

The Grammatical Expression of Presumption and Related Concepts in Balkan Slavic  
and Balkan Romance

*American Contributions to the 12th International Congress of Slavists*, ed. by Michael  
Flier and Alan Timberlake. 1998. Bloomington: Slavica. 390-405

Victor A. Friedman

Howard Aronson's contributions to the study of verbal categories represent some of the most important advances in this area of linguistic investigation since Jakobson's (1932/1971, 1957/1971) seminal articles. Building on work by Gołąb (1964), Janakiev (1962), and Kuryłowicz (1956:26), Aronson's (1977) discussion of aspect and mood in Bulgarian introduced a significant modification of Jakobson's (1957/1971) system by defining mood as the qualification of the narrated event without reference to the speech event or participants and status as the relationship of the participant in the speech event (the speaker) to the narrated event, thus effectively replacing Jakobson's category of *evidential*. Aronson, however, while adducing Jakobson's Bulgarian example of evidentiality in his redefinition of status, does not explicitly reject the notion of a separate category of evidentiality. In his subsequent comprehensive reworking of Jakobson's scheme, Aronson (1991) defines status as the relation of the narrated event to the speech event and still leaves open the possibility of an evidential category defined as the qualification of the narrated event by participant in the speech event. In footnote 10 of that work, however, Aronson observes that I have adduced evidence from a number of languages in support of the argument that the notional meaning 'evidential' can be derived from the category of status (Friedman 1979, 1986, 1988a) and he states: "I agree with Friedman and know of no language that has evidential as its invariant meaning. Evidential is given in Table I, but all the evidence indicates that it should not be." (p. 130). Aronson's ideas on the interrelationships of status, aspect, and mood have been crucial to my own work on grammatical categories (Friedman 1977, 1986), and it is therefore with respect, gratitude

and affection that I dedicate this paper to Howard Aronson, who celebrated his sixtieth birthday on 5 March 1996.<sup>1</sup>

In earlier work, I have argued that the various uses of status categories in different languages form a range of semantic isoglosses (Friedman 1988a, 1988b, 1994) that comprises the Balkans and the Caucasus as well as the intervening Anatolian plateau (for Armenian, see Kozniceva 1991). In this paper, I shall extend this research by examining the Romanian presumptive mood in a comparative Balkan context. In so doing, I shall show that status categories in Balkan Slavic (and Turkish) occupy a position midway between the paradigmaticized indicative expression of non-confirmative status found in Albanian (and Vlah) and the analytic modalities of Romanian. This in turn suggests a gradation from modality to indicativity in the expression of non-confirmative status that is connected with the grammaticalization of the relationship of the participant in the speech event (P<sup>S</sup>) to the narrated event (E<sup>n</sup>).<sup>2</sup> The central position of Balkan Slavic vis-à-vis Albanian and Romanian reflects both differences in the encoding of status and the role of marked confirmativity in Balkan Slavic. Moreover, the grammatical sources and realizations of status categories have relevance for the debate of typological versus areal explanations of their origins.

The development of verbal categories marked for indicative status—i.e., verb forms or usages specifying the speaker's level of commitment to the truth of the utterance and often referred to by terms such as *evidential*, *reported*, *re-narrated*, *imperceptive*, *auditive*, *dubitative*, *admirative*, *witnessed*, etc., and which I refer to as the opposition confirmative/non-confirmative—has never figured in the catalogue of classic Balkanisms. This can be attributed largely to the apparent or putative absence of such categories from Greek (but cf. Beševliev 1928) and Balkan Romance, coupled with their elusive nature. Unlike obvious phenomena such as definite articles, modal subordinators, future auxiliaries, and numeral formation, status categories are difficult to define (as seen in the voluminous literature that has evolved around them),<sup>3</sup> and sometimes even to identify (as evidenced by

the fact that they are not mentioned in the earliest modern grammars of Bulgarian and Albanian; cf. Pärvev 1975, Ismajli 1982, Kastrati 1980). Moreover, due to their expressive semantics, marked nonconfirmative status categories and usages, e.g. the Albanian admirative paradigms and Balkan Slavic paradigms with auxiliaries in the *I*-form, are characteristic of colloquial spoken discourse and quite rare in textual sources, especially formal and narrative prose.

In their general studies of Balkan linguistics, Banfi (1985) does not include status categories at all, while Sandfeld (1930:119–0), Schaller (1975:79, 94), Feuillet (1986:67), Asenova (1989:203–4), and Demiraj (1994:169–1) all treat the Albanian and Balkan Slavic phenomena as a bilateral correspondence at best, sometimes with Turkish as the possible model (cf. Goļab 1960; Demiraj 1971; Friedman 1978, 1980, 1981).<sup>4</sup> More recently, however, marked status categories have been described for the South Balkan Romance languages.<sup>5</sup> Atanasov (1984) observed that Megleno-Romanian has an inverted perfect that conveys precisely the same meanings as the specifically nonconfirmative uses of the Macedonian *I*-form, i.e. reported, admirative and dubitative.<sup>6</sup> Friedman (1994) and Markoviċ (1995) have described the first attestation of a morphologically marked status category in Arumanian, in the dialect of Gorna Belica (Beala di Suprâ) in southwestern Macedonia.

It is worth noting here—as I observed in Friedman 1988b and as was also indicated by Markoviċ (1995)—that in the extreme southwest of Macedonia, where the new perfect in *ima* ‘have’ has completely replaced the resultative and indefinite uses of the old perfect (verbal *I*-form), only the marked non-confirmative uses of the *I*-form—i.e., admirative, dubitative, and reported—survive. Similarly, new paradigms built with *I*-form auxiliaries, e.g. Macedonian paradigms of the type *imal napraveno* and Bulgarian paradigms of the type *bil napravil*, both meaning ‘he has/had [supposedly] done’ are markedly non-confirmative. This is in opposition to the old perfect (past indefinite) itself, which in Bulgarian and most of Macedonian has non-confirmative contextual variant meanings but

nonetheless also retains resultative and other non-status meanings in opposition to the markedly confirmative past definite. Thus Balkan Slavic and Turkish share the opposition of marked confirmative pasts—e.g. Mac. *nápravi*, Bulg. *naprávi*, Turk. *yaptı*—to an unmarked past with resultative, indefinite and non-confirmative contextual variant meanings—e.g. Mac. *nápravil*, Bulg. *naprávil [e]*, Turk. *yapmış*— which are semantic developments in already existing morphological material.

