

THE ELEMENTS:  
A PARASESSION ON  
LINGUISTIC UNITS AND LEVELS

April 20-21, 1979

Including

Papers from the Conference on  
NON-SLAVIC LANGUAGES OF THE USSR

April 18, 1979

EDITED BY

PAUL R. CLYNE  
WILLIAM F. HANKS  
CAROL L. HOFBAUER

CHICAGO LINGUISTIC SOCIETY  
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO  
1050 E. 59TH STREET  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60637

339

Toward a Typology of Status:  
Georgian and Other Non-Slavic Languages of the Soviet Union\*

Victor A. Friedman  
University of North Carolina -- Chapel Hill

Like Balkan Slavic (i.e. Macedonian and Bulgarian), Turkish, and Albanian,<sup>1</sup> many of the non-Slavic languages of the Soviet Union are said to possess special verb forms which indicate that the speaker is basing the utterance on a report or deduction or that the speaker is surprised by or dubious of the truth of the event described by the utterance. Such forms are labeled reported, unwitnessed, auditive, narrative, imperceptive, subjective, deductive, dubitative, admirative, evidential, inferential, etc. For the sake of convenience, these meanings as a group will be referred to as nonconfirmative. These same forms are also frequently said to function as perfects, i.e. to relate some (completed) past event to the moment of speech or to refer to a present result or an indefinite time in the past. Thus far, no attempt has been made to compare the Balkan phenomena with those of the Soviet Union aside from superficial and inaccurate descriptions such as that of Serebrennikov (1974:208-209), who, among other things, quotes Weigand's dubious or at least outmoded description of the Albanian perfect as having a reported meaning in urban dialects and who mistranslates the Albanian present admirative *rënka shi* 'It's raining!' as if it were past, and that of Haarman (1970:33-35), who, for example, describes the so-called Bulgarian reported in such a way as to completely ignore its near-total homonymy with the unmarked past and to make the so-called past definite, which is marked for confirmativity (Aronson 1967:87), appear to be unmarked. It is clear that the tense forms of the various languages involved have certain elements in common, but it is equally clear that each of them relates to the larger verbal system of the language in which it occurs in a unique manner peculiar to that language and cannot, therefore, be completely identified with similar forms in other languages. The goal of this paper is an outline of a framework within which these phenomena can be compared and contrasted cross-linguistically. The data will be drawn from Georgian, Avar, Tadjik, and Azerbaidjani, with some reference to Balkan Slavic and Turkish.<sup>2</sup>

This outline will, in essence, constitute the beginnings of a typology of status. Status is a term defined by Aronson (1977:13) as describing verbal categories characterized by the speaker's evaluation of the narrated event, i.e. in using a form marked for status, the speaker is editorializing on the narrated event.<sup>3</sup> Aronson compares English sentences of the type It snows in May and It does snow in May to show that while both are statements of objective reality, the latter carries the additional editorial comment that the speaker is vouching for the truth of the statement, and it is thus marked for assertive status. Similarly, the use of a form marked for or implying some type of nonconfirmative status

may contain the speaker's editorial comment that the statement, while accepted as objective reality, is based on a report or deduction or is surprising to the speaker, or, while being presented as objective reality by some other speaker, does not constitute objective reality in the opinion of the first speaker. It is interesting to note that Turkic alone occupies the position of being in contact with each of the other language groups in question, and at least in the case of the Balkan and Iranian languages, it has been hypothesized that the rise of marked status categories resulted from Turkic influence (e.g. Andrejcin 1952:39-41, Doerfer 1967:53). One cannot help but wonder, however, why this hypothesis of borrowed grammatical categories has not been suggested for the striking similarities in, e.g., aspect, mood, or tense in various languages. I would suggest, rather, that status, like aspect, is a grammatical category which frequently finds morphological as well as lexical expression, and that while one system may influence another, the existence of similarities does not require an assumption of borrowing (v. Friedman 1978).

