or even correct, use of the historical present is essentially a question of stylistics. Nonetheless, as the stylistic manipulation of a grammatical category, the historical present raises questions relevant to the discussion here. The neutralization of the perfective/imperfective opposition that occurs in shifting the narrative from past to present and simultaneously shifting aspect from perfective to imperfective is by far most characteristic of Russian and least characteristic of Macedonian, with Bulgarian in the middle. Thus, for example, in Suđba čoveka fully half of the instances of noncorrespondence in the use of the historical present were examples in which Russian and Bulgarian shifted while Macedonian did not. This was especially true after verbs of speaking, thinking, and the like, as illustrated by example (1); as (2) shows, however, this noncorrespondence occurred in other contexts as well.

While the specific causes of these noncorrespondences must await further study, there is one important observation which can be made on the basis of these data. It has been suggested, for example by Mutaščiev (1964:139-147), that Bulgarian particularly favors the historical present due to the fact that its use neutralizes the complex distinctions of personal confirmation or nonconfirmation obligatorily marked in the past tense system. While this may, in fact, serve as a motivating factor on some occasions, it does not suffice to explain the intermediate position of Bulgarian between Macedonian and Russian. This is because, on the one hand, Russian—with the most historical presents—has a far simpler past-tense system devoid of the complexities of Bulgarian, while on the other hand, Macedonian has a past-tense system as complex as that of Bulgarian with the same types of morphologically marked grammatical distinctions. Clearly then, the explanation for the patterns of historical-present usage must be sought elsewhere.

The first two of the three subordinate aspectual gradations involve the relationship between the subordinate and superordinate aspects of Bulgarian and Macedonian and the single superordinate aspectual opposition of Russian. As I have already indicated, the overwhelming majority of Macedonian and Bulgarian aorists are perfective while imperfects are imperfective, and these correspond to the Russian perfective and imperfective, respectively. The two aspectual gradations under consideration here, however, concern the imperfective aorist and the perfective imperfect, highly marked forms which combine the semantically less compatible of the two sets of aspectual meaning. Taking Russian as one end-point of a continuum defined by relative simplicity of aspectual choices, Macedonian is closer to that end-point than Bulgarian with regard to the imperfective aorist, while the opposite relationship holds true between the two languages with regard to the perfective imperfect.
There are two sets of imperfective aorist forms: synthetic and analytic. The synthetic imperfective aorist is nearly obsolete in Macedonian. Speakers of the younger generation do not use it and even have trouble recognizing and understanding the forms, and it is clearly far less common and far more marginal than in Bulgarian. In the Šoloxov corpus, not a single Macedonian imperfective aorist occurred and fewer than a dozen occurred in Bulgarian. These almost always corresponded to Macedonian imperfective imperfects and to Russian imperfective pasts; superordinate aspect took precedence over subordinate aspect, although such is not always the case in comparisons of Macedonian and Bulgarian. The following examples are typical:

(3) R: Rabota\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Pa} ja eti desjat' let i den'i noč'. (8) M: Rabotev\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Im} jas tie deset godini i denje i nočke. (9) B: Rabotis\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Ao} az tija deset godini i den i nošt. (15) 'During those ten years I worked day and night.'

(4) R: Vezlo-vezlo\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Pa}, da i dovezlo\textsuperscript{Pa} do samoj rukci. (11) M: Me slušče\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Im}, pa me dosluži\textsuperscript{Pa} do nivni race. (12) B: Vārvja mi, vārvja\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Ao} mi, dokato mi preseče\textsuperscript{Pa} rākata (19) 'I lucked out and lucked out until I tricked right into their hands.'