Examples (1–5) in Macedonian and (6) in Bulgarian illustrate the opposition. (1) illustrates the use of the confirmative past for a non-witnessed action; (2) illustrates both types of past used by speakers with the same sources of (indirect) information; (3) illustrates the speaker’s choice of emphasizing which information is vouched for despite the fact that all the information comes from the same source; (4) illustrates the speaker’s manipulation of confirmative and non-confirmative forms based on his sense of recollection; (5) shows the neutral, i.e. unmarked, use of the non-confirmative in a situation where the question of vouching for the information is irrelevant; (6) illustrates the fact that the presence versus absence of the third person auxiliary in the Bulgarian non-confirmative is not itself connected with the source of information (for detailed analysis and argumentation see Friedman 1982 and especially Fielder 1995, 1997, where auxiliary omission is analyzed as a pragmatically conditioned discourse function; cf. also Lindstedt 1993:47 and Grickat 1954).

(1) Kaži kako *begaše*. [Said by a legitimate daughter to her mother, Dolneni, 28 September 1973]

‘Tell [the story of] how you *eloped*.’

(2) [Zuza] Blaže *bil* vo Moskva. [Kosta] Da, *beše*. [Skopje, 6 October 1986]

‘[Zuza] Blaže *was* in Skopje. [Kosta] Yes, [I know] he *was*.’

(3) Mu se javiv na vujko mi. Ne *beše* doma, na plaža *bil*. [conversation based on telephone call, Ohrid, 28 august 1992]

‘I called my uncle. He *was* not home, [apparently] he *was* at the beach.’

(4) Bugarite od Sofija—zošto *ne doagjaa* vo Ohrid? Tie *bea* ... ne se seќavam točno... tie *bile* vo Ohrid porano. *Bea* vo maj mesec! I taka nemaše pari. [conversation, Skopje, 12 December 1995]

‘The Bulgarians from Sofia, why *didn’t* they come to Ohrid.? They *were* ... I don’t remember exactly... they *were* in Ohrid earlier—they *were* there in May—and so there wasn’t [any more] money.’

(5) Liceto koe *podnelo* baranje za nostrifikacija, odnosno priznavanje na ekvivalencija na svidetelstvo steknato vo stranstvo, može uslovno da go posetuva naredното oddelenie, dokolku postapkata ne e završena do istekot na rokot za upis na učenicite vo učilište. [*Zakon za osnovното obrazovanie*, člen 92, *Služben vesnik na Republika Makedonija* 20 September 1995, vol. 51 no. 44, p. 1134]

‘A person who *has submitted* an application for the certification or recognition of equivalency of a diploma earned abroad may provisionally attend the appropriate class insofar as the process is not completed before the expiration of the deadline for the registration of students in the school.’

(6) vednāz *e pātuval* ot Burgas nadolu kām granicata—selo Fakija—i *pātuval* toj—*stignal* e večerta do njakakvo selo s rejs i sled tova *trjabvalo* da premine. (Roth 1979:117)

‘once he *traveled* from Burgas down toward the border—the village of Fakija—and so he *traveled*—in the evening he *got* to some village with bus service and then he *was supposed* to go on.’

In contrast to the development of status categories involving the reinterpretation of already existing forms, Albanian and Vlah together with Balkan Slavic have in the course of the past few centuries developed new, markedly non-confirmative paradigms each in its own way.<sup>7</sup> The Balkan Slavic languages have expanded their inventory of auxiliaries—‘have’ in the case of Macedonian, ‘be’ in the case of Bulgarian—(Table 1), Megleno-Rumanian shifted the order of its elements (Table 2), Albanian both shifted element order and then expanded its auxiliary inventory, while the Frasherote dialect of Arumanian from Beala di Suprâ borrowed and reinterpreted a shifted Albanian element (Table 3).<sup>8</sup>

|            | confirmative | unmarked (non-confirmative) | marked non-confirmative |
|------------|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Macedonian | napravi      | napravit / ima napraveno    | imal napraveno          |
| Bulgarian  | napravi      | napravit [e]                | bil napravil            |

Table 1: Macedonian and Bulgarian confirmative/non-confirmative 3sg. ‘do’

|          |          |
|----------|----------|
| vizút-ăm | vizút-ăm |
| vizút-ăĭ | vizút-ăĭ |
| vizút-ăŭ | vizút-ăŭ |

Table 2: The Megleno-Romanian Inverted Perfect of ‘see’

|                | Arum.          | Alb.     |  | Arum.        | Alb.                     |
|----------------|----------------|----------|--|--------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Present</b> | ari            | ka       |  | avuska       | paska                    |
| <b>Perfect</b> | ari avută      | ka pasur |  | avuska avută | paska pasur <sup>9</sup> |
|                | Non-admirative |          |  | Admirative   |                          |

Table 3: 3sg Indicative of ‘have’ (present & perfect) in Albanian and Arumanian

Examples (7–9) are typical illustrations of the three types of marked non-confirmative usage. Although they are all taken from Albanian, equivalent usages could be supplied from Vlah, Balkan Slavic, or Turkish. Example (7) is neutral, a usage most often encountered when the source of information is an objective report. Example (8) illustrates the type traditionally labeled *dubitative*, although the semantics of the usage are ironic disbelief or sarcastic repetition rather than doubt *per se*. Example (9) is admirative *sensu stricto*, i.e. an expression of genuine surprise.

(7) Gëzohem se *qenkeni* mirë me shëndet. [personal letter, Prishtina, 4 April 1995)

‘I’m glad [to learn that] you *are* in good health.’ [non-confirmative, reported]

(8) Sipas një neokomunisti serb Kosova na *qenka* “pjesa më e sigurt e Serbisë”

[Kosovo Information Center, Informatori ditor no. 1167, Prishtina, 26 September 1995]

‘According to a Serbian neocommunist Kosova *is* [supposedly] the most secure part of Serbia’ [dubitative]

(9) Ti *kërceyeke* shumë mirë! [conversation, Tirana, 27 August 1995]

‘You *dance* very well!’ [admirative]

All of these phenomena illustrate indicative status categories, i.e. they do not involve any form of marked modality in the sense defined by Aronson (viz. the qualification of the narrated event as ontologically unreal). Turning now to the Romanian presumptive mood (*modul prezumtiv*), we find that the same complex of meanings that occur in forms marked for non-confirmative status in the aforementioned Balkan languages are attributed to this set of paradigms, i.e. supposition, (ironic) doubt, surprise, report. Sentences (10–13) are typical examples.