In examining the status systems of the languages in question, certain terminological conventions will be necessary in order to facilitate the presentation of the data and avoid tangential explanations. The term perfect will be used to refer to those forms which are said to be marked for or which can imply nonconfirmative status. In Georgian, this is a synthetic form with markers for the subject or direct object (depending on the conjugation) based on the present tense of the verb meaning 'be' (3sg. -a), although some verbs require the 3sg. marker -s according to the normative grammars. In Avar, this means the past gerund in -(u/o)n and the appropriate form of bugo 'is'. In Tadjik, it means the past participle in -da and the present enclitic auxiliary meaning 'be' (3sg. -ast). In Azerbaidjani and Turkish, it is the miş-past, formed by the perfect participle in -miş and the present auxiliary meaning 'be' (3sg. ø).<sup>4</sup> In Balkan Slavic, the term perfect will be used to refer to the unmarked (or so-called indefinite) past formed with the (formerly resultative) participle in -l and the present clitic auxiliary meaning 'be' (3sg. e).<sup>5</sup> The term preterite or simple preterite will be used for the Georgian aorist, the Avar simple past in -(a/u)na, the Tadjik simple past, the Azerbaidjani and Turkish past in -di, called the di-past, and the Balkan Slavic past definite or simplex past.

The first fact which is true of all these languages is that the perfect can be used as a pure resultative with no overtones of marked (nonconfirmative) status. It must be acknowledged, however, that this is especially true in the first person, which is already marked for reference to the speaker and is thus usually, but by no means always, incompatible with nuances of nonconfirmative status.<sup>6</sup> One example from Georgian will serve to illustrate this type of sentence. (For examples from the other languages, v. Bokarev 1949:120, Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:76, Agazade 1967:17, and Friedman 1978:109-110.):

(1) Bevri vai-vaglaxi minaxavs čems sicocxleši (Peikrišvili 1974:54).

Much woe have I seen in my life.

This type of sentence definitively eliminates the possibility of describing the perfects in the languages in question as marked for, i.e. always specifying, nonconfirmative status. The strongest statement which could be made would be that such is the chief contextual variant meaning (cf. Friedman 1977:81 and v. infra).

On the other hand, it is equally true that all of these languages permit their perfects to be used in connected narratives of sequential events and with definite past time adverbs. In such contexts, it is resultativity which appears to be excluded as a possible basic meaning, since such narratives do not relate past events to the present but only to each other. In such instances, the nonconfirmative meaning of these perfects is dominant. A significant difference between the various languages is in the use of these forms in extended narratives such as folk tales. While Azerbaidjani, like Turkish and Balkan Slavic, frequently uses the perfect in such narratives, Avar varies between the use of the perfect and the use of the simple preterite with the quotative enclitic -ila. Georgian, which also has quotative enclitics, also uses the simple preterite (aorist), while Tadjik may favor the imperfect in me. (For examples, v. Rudenko 1940:243; Bokarev 1949:119; Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:80, 94-95; Axundov 1968:136, Friedman 1977:140, Johanson 1971:80.)

Both the resultative and the nonconfirmative meanings of these perfects can have special nonpast and/or emotive uses. Those uses based on the resultative meaning appear to relate to the perfect's reference to a present state. In all these languages except, perhaps, Avar (no data was available to me), the perfects of certain verbs can be used to express surprise at a fact which the speaker did not suspect and only discovered at the moment of speech, but which existed (as a state) in the past. This is the so-called admirative usage:

(2) a. Ra lamazi gogo qopilxar! (Georgian)

What a beautiful girl you are!

b. Či zani xube dostaed! (Tadjik)(Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:82)<sup>7</sup>

What a beautiful wife you have!

c. Dünjada nežã alçağ adamlar varmys! (Azerbaidjani)(Johanson 1971:64)

What vile people there are in the world!