The analytic imperfective aorist is a more complicated phenomenon and is best understood in the light of its diachronic background. The synthetic aorists and imperfects were all inherited by Macedonian and Bulgarian from Common Slavic. From this same ancestor they inherited a single perfect formed from the resultative participle in \textit{l}—itself based on the aorist stem—and the present auxiliary verb meaning 'be'. In the course of the development of Macedonian and Bulgarian, a second \textit{l}-particle based on the imperfect stem arose and significant changes in the meanings and relationships among the synthetic and analytic past tense forms occurred. The old perfect became transformed into what is now called the INDEFINITE PAST in traditional Bulgarian and Macedonian grammatical terminology, while nonetheless retaining, contextually, the resultative nuances for which it was originally marked. In both languages there are now two analytic, indefinite past forms: an imperfect and an aorist. In Macedonian, these forms are treated as aspectually parallel to the synthetic imperfect and aorist, which latter are collectively called the DEFINITE PAST in traditional Macedonian and Bulgarian grammatical terminology; subordinate aspect is not a distinguishing factor in the differentiation of the so-called definite (synthetic) and indefinite (analytic) past tense forms. In the conservative Bulgarian norm, however, the perfect (indefinite past) is said to be formed only from the aorist \textit{l}-participle, while the use of the imperfect \textit{l}-participle is said to occur in contrast with the aorist only in the so-called reported mood (preizkazno naklonenie), which is used for rendering nonwitnessed events and is distinguished from the indefinite past by the former's lack of an auxiliary in the third person. In actual practice, however, and also in the descriptions of less conservative grammarians, the analytic imperfect and aorist contrast in the indefinite past just as their synthetic counterparts contrast in the definite past (Popželjazkov 1962:89, Stankov 1967:341). In the comparison of Macedonian and Bulgarian, however, it is clear that Macedonian is more consistent in preserving the imperfect/aorist distinction in the indefinite past while Bulgarian still prefers the aorist participle, thus producing a number of formally imperfective aorists where Macedonian has the imperfective imperfect, as in the following typical example:

(5) R: Kto služil\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Pa} v armii ili do vojni rabotal šoferom, — šag vpered. (22) M: Koj služel\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Im} vo vojska ili do vojnata rabotel kako šofer — čekor napred! (24) B: Kojto e služil\textsuperscript{[1]}\textsuperscript{Ao} v armijata ili predi vojnata e bil šofor, kračka napred. (35) 'Whoever worked in the army or before the war as a driver take one step forward.'

The perfective imperfect is used primarily in modal constructions, but I am treating it as one of the aspectual gradations since its primary interest here is in its combination of superordinate and subordinate aspectual features, and a nonmodal type of usage is the principal factor in determining the gradation. Unlike the imperfective aorist, the perfective imperfect has an important, stable place in both the Macedonian and the Bulgarian systems. It functions to render conditional and iterative-habitual constructions. For the most part, the correspondences are straightforward: a Macedonian or Bulgarian perfective imperfect will correspond to a Russian perfective, either imperative, present, or conditional—all functioning modally—as in the following examples:

(6) R: A skaži ona mne xmešnomu slovo poperek, krikni\textsuperscript{Pl} ili obrugajsa, i ja by, kak bog svijat, i na vtoroj den' napilja. (8) M: A da mi kaže kako na pijan čovek prekoren zbor, da mi vikne\textsuperscript{Pl} ili da me iskara, i jas, žimi boga, i utredenta bi se napil. (9) B: A ako mi kažēšte, kako sâm pijan, njakoja opaka duma, ako mi vikne\textsuperscript{Pl} ili mi se skaraše, stjaj, vjarvaj mi, i na drugija den da se napija. (14)
'But if she had said to me, drunk as I was, a single word of reproach, if she had yelled or scolded, then by God I would have gotten drunk the next day, too.'

(7) R: I kulakami bili, i nogami, i rezinovymi palkami bili, i vsjačeskim železom, kakoe pod ruku populetsja\(^{\text{PnP}}\). (18)

M: I so tupanici tepaa, i so nože gaza, i so gumeni palki udrajaa, i so sekakvo železo koe ke im dopadneše\(^{\text{PIm}}\) v raka. (20)

B: I s jmurnici biexa, i s krakata tâpexa, i s gumeni palki udrjaja, i s vsjaakavi železa, kakvito im populneca\(^{\text{PIm}}\) pod raka. (29)

'They beat us with their fists, with their feet, with rubber clubs, with any kind of iron that came to hand.'