(10) Mihai, oare *să fi existînd* strigoi? (Vasiliu 1966:223)

‘Mihai, do ghosts really *exist*?’

(11) —Îți zice lumea “Niculăiță Minciună”?

—Mi-*o fi zicînd*. (Iorgu and Robu 1978:473)

‘—Do they call you “Nick the liar”?’

—They [supposedly] *call* me that.’

(12) Pe lîngă urs se spune că *ar fi avînd* și această pajură care-l priveghează.

(Vasiliu 1966:224)

‘Alongside the bear it is said that *there is* said to be this golden eagle that keeps a vigil over him.’

(13) Rugăm pe toți românii iubitori de istoria nației să ne facă cunoscute hrisoavele ce *vor fi avînd* și care au o importanță istorică. (Vasiliu 1966:224)

‘We ask all Romanians who are amateurs of the history of the nation to make known to us the charters which they *might have* and which have historical significance.’



There is disagreement, however, concerning precisely which paradigms enter into this mood and even whether it constitutes a paradigmatic set. There are three elements that combine to form the presumptive: a) the future or conditional auxiliary or the subjunctive or future particle plus b) the invariant non-finite form *fi* ‘be’ plus c) the gerund or past participle of the main verb.<sup>10</sup> The maximum of possibilities is summarized in Table 4, in which any first element can combine with the second element and either third element.<sup>11</sup>

|                                                            |               |    |                       |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----|-----------------------|
| voi-vei-va-vom-veți-vor ~ o ~ i ~ oi-oi-o-om-oți-or (etc.) | (future)      | fi | lucrînd (present)     |
| să                                                         | (subjunctive) |    |                       |
| aș ai-ar-am-ați-ar                                         | (conditional) |    | lucrat (past/perfect) |

Table 4: The Daco-Romanian Presumptive Mood—Maximum Possible Inventory

The majority of scholars treat the presumptive as a paradigm but disagree regarding which constructions are to be included in it. Dimitriu (1979:269–71, 311–2), Iorgu and Robu (1978:473), Irimia (1976:117–3), Goudet (1977), and others (see Halvorsen 1973:28–0) all represent the maximalist approach, i.e. the presumptive is said to constitute a separate mood consisting of both a present and a past (perfect) and utilizing all the possible formants. Mallinson (1968:284, 289) and Siever (1953:161) take a minimalist stance, citing only the future format + *fi* + gerund as presumptive, without any indication that this position is open to debate. Vasiliu (1966:216, 271) and Beldescu and Popescu (1972:145, 221) hold an intermediate position that can be termed *partialist*, treating the present presumptive as a separate mood (*modul prezumtiv*) utilizing any of the possible formants but classifying past presumptive constructions as modal uses of the future, subjunctive, and conditional perfect, with which they are totally homonymous. Luxt’s (1970:127) description represents a reduced version of the maximalists: she treats the presumptive as a separate mood and admits all the possible present constructions, but for the past (perfect) she cites only constructions with the future formant. Halvorsen (1973:28–0) represents the syntagmatic

position, i.e. presumptive constructions do not constitute a mood (paradigmatic set), but rather periphrastic constructions. Vasiliu (1966:216) also states that insofar as there is no difference in meaning among the uses of the various formants, the presumptive does not constitute a proper mood in the sense of a conjugational modal category. Although she does not use the term, she implies that the constructions constitute a discourse function. Nonetheless, for the purposes of her exposition she treats the presumptive in the conventional modal framework. Similarly, Manoliu-Manea (1994:270, 273, 307–3) does not directly address the question of paradigmaticity of the presumptive, but her presentation of the presumptive in her account of the grammaticalization of discourse functions is implicitly maximalist or reduced maximalist. We can note here in passing that at the other end of the grammatical spectrum, Slave (1957) treats the presumptive as a separate, periphrastic conjugation with three moods (indicative, subjunctive, conjunctive). Dimitriu (1979:269) dismisses this view by pointing out that there is no difference in meaning among the three types of formants when used in the presumptive. The arguments for treating the presumptive paradigmatically invoke its distinct intonation, the fact that it is used in absolute constructions, that it is contextually unambiguous, and, in the case of the present presumptive, the fact that there is no possible homonymy with any other category or usage. Arguments for treating the presumptive pragmatically include the fact that there is no semantic differentiation among the formants and there is total homonymy between the past presumptive and the modal perfects.<sup>12</sup> Regardless of the solution chosen, the Romanian constructions are clearly closer to discourse functions than the paradigms of Albanian and Vlah.

Examples (14–20) illustrate constructions of the type formant + *fi* + past participle, which have been adduced to illustrate the difference between a past presumptive and the modal perfects. (14) and (15) are identified as pure presumptives with subordination to the verb of reporting providing the clarifying context. Examples (16–20) contain constructions that can be interpreted as presumptive or non-presumptive depending on the context. In

(16), The first sentence can be interpreted either as a presumptive or a future perfect and is disambiguated by the second. Example (17) by itself would be interpreted as presumptive with any of the three formants, and (18–20) show how the same clause, when part of a complex sentence, functions as a future, subjunctive, or conditional perfect, respectively.

(14) Iar doamna lui Dragoș vodă, așa povestescu oamenii acei de locu, de la târgul Siretului, cum *să fie fost* de leage sască. [Moldavian chronicle, cited in Maoliu-Manea 1994:310]

‘But king Dragoș’s lady, as the people of the place, the market town of the river Siret, say, *was* of Saxon religion.’

(15) Zice că *ar fi citit* lecția. (Dimitriu 1979:269)

‘He says that he *has read* the lesson’

(16) *Va fi citit* el acest roman?

(a) Mă îndoiesc. (b) Vom sta de vorbă numai după ce-l *vei fi citit* și tu. (Irimia 1976:118)

*Will* he *have read* this novel?