Such usage is restricted, however, to verbs meaning 'be', the semantically closely related 'have', and in Georgian as in Balkan Slavic, a handful of other verbs all of which can be semantically reinterpreted as noun phrases plus 'be' (cf. Friedman forthcoming). Although the English translations of these forms use verbs in the present tense, these examples do not contradict the notion of past

tense marking for these perfects, since they can be described as referring to the past existence of the newly discovered fact. It is interesting to note that this same type of usage can occur with the perfect of 'be' in the Scandinavian languages (Ian White/Kjetil Rå Hauge [Norwegian], Roger Hagglund [Swedish]: personal communication).

A related phenomenon is the fact that a group of stative verbs in Tadjik lack the present tense and use the perfect in this meaning, e.g. istodan 'stand', sistan 'sit', xobidan 'lie, sleep' (Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:80). As with the admirative, this phenomenon can be explained by the fact that the present state is a continuation of that same state from the past and results from a past act which produced the state. Hence, to say I am standing means 'I assumed a standing position at some time in the past and have continued in that state up to the moment of speech'. This same type of usage appears to occur in the Avar perfect as well (Bokarev 1949:120).

A more complicated phenomenon is the Georgian use of the perfect for performative verbs and to describe actions virtually co-terminous with the moment of speech:

(3) Momilocavs!

Congratulations! (literally: 'I have congratulated you')

(4) Es ar sei3leba, Galakṭion, ar sei3leba, metkvams sentvis (Peikrisvili 1974:55).

This isn't possible, Galakṭion, it isn't possible, I tell you. (literally: 'I have told you')

The use of the perfect in these contexts can be explained as a different view of the division between past and nonpast with strong formulaic and/or emotive overtones. In order to stress or emotionally color the event, it is presented as having already occurred but still relevant to the present. In (3), the event is in fact past the moment its pronunciation is completed, while in (4) the thing told has been spoken before metkvams is uttered to call attention to it. A similar phenomenon in Azerbaidjani (v. Agazade 1967:19) and Turkish is the use of the simple preterite (di-past) to stress a present state resulting from a past act:

(5) Anne ekmek ver acıktık (Turkish) (Seyfullah 1968:113).

Mother, give [us] bread; we're hungry. (literally: 'we were hungry')

Other examples of Georgian perfects which would be translated by English presents or futures can be explained as marked, emotive, nonliteral uses much like the usage in English sentences such as If you don't show up tomorrow, you've had it or I need this by yesterday.

With regard to the nonconfirmative implications of these perfects, there is a phenomenon which can indicate the varying degrees of the grammaticalization of the nonconfirmative meaning and which

has different manifestations in the various languages under consideration, viz. dubitativity. In Balkan Slavic, if one speaker makes a statement in the present tense, an interlocutor can express disbelief by repeating the statement with the verb shifted into the perfect, i.e. into that past tense which has nonconfirmativity as its chief contextual variant meaning (v. Friedman 1977:78):

(6) First speaker: "Toj go saka." Second speaker: "Toj go sakal!" (Macedonian)

Fs: "He likes it." Ss: "He likes it, indeed!" (or 'He<sub>1</sub> just said he<sub>2</sub> liked it! What nonsense!')

Similarly, in Turkish and Azerbaidjani (Friedman 1977:63, Axundov 1968:136), the perfect or the perfect of 'be' used as an auxiliary can be used to repeat a statement in some other tense to produce the same effect. In Tadjik, the 3sg. perfect of 'be', budaast, can function as a particle meaning 'so someone says'. It can be used after any statement to indicate that the speaker is quoting someone else's words:

(7) ...rošed budaast (Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:82).

"Come" she says or She says for you to come.

Contextually, however, this particle can be used to express doubt, e.g. in conjunction with the repetition of a statement which has just been made by one's interlocutor:

(8) Man ba jodi tu ovarda memonam, duxtari berūi! "Maṣbur mekoned" --budaast. "Odami kūhna" budaast (Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:83).

I'll teach you, you shameless wench! "You're forcing me", indeed! "Backward old man", indeed!