(8) R: Možet byť, vse i obošlos' by\(^{\text{P}^2}\) blagopolučno pri našem rasstavaniu, no ... (32)

M: Možebi, s'ke se svršeše\(^{\text{PIm}}\) ubavo pri našata razdelba, no ... (35)

B: Može bi vsičko štěše da mine\(^{\text{PIm}}\) blagopolučno pri našata razdjalja, no ... (49)

'Perhaps everything would have turned out fine at our parting, but ...'

There is one significant difference between Macedonian and Bulgarian, however, and this is in the use of the so-called "future-in-the-past." In Macedonian, this construction is formed with the invariant future marker ke and the perfective imperfect. In theory, literary Bulgarian permits an analogously formed construction, namely invariant ste and the perfective imperfect. In practice, however, such constructions do not occur in literary Bulgarian and are considered dialectal. The preferred form in Bulgarian separates the marking for the two types of aspect; the auxiliary is conjugated in the imperfect (stijax, steše, etc.), and the main verb is a perfective present subordinate to da, as in the form cited in (8).\(^6\) This type of perfective imperfect construction is limited to modal contexts in literary Bulgarian (Goštev 1964:22, Aronson 1977:27), but is permissible in iterative-habitual contexts in Macedonian, where Bulgarian either omits the future marker, if the form occurs in a subordinate clause as in (7), or uses an imperfective imperfect if there is a main clause, as in (9):

(9) R: Koe-kogda i mne oto nego perepadalo\(^{\text{LPS}}\). (22)

M: Ponekognas i mene od nego po nešto ke mi dopadneše\(^{\text{PIm}}\). (25)

B: I az ponjakoga zakacax\(^{\text{LIM}}\) nešto pokraj nego. (35)

'Once in a while I would get something from him.'

As a result of the restriction in Bulgarian illustrated by (9), Macedonian has a wider range of possibilities of employing the perfective imperfect.

The third type of aspecual gradation is an extremely limited phenom-
In this example, Bulgarian has two independent perfective nonpasts. One corresponds to a Macedonian perfective nonpast subordinated to the future marker ke and the other to a Macedonian imperfective present. The original Russian likewise has a perfective nonpast in the first clause, and although it happens to have an imperfective nonpast in the second clause, this does not change the basic fact that Russian has a wider range of contexts permitting independent perfective nonpasts (for example, the future), where Bulgarian, like Macedonian, normally requires a special marker (što). Thus, Bulgarian is midway between Russian and Macedonian in this type of gradation.

In the second gradation, the positions of Bulgarian and Macedonian are reversed. In Bulgarian, perfective imperatives cannot occur in negative constructions with ne ‘don’t’ (Maslov 1959:217). Macedonian permits the perfective imperative after ne, but its use is limited to threats and proverbs and does not involve genuine negative commands, as for example Ajde ne zemlj go, pa ke vidi što ke ti napravam (Koneski 1967:416) ‘Go ahead, don’t get it, and then just see what I’ll do to you!’ In Russian, the perfective imperative after ne is likewise limited to warnings, but the command is sincere (Forsyth 1970:257-59). The only example illustrative of the Šoloxov corpus has a negative optative construction in Macedonian, but the basic point remains the same: Russian has genuine negated perfective imperatives, Macedonian has the form but without a true imperative meaning, and Bulgarian does not even permit the form:

(13) R: A rabotu davay, i slova ne skazi. (18)
M: A vamu raboti, i da ne pisnes. (20)
B: A pri tova raboti i gak ne kazvaj. (29)
‘Just you work, and don’t let out a peep.’