(a) I doubt it. (presumptive) (b) We’ll talk only after you *have read* it, too.’  
(future perfect)

(17) *Va/Să/Ar fi ajuns* el pîna acolo? (Dimitriu 1979:271)

‘*Has* he *gotten* there?’ (presumptive)

(18) Cînd ea va fi acasă, el *va fi ajuns* pîna acolo. (Dimitriu 1979:271)

‘When she gets home, he *will have gotten* there. (future perfect)

(19) În alte condiții nu ar fi fost posibil *să fi ajuns* el pîna acolo. (Dimitriu 1979:271)

‘Otherwise, it wouldn’t have been possible for him *to have gotten* there.’

(subjunctive perfect)

(20) Dacă ar fi ajuns el pîna acolo, alta *ar fi fost* situația. (Dimitriu 1979:271)

‘If he had gotten there things *would have been* different.’ (conditional perfect)

As noted above, the past presumptive is always morphologically homonymous with a modal perfect. This situation is reminiscent of the multiply homonymous verbal paradigms of traditional Bulgarian grammar as codified by Andrejčín, e.g., Bulgarian *bil pravil* is described as belonging to three distinct and totally homonymous paradigms: the reported perfect of *pravil e*, as the reported pluperfect of *beše pravil*, and as the emphatic reported aorist of *pravi* (Andrejczin 1938:57). The debate over grammatical versus pragmatic motivations for the omission of the third person auxiliary in the Bulgarian past indefinite can also be mentioned (cf. the discussion at (9) above). Unlike Bulgarian and Romanian, Macedonian, especially in the southwest (like Albanian and Vlah), has a higher degree of clearly grammaticalized non-confirmativity and does not operate with multiply homonymous or pragmatically determined constructions.

In an attempt to compare the Romanian presumptive to forms and usages in other Balkan languages, I conducted a search the Romanian translation of Konstantinov’s *Baj Ganjo*, a work which I have used in the past to investigate Balkan indicative status categories (Friedman 1978). Owing to its extensive use of colloquial and expressive language, *Baj Ganjo* is particularly suitable for investigating these types of constructions, but in the entire text of some 200 pages I found only three present presumptives, those of (21–23). Among the candidates for past presumptives, there were significant differences in the use of formants: 51 examples used the conditional, 5 used the subjunctive, and 7 used the future. In the case of the future, the translator made a clear distinction between the

literary auxiliary with initial *v*- and the colloquial auxiliary with initial *o*-. The two examples with the *v*-auxiliary were unambiguously anterior futures and translated Bulgarian future constructions, whereas the *o*-auxiliary constructions all carried some sort of nuance of attenuated reality and corresponded to Bulgarian present or past tenses.<sup>13</sup> In the case of *să*-constructions, three occurred in subordinate subjunctive constructions and two were in independent clauses that could be classified as presumptive. The conditional examples were primarily modal, but the few candidates for past presumptives, given as (24–6), clearly could not be construed as conditionals in the traditional sense; that fact argues for a past presumptive as a paradigm rather than a discourse function, although the matter cannot be considered settled without further investigation.

In comparing the different languages' use of non-confirmative categories, the most striking result to emerge is the fact that while some Albanian admiratives correspond to Balkan Slavic and Turkish non-confirmative uses, and in turn some Balkan Slavic and Turkish non-confirmatives are equivalent to Romanian presumptives, there was not a single instance of a correspondence between an Albanian admirative and a Romanian presumptive in the entire corpus.

The following examples illustrate the various correspondences and non-correspondences described above.<sup>14</sup> Example (21) is a clear instance in which the Romanian present presumptive corresponds to Balkan Slavic and Turkish non-confirmative pasts and yet Albanian has a plain imperfect. In the context of this example, the speaker is emphasizing that he has no basis for vouching for the information other than the words of someone else:

- (21) [R] Cînd se întoarse, veni cu surdomutul, îmi spuse cum că băiatul *ar fi avînd* în Bulgaria un frate ofițer, ori funcționar—nu mi-aduc aminte —, care avea să-i trimită cîte-o sută de franci pe lună...

- [B] Kato dojde tazi godina s gluhonjamoto momče, kaza mi, če tuj momče *imalo* u vas, v Bălgarija, brat činovnik ili oficerin—ne pomnja,—kojto štjal da mu otpušta po sto franka ežemesečno... (IX)
- [M] Koga dojde taa godina so gluvo-nemoto dete, mi reče, deka toa *imalo* kaj vas, vo Bugarija, brat činovnik ali oficer—ne pametam, koj ќе mu pračkal sekoj mesec po sto franka...
- [A] Kur erdhi këtë vit përsëri, po tani i shoqëruar nga djali shurdh e memec, më tha se ai fëmijë *kishte* në vëndin tuaj, në Bullgari, një vëlla nëpunës a oficer—s'më kujtohet ç'më tha—që do t'i dërgonte njëqin [sic] franga për çdo muaj...
- [T] Bu yıl, beraberinde sağır ve dilsiz çocukla geldiği zaman bana şunları yutturdu: Sözde bu çocuğun Bulgaristan'da memur mu, subay mı, pek iyi hatırlayamıyorum, ağabeyisi *varmış* ... kardeşine her ay yüz frank gönderecekti
- ' When he came back that year with a deaf-mute lad, he told me that this boy *had* a brother who was an official or an officer—I don't remember which—in your country, in Bulgaria, who was going to send him one hundred francs a month....'

Examples (22) and (23) express doubt and surprise, and yet only Romanian uses a non-confirmative form. In both cases, the voice is the narrator's making an aside, which suggests a discourse function.

- (22) [R] Orice fel de raporturi sau acțiuni care nu i-ar fi adus lui Botkov ... vreun folos ori chilipir erau lipsite de sens pentru el. (*Or fi existînd oare în limbile europene cuvinte corespunzătoare în privința asta?*)

- [B] Nikakvi dejstvija i otnošenija njamaha smisāl za Bodkova ... ako ot tjah ne proiztičaše nešto kJORAVO, njakoj kelepir. (Dali *ima* v evropejskite ezici dumi, sāotvetstvjušti na tija, v tova im značenie?) (VII)
- [M] Nikakvi dejstva i obnoski nemea smisla i za Bodkov ... ako od niv ne izleguvaše nešto koro, nekoj kelepir. (Dali *ima* vo evropskite jazici zborovi što odgovaraat na ovie, vo toa nivno značenje?)
- [A] Kēshtu ngjante edhe me Bodkovin,... Për të asnjë veprim apo marrëdhënie s’do të kish të kuptim, po të mos dilte prej tyre qelepiri. (*Ekziston vallë në gjuhët evropiane kjo fjalë? Po s’ka rëndësi*).
- [T] Sonuç olarak, kelepir çıkmadıkça, avanta düşmedikçe, Bodkov için ... hiç bir davranışın, hiç bir ilişkinin anlamı yoktu. (Kelepir ile avanta sözcüklerinin karşılığına Avrupa dillerinde *rastlanır* mı bilmem?)  
 ‘No actions or relations had any sense for Bodkov ... unless they resulted in something kjoro [‘something for nothing’] in some sort of kelepir [‘free ride/free lunch’]. (Do the European languages *have* words that correspond to these in their meanings?)’