This phenomenon is transitional to the clitic quotative particles of Georgian and Avar, which can be placed after the verb or, in Georgian, at the end of the phrase to indicate that the statement is a report of someone else's words. Like the Tadjik budaast, these particles can be used contextually in a dubitative function. As a result, the Georgian perfect (perhaps also the Avar, no data was available to me) cannot be used by itself as a dubitative.

The existence of quotative particles which has just been mentioned is an additional factor which has never been taken into account in descriptions of the nonconfirmative use of perfects in these various languages. In Georgian, there are three particles which can be attached to the end of a verb or phrase: -metki 'I tell you', -tko/-tkva 'you should tell someone', and -o 'someone says'. This last particle is especially frequently used; it occurs regularly in conjunction with titko(s) and vitom both 'as if' (Vogt 1971:217) and even functions to render a kind of indirect discourse:

(9) Vanom ra mindao.

What did Vano say he wanted. (literally: Vano what I-want-he-said)

In Avar, the particle -ila can be suffixed to any past tense form to indicate that the message has been reported to the speaker and also functions as the most common form used in relating folk tales (Bokarev 1949:250). This same particle can also be used for indirect speech and the objects of verbs of perception, as opposed to the particle -li, which is used for direct speech and the objects of verbs of knowing (Bokarev 1949:248-250). The Tadjik use of budaast mentioned above is much like the Russian de or mol or the Bulgarian ka -- all of them shortened forms of verbs of reporting functioning as quotative particles -- while the freedom of combination of auxiliary and participle in Turkish and Azerbaidjani permits imis (3sg. perfect of 'be') to perform similar quotative functions (Lewis 1967:102).

Aside from quotative particles, Georgian, Avar, and Azerbaidjani, like Balkan Slavic, all possess other verb forms or constructions which are in competition with the regular perfect forms. Georgian has a periphrastic perfect and pluperfect using the present and imperfect of the verb 'have' and the perfect passive participle (Peikrišvili 1974:57):

(10) Makvs/Mkonda daçerili çerili.  
I have/had written the letter.

These forms appear to compete with the synthetic perfect and pluperfect as resultative forms and seem to correspond exactly to the Macedonian resultative perfect in ima 'have' with the old past passive participle. Also, at least in the western dialects, Georgian has a fourth series of forms using the participial prefix na- (in Mingrelian no-) which is said to be purely reported (Rogava 1953, Peikrišvili 1974:68-69). Similarly, in Avar, in addition to the perfect, the past participle in -rab/-reb can be used with bugo 'is' (Xajdakov 1975:135), while the verb batize 'to be found/located', to exist' can be used in the infinitive with the perfect or in the simple preterite (batana) with a number of forms, including the past gerund, to render opinions, i.e. the meaning 'apparently, so it seems', as opposed to reports or deductions (Xajdakov 1975:128, Bokarev 1949:131-133). (The future form, batila, can be used with the present or past participles to indicate supposition [Bokarev 1949:132].) In Azerbaidjani, the participle in -ib is said to be used colloquially in the second and third persons to render reported speech (Agazade 1967:27). This form also has a number of other uses, however, and even its use with second person markers does not appear to be acceptable to some native speakers of Azerbaidjani. None of the forms mentioned in this paragraph has yet received adequate study regarding its relationship to the regular perfect.

As has been seen thus far, the perfect forms in these various languages cannot be said to have a nonconfirmative invariant meaning

due to their resultativity, and they are frequently in competition with other nonconfirmative or resultative forms or constructions. Another important area of comparison is the relationships of these perfects to their immediate neighbors on both the vertical and horizontal planes, i.e. perfect vs. pluperfect and perfect vs. simple preterite. In Avar, Tadjik, and Azerbaidjani, as in Balkan Slavic, Turkish, and perhaps Albanian,<sup>9</sup> it appears that the combination of taxis (marking for anteriority) and resultativity, i.e. the double marking of a past auxiliary and a past participial form, can result in the pluperfect's functioning as a genuinely pure reported form. This is to say that that which in the perfect may be the chief contextual variant meaning occurring in the least marked contexts becomes the invariant meaning in the more highly marked pluperfect (v. Bokarev 1949:123-124, Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:73, Širaliev and Sevortjan 1971:134, Friedman 1977:120). This is not the case in Georgian, however, where the pluperfect's chief function is modal; it serves as the past tense of the present and future conjunctive and of the optative (cf. English Had I had the time I would have gone). Its secondary function is purely taxic (Aronson forthcoming:Chapter 10).