The third gradation relates to the use of the imperfective imperative in Russian for a meaning which Forsyth (1970:215) calls ‘insistent.’ This same type of use can also be found in Bulgarian and Macedonian, but it is less likely to be interpreted as “polite”; hence the choices in the following example, where the wife is trying to hum and protect her drunken husband:

(14) R: Ložis’ k stenke, Andrijaša. (8)
M: Legni si do dzidot, Andrijaša. (8)
B: ‘Lie down by the wall, Andrijaša.’

The final set of examples illustrate differences in aspect choice in certain deontic modal constructions. These examples all have a Russian imperfective infinitive corresponding to a perfective nonpast da-clause in both Macedonian and Bulgarian. All three languages have a relative degree of freedom in permitting both aspects after deontic modals; the perfective is “normal” but the imperfective is equally permissible for special effects. The differences seem to be due to the nature of the special effects in question. It would appear that the effect is one of objectivization in Russian but subjectivization in Macedonian and Bulgarian (Forsyth 1970:267-268, Stankov 1980:116-17). Be that as it may, the following examples demonstrate that whatever the effect intended by the Russian imperfective, the Bulgarian and Macedonian translators did not feel that it would be rendered by the same aspect in their native languages:

(15) R: Dolžna by ponimat’, čto mne tože nelegko s nimi rasstavas’. (9)
M: Bi trebalže da razbire deka i mene, isto taka, ne mi je lesno da se razdeluam od niv. (10)
B: Trjubvaše da razbere če i na mene ne mi e leko da se razdeljam s njaj. (16)
‘She should have understood that it wasn’t easy for me to part with them either.’

(16) R: Perepravljaj’s nado byo na utolj ploskodonke. (3)
M: Trebaše da se preflite so eden nesiguren izgnjen čun so ramno dno. (4)
B: Trjubvaše da ja premimen s prugnila ploskodančka. (8)
‘We had to cross in a leaky flat-bottomed boat.’

(17) R: Pridetsja mne ego končat’. (16)
M: Ė koram jača davšam so nego. (17)
B: Šte trjubva az da go svarka. (26)
‘I’ll have to finish him off myself.’

As can be seen from the data in this article, the use of the distinction perfective/imperfective differs significantly among Russian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian. Thus, while it may be possible to characterize the gross features of the aspectual opposition in similar or identical terms for all three languages, it is impossible to treat the specific data from one language as identical for Slavic as a whole. Starting from the minimal system of
Russian, I have adduced three types of contexts in which language-specific aspectual differences are manifested: 1) the interaction of aspect and tense, 2) the interaction of superordinate and subordinate aspect, 3) the interaction of aspect with modality.

Each noncorrespondence in the use of aspect among the three languages can be expressed as a gradation between the relative frequency or acceptability of the perfective and that of the imperfective resulting from the tendencies and rules in each language. Thus Macedonian will have the most perfectives and Russian the most imperfectives in the contexts of the historical present and the perfective imperfect, because Russian makes the greatest use of the historical present; and Macedonian has the broadest range of applications for the perfective imperfect, in cases where both Russian and Bulgarian would use imperfectives. In contrast, Russian has the most perfectives and Bulgarian the most imperfectives in the contexts of the imperfective aorist and the negated imperative; because Bulgarian does not permit negated imperfective imperatives and because in contexts where "aoristness" takes precedence over imperfectivity, both Macedonian and Russian will have a perfective (see note 4). In the case of the independent perfective, Russian again has the most perfectives, but it is Macedonian which has the most imperfectives, since independent perfectives are ungrammatical in that language and some of the contexts where they are permissible in Russian or Bulgarian have imperfectives in Macedonian. Finally, in the contexts of the Russian imperfective determinate, positive imperfective imperative, and deontic imperfective, Macedonian and Bulgarian pattern together and are opposed to Russian in their tendency to use perfectives. These data are summarized graphically and are presented in table 1.