(23) [R] De unde i-or fi trecînd prin minte asemenea năzbîtii?

[B] Otde mu *idat* na um tija komedii. (XII)

[M] Otkade mu *teknuvaat* tie komedii?

[A] E ku i *shkon* mëndja të luajë komedira të tilla!

[T] [not translated]

‘Where does he *get* these comedies from?’

Examples (24–26) are all identical to past conditionals in forms, but clearly presumptive in content. Example (24) has non-confirmative pasts in both Balkan Slavic and Turkish, while (25) has such corresponding usage only in Balkan Slavic. Interestingly enough, example (24) is dubitative (ironic), whereas example (25) is a more neutral

reported. Example (26) is a complex narrative that involves non-confirmativity in all the languages, but the category is expressed in different parts of the narrative in each language. The speaker is Baj Ganjo, relating a story told to him by a student. Baj Ganjo's narrative carries a tone of surprise and indignation but not irony. Particularly striking in this example is the manner in which no two languages pattern identically. Albanian, Turkish, and Romanian each have unique occurrences, while Balkan Slavic forms always overlap with some other language. Here too, however, Albanian and Romanian are in complementary distribution.

(24) [R] Bai Ganiu îmi ceru să-i fac cinste, deoarece pe drum *aş fi fumat* din tutunul lui.

[B] Baj Ganjo poiska az da počerpja, poneže iz pătja *săm pušil* ot negovija tjutjun. (IX)

[M] Baj Ganjo pobara jas da čestam oti po pat *sum pušel* od negoviot tutun.

[A] Baj Ganua deshte ta qirasnja unë, sepse rrugës *kisha pirë* nga duhani i tij.

[T] Büfede, Bay Ganü, yenip içilecek şeyleri benim ısmarlamam gerektiğini ileri sürdü. Çünkü yolda hep onun tütününden *içmişiz*.

‘Baj Ganjo wanted me to treat him, since on the road I *had smoked* some of his tobacco.’

(25) [R] Dar cică la plecare *ar fi spus* studentului bulgar care-l însoţea la gară: ...

[B] Samo na trăgvane *kazal* na studenta bălgarin, kojto go izpraštal na garata: ... (IV)

[M] Samo, na trganje mu *kažoval* na studentot, Bugarin, što go ispraĳal na stanica: ...

[A] Po di ç'i *rrëfeu* vetë baj Ganua një studenti që e përcolli, kur u nis, deri në stacion.



[T] Bildiğm bir şey varsa, o da istasyona, kendisini geçirmeye giden üniversiteli arkadaşına *söyledikleridir*: ...  
'Only as he was leaving, he *said* to a Bulgarian student who was seeing him off at the station: ...'

(26)15[R]De mult ar fi ieșit<sup>R(B)</sup> doctor, dar oamenii de pe aici sînt îndărătnici, încăpățînați... Rectorul nu-l slăbește,<sup>MAT</sup> zice el. *Cică* i-ar fi spus<sup>RBMT</sup>...  
"Nu se poate<sup>A</sup> să te faci<sup>A</sup> doctor în trei luni!" Așa *cică* i-ar fi zis<sup>R</sup>. Da cum să nu poată,<sup>T</sup> dînd băiatul știe?!

[B] Dosega da e stana<sup>R(B)</sup> veke doktor, ama inat hora tukașnite. Rektora, *kaj*, ne go ostava.<sup>MAT</sup> Ne može,<sup>A</sup> *kaj*, kazal<sup>RBMT</sup> mu, za tri meseca da staneș<sup>A</sup> doktor, *kaj*<sup>(R)</sup>. A be kak da ne može,<sup>T</sup> kogato momčeto znae; (VIII)

[M] Dosega veke trebaše da stane<sup>R(B)</sup> doktor, ama inaetçii se ovdešnive. Rektorot, *veli*, ne go ostaval.<sup>MAT</sup> Ne može,<sup>A</sup> *veli*, mu rekol<sup>RBMT</sup> za tri meseca doktor da staneș,<sup>A</sup> *veli*<sup>(R)</sup>. A, be, kako ne može,<sup>T</sup> koga znae momčeto;

[A] Do të qe bërë<sup>R(B)</sup> doktor gjer tani, po këta të këtushmit janë kokëfortë, Rektori, *gjoja*, nuk e lejuaka!<sup>MAT</sup> Nuk qënka e mundur,<sup>A</sup> *gjoja*, t'u bëka<sup>A</sup> doktor, *gjoja*, njeriu, vetëm për tre muaj! E po pse s'mundet,<sup>T</sup> ore t'i thuash, kur çuni i di për bukuri;

[T] Bu akılla artık doktor olmalıydı,<sup>R(B)</sup> ama buradakiler inat! Rektör razı gelmezmiş<sup>MAT</sup> "Üç ayda doktor olunmaz,<sup>A</sup>" demiş<sup>RBMT</sup> Rektör. A be, oğlan biliyor ya; bildikten sonra nasıl olunmazmış<sup>T</sup>  
'He should have been<sup>RB</sup> a doctor already by now, but the people here are spiteful. The rector, *he says*, won't let<sup>MAT</sup> him. "It is impossible<sup>A</sup>"—*he says* [that] he said<sup>RBMT</sup> to him —"for you to become<sup>A</sup> a doctor in three

months”—*he says*<sup>(R)</sup>. Well, but how can it be impossible<sup>T</sup> when the fellow knows [everything];’

The material in the foregoing examples illustrates a continuum between status and modality in which the position of Balkan Slavic (and Turkish) lies between Romanian and Albanian. In Albanian (and Vlah) we find pure non-confirmative status categories of indicative origin and no categories marked for confirmativity. In Balkan Slavic and Turkish we have a confirmative/non-confirmative opposition in which the old perfect acquires ‘non-confirmative’ as a contextual variant meaning in opposition to a marked confirmative, while newer forms—as with the marked admiratives of Albanian and Vlah—are markedly non-confirmative. Finally, in Romanian, we find the development of non-confirmative modal constructions as periphrastic narrative forms (cf. Manoliu-Manea 1994:273–17).