The similarities and differences between the oppositions perfect/preterite in Azerbaidjani and Georgian are striking. Both simple preterites denote confirmation, but the nature of the marking differs. In Azerbaidjani, as in Turkish and Balkan Slavic, the simple preterite cannot be subordinated to clauses of doubt or disbelief, and it is marked for confirmativity in opposition to the perfect, which in its unmarkedness has acquired a chief contextual variant meaning of reportedness or some other form of nonconfirmativity (Agazade 1967:17-18, Friedman 1978). In Georgian, clauses such as vici rom 'I know that' require the aorist, while those such as darcmunebuli ar var rom 'I am not sure that' normally require the perfect. However, it is the aorist which must be treated as unmarked in positive clauses, while the perfect appears to be the unmarked tense form in negative clauses. It also appears that native speakers will accept aorists in subordination to clauses of doubt, although the exact meaning of such sentences is unclear:

(11) Veçvob/Me eçvi makvs rom Vanom dacera.  
I doubt that Vano wrote it.

It is possible to subordinate the simple preterite to clauses of doubt and disbelief in Persian, but I have been unable to obtain data on this for Tadjik as well as for Avar.

One final set of problems which must be mentioned is the treatment of volition and uncertainty. The nonconfirmative nature of the perfect is said to give it a nonvolitional quality. Thus in Georgian it is felt that when answering a question negatively, the use of an aorist implies intention while the choice of a perfect implies that the speaker did not willfully choose not to perform the action (Aronson forthcoming:Chapter 8).<sup>10</sup> The desire to convey nonvolitional performance of an act is also said to motivate the

choice of a perfect in Tadjik (Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:93-94) and Macedonian (Lunt 1952:97).<sup>11</sup> Another factor which has been mentioned but not investigated in the languages of the Soviet Union under consideration is the co-occurrence of adverbs and verbal expressions of uncertainty with both perfect and simple preterite tense forms, e.g. Georgian *turme*, Azerbaidjani *dejäsä* both 'it seems'. Perhaps the Avar use of *vatize* also belongs here. While it has been noted that such noncommittal adverbs occur with simple preterites (Agazade 1967:20, Peikrisvili 1974:66, Rastorgueva and Kerimova 1964:91), no mention has been made of how this affects meaning. Such adverbs in Macedonian, e.g. *ocigledno* 'apparently', generally occur with the first person simple preterite to indicate a deduction of which the speaker is convinced (Friedman 1977:47-48). Such usage is said to be impermissible in Bulgarian, however (Christiforov 1972:112, 134).

As a conclusion, I shall present an outline for the comparative investigation of verb forms involving nonconfirmative status in languages of the Soviet Union and the Balkans, and perhaps elsewhere in Europe and Asia.<sup>12</sup>

#### I. Perfect as pure resultative vs. Perfect as nonconfirmative

- A. First person
- B. Connected narratives
  1. With definite past time adverbs
  2. In folk tales

#### II. Perfect with apparently nonpast meanings

- A. Resultative
  1. Admirative
  2. Stative
  3. Performative
  4. Other emotive

- B. Nonconfirmative
  1. Dubitative

#### III. Quotative particles

- A. Clitic
- B. Independent

#### IV. Competing forms

- A. Resultative
- B. Nonconfirmative

#### V. Relation of perfect to neighboring forms

- A. Simple preterite
  1. Marked confirmative
  2. Unmarked
  3. Other
- B. Pluperfect
  1. Pure reported
  2. Pure taxic
  3. Modal