    P ←→ I

TENSE
1. Use of the historical present (P — I)       M  B  R

SUBORDINATE ASPECT
1. Perfective imperfect                  M  B  R
2. Imperfective aorist                   R  M  B
3. Imperfective determinate              MB  R

MODALITY
1. Negated perfective imperative         R  M  B
2. Independent perfective                R  B  M
3. Positive imperfective imperative      MB  R
4. Deontic imperfective                  MB  R

Table 1

On the basis of the data presented in Table 1, it is possible to make the following generalizations. First of all, while it may come as no surprise, it is nevertheless worth stating that Russian never comes between Macedonian and Bulgarian in a gradation; Macedonian and Bulgarian are never so divergent that either is closer to Russian than to the other. Of the five gradations in which Bulgarian and Macedonian pattern separately, Bulgarian is closer to Russian in three of them, and the behavior of Macedonian in the other two is closer to Bulgarian than it is to Russian. As a general tendency, Russian favors the imperfective in a wider variety of contexts than either Macedonian or Bulgarian, and Macedonian favors perfectives more than Russian. The most important generalization, however—and this is the main point of this article—is that a description of the perfective/imperfective opposition cannot be made in absolutely identical terms for all the Slavic languages. It is possible that certain differences in aspectual usage can be accounted for in terms of the language-specific interpretation of what may be construed as some type of shared basic meaning. Nonetheless, stylistic restraints and the interaction with other grammatical categories result in far more differences in the treatment of aspect in the individual Slavic languages than is generally acknowledged. The individual systems are clearly divergent in many respects, with the result that what may be within the scope of the aspect system of one Slavic language is not necessarily within the scope of another.
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NOTES
1. Examples are cited from: (Russian) Mixail Soloxov, 1956/82. Sudba čeloveka. Tashkent; (Macedonian) 1970. Sudbinata na čovekot, trans. Cvetko Martinovski. Skopje; (Bulgarian) 1981. Sbětata na čoveka, trans. Asja Spirova. Sofia. Numbers following examples refer to the pagination of these editions. The English glosses are my own, and when there are minor differences among the three languages (those irrelevant to verbal aspect) I have generally followed the Russian original. Unless otherwise stated, I treat only the literary codifications of the three languages throughout. I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the assistance of the Center for Bulgarian Studies, the Institute for the Macedonian Language, the Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Commission for Information of the SRM, which have consistently supplied me with materials which have aided my research.

2. The remaining grammatical oppositions in Macedonian and Bulgarian (taxis, status, and resultativity) will not, for the most part, enter into this discussion. Given that Russian has only a single set of past-tense forms, the subtleties of the Macedonian and Bulgarian systems are simply lost or rendered by other means, and as this article focuses on the use of subordinate aspect, the question of when Macedonian and Bulgarian choose to use additionally marked categories when translating from Russian is beyond its scope.
3. Comrie (1976:75) states that the perfective can be used in the historical present in Bulgarian, but both Maslov (1959:241 42) and Mufafčev (1964:54-55) unequivocably state that such usage is nonliterary and characteristic of West Bulgarian dialects. Its use in literature is for the purpose of producing the effect of dialectal (nonstandard) speech (see also Stankov 1981:96).

4. In my fieldwork in Macedonia, I found that speakers confronted with imperfective aorists tended to replace them with perfective aorists, suggesting that subordinate aspect took precedence (Friedman 1977:135). This may have to do with factors such as context and direction of translation, but such questions must be the topic of a subsequent study. In any case, the realization of the potential dominance of subordinate aspect can and does result in Macedonian perfectives where Bulgarian would have imperfectives, although there were few examples of this in the Šolovor corpus. The position of Russian in this gradation also requires further investigation. In general, if Macedonian had a perfective, so did Russian. My conclusions on this gradation, however, are to be regarded as extremely tentative.

5. For more on this topic, see Friedman 1982.

6. Macedonian also has constructions of the type ke da dojde instead of ‘he will/must have come’, but they are rare and limited to suppositional contexts (see Kramer 1983).

7. It should be noted that in imperatives Macedonian and Bulgarian often use imperfectives corresponding to Russian determinates, e.g. Idi... (R,B), Odi... (M) ‘Go...’
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