In Aronson’s (1977, 1991) modifications and extensions of Jakobson (1957/1971) (cf. also Fielder 1996), mood and aspect are linked as manifestations of a single category of MANNER by the fact that both are absolute characterizations of the narrated event. Fielder (1996:216) links taxis, tense, and status by means of a feature DISTANCE relative to the speech event, and introduces an “implied temporal orientation point of =E<sup>s</sup>” into the definition of taxis, which allows her to account for the Bulgarian facts she is analyzing. Status and Mood are linked as qualifiers of the narrated event, with the presence of speaker’s attitude (P<sup>s</sup>) being the distinguishing characteristic of Mood in Jakobson (1957/1971) and of Status in Aronson (1977). The data I have adduced linking Albanian, Balkan Romance, Balkan Slavic, and Turkish suggest that status categories result from the grammaticalization of the relationship of P<sup>s</sup> to E<sup>n</sup>, whereas when that relationship is more a discourse function than a grammatical category, non-confirmative meanings will be limited to the manipulation of modal markers.<sup>16</sup> I would propose that there exists a Balkan areal tendency to grammaticalize the concept of non-confirmativity along a continuum from the non-modal paradigmatic forms of Albanian and the non-modal semi-paradigmatic forms of

Vlah through the gramatico-pragmatic formations of Slavic and Turkish to the modal pragmatic/paradigmatic forms of Romanian.

As Gołąb (1970) has shown, there are striking bilateral Macedonian-Vlah similarities on the one hand and Bulgarian-Romanian congruencies on the other—the former based on a Balkan Romance model, the later based on a Common Slavic model (as represented by Old Church Slavonic). Looking at Romanian presumptivity and expressions of non-confirmativity in the Balkans general, we find a similar type of bipartition insofar as Romanian patterns closer to Bulgarian than to any of the other languages and is essentially in complementary distribution with Albanian with respect to the choices of context for expressing the category. As with other phenomena described by Gołąb, Romanian goes with Bulgarian (more pragmatic) while Vlah goes with Macedonian (and Albanian) (more grammaticalized), but in general Balkan terms there seems to be a continuum of marked non-confirmative status categories interacting with both modal and pragmatic factors that requires further elucidation. Gołąb's concept of the isogrammatism (cf. also Kuryłowicz@), I would suggest, can be expanded to the concept of an isopragmatism.<sup>17</sup>

University of Chicago

#### NOTES

---

<sup>1</sup>An earlier version of this work was read at the Tenth Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore (University of Chicago, 2– May 1996), which was dedicated to Professor Aronson's sixtieth birthday. I am grateful to the participants in the conference whose comments have helped improve this work.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Aronson's (1977) category of *manner*, which explains intersections of aspect and mood, or Fielder's (1996) use of *distance* as a cover term for the similarities among tense, taxis, and status.

---

3The literature is too vast to cite—virtually every scholar who has devoted serious attention to the relevant languages has written on this topic at least once— and to date there exists no comprehensive bibliography of it. For a survey of the basic relevant literature pertaining to Balkan Slavic, Albanian, and Turkish up to 1977 see Friedman (1980). For more recent treatments of Balkan Slavic, see Foulon-Hristova (1995), Gerdžikov (1984), Guentcheva (1990), and Kucarov (1994).

4Asenova's (1989:144–0) treatment of dubitative and admirative meanings of constructions using the Balkan modal subordinators *da-tě-sǎ-ná* (Slavic-Albanian-Romance-Greek, respectively), touches on some of the same concepts, but not on their grammaticalization.

5The term *South Balkan Romance* refers to Megleno-Romanian and Arumanian together. The term *Vlah* is also used here as a cover term that includes these two languages (but not the Daco-Romanian dialects of Eastern Serbia).

6Although Caragiu-Marioțeanu (1975:282) had already noted the inverted perfect of Megleno-Romanian based on data from Capidan (1925), she treated it as the ordinary realization of the perfect. Fiedler (1968:131) stated that Vlah lacks marked status categories (*Admirativ-Kommentativsystem* in his terminology), but he later corrected this (Fiedler 1989) on the basis of Atansov's data. Atanasov (1990:119–20) discusses the Megleno-Romanian plain and inverted perfect in greater detail.

7 In the case of Balkan Slavic this process is textually documented, in the case of Albanian it can be deduced from the situation in the earliest major texts, e.g. Buzuku's sixteenth-century missal (Çabej 1968) and the dialectal situation, in the case of Vlah, the isolated nature of the phenomena points to their relatively recent development.

8Already at the end of the last century, the Vlah villages of Upper and Lower Belica represented an Arumanian speech island between Albanian and Macedonian linguistic

---

territory (Weigand 1895). Moreover, the villagers had come there from two different parts of Albania. Those from Frashëri, the Fărșăloçi, have the Arumanian admirative, but the other group, the Mbalioçi, do not. Moreover, my recent work in Albania (summer 1995) with informants from Korçë indicates that they do not have these admirative forms.

Because the Vlah dialects of Albania are as yet so little investigated, however, it may yet be found there. Another possibility is that the Arumanian admirative of the Fărșăloçi of Upper Belica (Beala di Suprâ) represents an archaic innovation that developed while their ancestors were in Albania and was subsequently lost by those who stayed behind.

9In modern Standard Albanian, the long form of the participle, in this case *pasur*, is the preferred form in the perfect, and the short form, here *pasë*, is marginal. Historically, however, both participles could be used to form the perfect and both served as the base for the admirative, depending on the dialect (see Pekmezi 1908:198; Lambertz 1948:48–9). The Standard Albanian admirative is based on the short participle, which also occurs in compound auxiliary constructions.

10For the sake of conciseness, I shall use the term *formant* when referring to the first element in the presumptive regardless of whether it is an auxiliary or participle.