#### VI. Volition and Uncertainty

#### (VII. Modality)<sup>13</sup>

In examining nonconfirmativity in languages such as those considered in this paper, the use of a framework such as that which has just been given can provide a typological classification comparing and contrasting similarities and differences in an accurate and meaningful way. Thus, for example, while category I applies to all the languages, I.B.2 does not, and there may be a correlation between the existence of clitic quotative particles (III.A), e.g. in Georgian, and the lack of applicability of I.B.2. Similarly, there may be a connection between the marking in V.A.1 and V.B.1, e.g. in Macedonian and Azerbaidjani. (In Tadjik, however, it may be the case that there is marking of the type V.A.2 and V.B.1.) There is also a possible connection between the occurrence of II.B.1 and the lack of III.A, e.g. Azerbaidjani vs. Georgian. While it is not possible to draw any definitive conclusions regarding the classification of the languages discussed or connections between the various categories of classification at this time, it is nevertheless to be hoped that this discussion has provided an indication of the directions in which fruitful investigation can be conducted.

#### NOTES

\*I would like to express my gratitude to the Central National Library of the Georgian Academy of Sciences for their generous help by sending me books on Caucasian linguistics which aided me in this study. I wish to thank Dee Ann Holisky for all her help with the Georgian and for checking sentences of the types illustrated by (2a) and (11), Howard I. Aronson, who first pointed out to me examples of the type illustrated by (2a), Kim Braithwaite, who supplied example (9), and Alice Harris; all of them aided me with their helpful comments. I also wish to thank Reza Ordoubadian and John Perry for their helpful comments on the Turkic and Iranian languages dealt with here.

1

Also the Sliven dialect of Bulgarian Romany (Kostov 1973:108).

2

The related phenomenon of the Albanian admirative will also have to be accounted for, but limitations of space prevent its consideration here.

3

The term *status* was used earlier by Whorf (1938) and Jakobson (1957), but Aronson (1977) has convincingly argued in favor of his somewhat different definition which, while describing many of the same types of categories, makes a clearer distinction between those categories and others, which are marked for *mood*. Unfortunately, most linguists still use terms such as *modality* when referring to *status* thus confusing these two different types of categories.

4

The emphatic copulative enclitic *-dir* can be used with any person, and while it may be frequently translated 'is', it is not really a part of the paradigm of 'be'. I have discussed the

problems raised by its use with the mis-past elsewhere (Friedman 1978)

5

In Literary and Western Macedonian, the third person auxiliary is always omitted. In Western Bulgarian it is always retained. In Eastern Macedonian and Literary and Eastern Bulgarian, it is often omitted, but the circumstances are too complicated to describe here (v. Friedman 1978).

6

Reported and dubitative usage of the 1sg. is clearly nonconfirmative:

(i) Az sŭm bil star!

[They said] I was old!

In example (i), the speaker was a youthful looking man in his late thirties or early forties, and it was clear that he was mockingly referring to what others said or might have said about him.

7

Actually, the perfects of budan 'be' and doŭstan 'have' are always present due to the stative nature of the verbs (v. the fourth page of this paper). Nevertheless, the admirative type of usage has been included here due to its parallelism with the other languages.

8

No data was available for Tadjik. There do not appear to be competing perfects in the closely related Persian, but this is not sufficient for drawing conclusions regarding Tadjik.

9

The situation in Albanian is of a different and more complicated nature. It has yet to be described in print, and it is too difficult to enter into the details here.

10

Cf. the feeling in the English I didn't do it and I haven't done it (yet).

11

It is curious to note that precisely the opposite appears to be true in Modern Greek, where the perfect appears to be unacceptable in such clauses (Joseph Pentheroudakis: personal communication):

(ii) Khōrís ná tó katalávō, espása tó mpoukála.

\*ékhō spásei

Without noticing it, I broke the bottle.

have broken

12

Some North American Indian languages also appear to display similarities which ultimately might be taken into account (Cf., e.g. Boas 1911:124, 247-249, 255, 348-349, 703-704, 954; 1922:158, 200-201).