11The future auxiliary in *v-* is literary, that in *o-* is colloquial. The persons of the future and conditional auxiliaries are separated by hyphens and the order of presentation is 1sg-2sg-3sg-1pl-2pl-3pl. The future can also be marked by an invariant particle, *o* or *i*. The different sets of future markers are separated by tildes. Moreover, in the colloquial future auxiliary the variants *ăi*, *ei*, *îi* occur in the 2sg, *a* in the 3sg, and *ați*, *eți*, *îți* in the 2pl.

12Henceforth, we shall use the term *modal perfects* to refer to the future, conditional, and subjunctive perfects as a group of distinct paradigms. We shall use the term *past presumptive* to refer to the homonymous constructions in which the formants can be used interchangeably.

---

13This is consistent with Romanian native speaker feelings that the presumptive is more appropriate with the colloquial future marker *o* (Dorin Urişescu and Emil Vrabie, p.c.).

14The order of presentation in the examples is the following: Romanian-Bulgarian-Macedonian-Albanian-Turkish. Languages names are indicated by the first letter in square brackets. English glosses use the Bulgarian original. Minor differences among the translations have been ignored. Roman numerals after the Bulgarian examples refer to the chapters in which the sentences occur.

15In this example, the superscript capital letters indicate that languages in which the verb form carries a marking or contextual variant meaning of non-confirmative status. Moreover, reportative/dubitative particles have been italicized.

16There are a number of other intersections of modality and non-confirmativity that are highly suggestive and worthy of future research but beyond the scope of the present analysis. By way of illustration we can mention examples such as the use of modal particles with aorists in the various Balkan languages, such as the use of the future marker with the aorist in Greek to express uncertainty, e.g., *tha égrapsa*, glossed in Bulgarian with a future subjunctive perfect *şte da sǎm napisal* ‘I must have written [it]’ (Asenova 1989:145), as well as the presumptive modal use of the future in Aromanian reported by Caragiu-Marioţeanu (1968:110–1) and Cosmopol (1987:165–6) but not found by Gołąb (1984:107).

17Although some realizations of the opposition confirmative/non-confirmative are clearly of contact origin, as is the case in the Arumanian dialect of Beala di Suprâ, others may be the result of a combination of internal motivations and external catalysts, as in the cases of Albanian and Balkan Slavic in contact with Turkish. On the basis of the fact that the use of ‘be’ as transitive auxiliary is characteristic of Slavic rather than Romance, Seidel (1958) has suggested a Bulgarian origin for the Romanian presumptive. Manoliu-Manea

---

(1994:273–17) makes arguments for internal motivation but as in so many contact phenomena, both internal and external factors were probably involved.

#### REFERENCES

- Andrejczin, Ljubomir. 1938. *Kategorie znaczeniowe koniugacii bułgarskiej*. Cracow.
- Aronson, Howard I. 1977. “Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian,” *Folia Slavica* 1(1):9–2.
- . 1991. “Towards a Typology of Verbal Categories,” ed. Linda R. Waugh and Stephen Rudy, *New Vistas in Grammar: Invariance and Variation*, 111–32. Amsterdam.
- Asenova, Petya. 1989. *Balkansko ezikoznanie*. Sofia.
- Atanasov, P. 1984. “Meglenoromâna,” *Tratat de dialectologie româneasca*, 476–50. Craiova.
- . 1990. *Le mégléno-roumain de nos jours*. Hamburg.
- Banfi, Emanuele. 1985. *Linguistica balcanica*. Bologna.
- Beldescu, George, and Ion Popescu. 1972. *Gramatica limbii române*. Bucharest.
- Beševliev, Veselin. 1928. “Kãm vâprosa za taka narečena ‘admirativ’ v bălgarski ezik,” *Makedonski pregled* 4(1):174–7.
- Çabej, Eqrem, ed. 1968. “Meshari” i Gjon Buzukut (1555): *Botim kritik*, 1–. Tirana.
- Capidan. Th. 1925. *Meglenoromânii*. 1. Bucharest.
- Caragiu-Marioțeanu, Matilda. 1968. *Fono-morfologie aromână*. Bucharest.
- . 1975. *Compendiu de dialectologie română*. Bucharest.
- Cosmopol, Eléonore. 1987. “Considerations sur les modes verbaux en aroumain,” ed. Rupprecht Rohr, *Die Aromunen: Sprache—Geshichte—Geographie*, 155–8. Hamburg.
- Demiraj, Sh. 1971. “Habitorja dhe mosha e saj,” *Studime filologjike* 8(3):31–9.

- . 1994. *Gjuhësi ballkanike*. Skopje.
- Dimitriu, C. 1979. *Gramatica limbii române explicată*. Iași.
- Feuillet, Jack. 1986. *La linguistique balkanique*. Cahiers balkaniques 10. Paris.
- Fiedler, Wilfried. 1968. “Das aromanische Verbalsystem in balkanologischer Sicht,” ed. Werner Bahner, *Beiträge zur rumänischen Philologie*, 115–9. Berlin.
- . 1989. “Zur Arealtypologie der Futurbildung in den Balkansprachen,” *Studien zur Morphologie und Syntax der Balkansprachen 2, Beiträge zur Balkanlinguistik 4*. Linguistische Studien, Reihe A, Arbeitsberichte 192, Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR Zentralinstitut für Sprachwissenschaft, 70–09. Berlin.
- Fielder, Grace E. 1995. “Narrative Perspective and the Bulgarian *I*-Participle,” *Slavic and East European Journal* 39:585–00.
- . 1996. “Distance as a Prototypical Verbal Category in Bulgarian,” *Balkanistica* 9:211–5.
- . 1997. “The Discourse Properties of Verbal Categories and Their Implications for Balkan Linguistics,” *Balkanistica* 10:162-84.
- Foulon-Hristova, Jadranka. 1995. *Les modes de narration en Macédonien*. Paris.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1977. *The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative*. Columbus, OH.
- . 1978. “On the Semantic and Morphological Influence of Turkish on Balkan Slavic,” ed. Donka Farkas, Wesley Jacobsen, and Karol Todrys, *Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 108-18. Chicago.
- . 1979. “Toward a Typology of Status: Georgian and Other Non-Slavic Languages of the Soviet Union,” ed. Paul R. Clyne, William F. Hanks, and Carol L. Hofbauer, *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, 339-50. Chicago.
- . 1980. “The Study of Balkan Admirativity: Its History and Development,” *Balkanistica* 6:7-30.
- . 1981. “Admirativity and Confirmativity,” *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 17(1):12-28.



- 1982a. “Admirativity in Bulgarian Compared with Albanian and Turkish,” ed. D. Kosev, *Bulgaria Past and Present*, 2, 63-67. Sofia.
- 1982b. “Reportedness in Bulgarian: Category or Stylistic Variant?,” *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 25–6:149–3.
- 1986. “Evidentiality in the Balkans: Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Albanian,” ed. Johanna Nichols and Wallace Chafe, *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, 168-87. Norwood, NJ.
- 1988a. The Category of Evidentiality in the Balkans and the Caucasus, ed. A. M. Schenker, *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*, 1: *Linguistics*, 121-139. Columbus, OH.
- 1988b. “Morphological Innovation and Semantic Shift in Macedonian,” *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 24(1):34-41.
- 1994. “Surprise! Surprise! Arumanian Has Had an Admirative!,” ed. George Fowler, Henry R. Cooper, Jr., and Jonathan Z. Ludwig, *Indiana Slavic Studies*, 7, 79–9.
- Gerdžikov, Georgi. 1984. *Preizkazvaneto na glagolното dejstvie v bălgarskija ezik*. Sofia.
- Gołąb, Zbginiew. 1959. “Some Arumanian-Macedonian Isogrammatisms and the Social Background of Their Development,” *Word* 15:415–5.
- 1960. “The Influence of Turkish upon the Macedonian Slavonic Dialects,” *Folia Orientalia* 1:26–5.
- 1964. “The Problem of Verbal Moods in Slavic Languages,” *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 8:1–6.
- 1970. “Za ‘mehanizmot’ na slovensko-romanskite odnosi na Balkanskiot Poluoostrov,” *Makedonski jazik* 21:5–8.
- 1984. *The Arumanian Dialect of Kruševo in SR Macedonia, SFR Yugoslavia*. Skopje.
- Goudet, Jacques. 1977. “An Attempt at Interpreting the Periphrastic Verbal System: *A fi* + *Gerund*,” ed. Sorin Alexandrescu, *Transformational Grammar and the Rumanian Language*, 59–3. Lisse.

- Grickat, Irena. 1954. *O perfektu bez pomoćnog glagola u srpskohrvatskom jeziku i srodnim sintaksičkim pojavama*. Srpska Akademija Nauka Posebna Izdanja, 223. Belgrade.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka. 1990. *Temps et aspect: L'Exemple du bulgare contemporain*. Paris.
- Halvorsen, Arne. 1973. *Essai d'une analyse des formes dites 'de futur' en roumain moderne*. Bergen.
- Iorgu, Iordan, and Vladimir Robu. 1978. *Limba română contemporană*. Bucharest.
- Irimia, Dumitru. 1976. *Structura gramaticală a limbii române: Verbul*. Iași.
- Ismajli, Rexhep. 1982. *Gramatika e parë e gjuhës shqipe*. Prishtina.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1932/1971. "Zur Struktur des Russischen Verbums," *Selected Writings*, 2: *Word and Language*, 3–5. The Hague.
- . 1957/1971. "Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb," *Selected Writings*, 2: *Word and Language*, 130–7. The Hague.
- Janakiev, Miroslav. 1962. "Za gramemite naričani v bălgarska gramatika 'segašno vreme' i 'bădešte vreme'," *Izvestija na Instituta za Bălgarski Ezik* 8:420–2.
- Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. Cambridge.
- Kastrati, Jup. 1980. *Histori e gramatologjisë shqiptare (1635–944)*. Prishtina.
- Konstantinov, Aleko. 1895. *Baj Ganjo*. Sofija.
- . 1964. *Baj Ganiu*, transl. Tudor Căliu and Ioachim Boscu. Bucharest.
- . 1967. *Baj Ganjo*, transl. Ğorgi Caca. Skopje.
- . 1972. *Baj Ganü*, transl. İsmail Ağlagül. Istanbul.
- . 1975. *Baj Gano*, transl. Dhurata Xoxa. Prishtina.
- Kramer, Christina. 1986. *Analytic Modality in Macedonian*. Slavistische Beiträge, 198. Munich.
- Kozinceva, N. A. 1991. *Vremennaja lokalizovannost' dejstvija i ee svjazi s aspektual'nymi, modal'nymi i taksisnymi značenijami*. Moscow.
- Kucarov, Ivan. 1994. *Edno ekzotično naklonenie na bălgarskija glagol*. Sofia.

- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1956. *L'Apophonie en indo-européen*. Wrocław.
- Lambertz, Maximilian. 1948. *Albanisches Lesebuch*. Leipzig.
- Lindstedt, Jouko. 1993. "Za razvitiето na južnoslavjanskija perfekt," *Studia Slavica Finlandensia* 10:31–4.
- Luxt, Linda Ivanovna. 1970. *Sravnitel'no-sopostavitel'naja grammatika romanskix jazykov: Rumynskij jazyk*. Moscow.
- Mallinson, Graham. 1986. *Rumanian*. Croom Helm Descriptive Grammar Series. London.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1994. *Discourse and Pragmatic Constraints on Grammatical Choices: A Grammar of Surprises*. North Holland Linguistic Series, 57. Amsterdam.
- Marković, Marjan. 1995. "Glagolskiот sistem vo makedonskiот i vo aromanskiот ohridski govor." Master's thesis, Macedonian Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Pärvev, Hristo. 1975. *Očerk po istorija na bălgarskata gramatika*. Sofia.
- Pekmezi, G. 1908. *Grammatik der albanesischen Sprache (Laut- und Formenlehre)*. Vienna.
- Sandfeld, K. 1930. *La linguistique balkanique*. Paris.
- Schaller, Helmut. 1975. *Die Balkansprachen*. Heidelberg.
- Seidel, Eugen. 1958. *Elemente sintactice slave în limba română*. Bucharest.
- Siever, George O. 1953. *Introduction to Romanian*. New York.
- Slave, Elena. 1957. "Prezumtivul," *Studii de Gramatică* 2:53–0.
- Vasiliu, Laura. 1966. "Verbul," ed. Al. Graur et al. *Gramatica limbii române*, 1, 202–9. Bucharest.
- Weigand, Gustav. 1895. *Die Aromunen*, 1–. Leipzig.