13

This entire discussion has been limited to the indicative

nonconfirmative. The interaction of status and marked modality is beyond the intended scope of this paper. Nonetheless, the connection between the two, e.g. in the markings of 'inferentiality' and futurity in Abkhaz (Hewitt 1977) or the use of batila in Avar (v. the sixth page of this paper), is one which will require further consideration.

## REFERENCES

- Agazade, N.G. 1967. Sistema glagol'nyx naklonenij v sovremennom azerbajdzanskom literaturnom jazyke. Baku: AN ASSR.
- Andrejcin, Ljubomir. 1952. "Vŭprosŭt za nacionalna samobitnost na ezika". Izvestija na Instituta za bŭlgarski ezik 2.29-54.
- Aronson, Howard I. "The Grammatical Categories of the Indicative in the Contemporary Bulgarian Literary Language". To Honor Roman Jakobson, vol. 1, 82-98. The Hague: Mouton.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. "Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian". Folia Slavica 1.1.9-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. forthcoming. Georgian: An Elementary Reading Course.
- Axundov, A.A. 1968. "Izjavitel'noe naklonenie glagola v azerbajdzanskom jazyke". Voprosy kategorij vremeni i naklonenija glagola v tjurkskix jazykax, ed. by M.S. Siraliev et al., 131-137. Baku: Elm.
- Boas, Franz (ed.). 1911; 1922. Handbook of American Indian Languages, parts 1 and 2. (Smithsonian Institution Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Bokarev, A.A. 1949. Sintaksis Avarskogo Jazyka. Leningrad: AN SSSR.
- Christiforov, Nadia. 1972. L'Emploi de l'aoriste et du parfait en bulgare moderne. Amsterdam: Hakert.
- Doerfer, Gerhard. 1967. Tŭrkische Lehnwörter im Tadschikischen. (Abhandlung für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXVII,3). Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1977. The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative. Columbus: Slavica.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. "On the Semantic and Morphological Influence of Turkish on Balkan Slavic". Papers from the Fourteenth Regional Meeting: Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society
- \_\_\_\_\_. forthcoming. "Admirativity in Bulgarian, Albanian, and Turkish". to appear in Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Bulgarian Studies. Sofia: Bŭlgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Haarman, Harald. 1970. Die indirekte Erlebnisform als grammatische Kategorie. Eine Eurasische Isoglosse. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hewitt, B.G. 1977. "Expression of 'Inferentiality in Abkhaz". St. John's College, Cambridge.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1957. Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb. Cambridge: Harvard.

- Johanson, Lars. 1971. Aspekt im Türkischen. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
- Kostov, Kiril. 1973. "Zur Bedeutung des Zigeunerischen für die Erforschung Grammatischer Interferenzerscheinungen". Balkansko ezikoznanie 16.99-113.
- Lewis, G.L. 1967. Turkish Grammar. Oxford: Oxford.
- Lunt, Horace. 1952. A Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language. Skopje: Drzavno Knigoizdatelstvo.
- Peikrišvili, Ž. 1974. "Turmeobitis mnišvneloba da gamoqeneba axal kartulsi". Kartvelur enata strukturis sakitxebi 4.53-70.
- Rastorgueva, V.S. and A.A. Kerimova. 1964. Sistema tadžikskogo glagola. Moscow: Nauka.
- Rogava, Giorgi. 1953. "Dro-kilota meotxe žgupis nakvtebi kartvelur enebši". Iberiu-kavkasiuri enatmecniereba 5.17-32.
- Rudenko, V.T. 1940. Grammatika gruzinskogo jazyka. Moscow: AN SSSR.
- Serebrennikov, B.A. 1974. Verojatnostnye obosnovanija v komparativistike. Moscow: Nauka.
- Seyfullah, Kevser. 1968. Sevimli kitabım. Skopje: Prosvetno Delo.
- Širaliev, M.Š. and E.V. Sevortjan. 1971. Grammatika azerbajdžanskogo jazyka. Baku: Elm.
- Vogt, Hans. 1971. Grammaire de la langue géorgienne. Oslo: Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1938. "Some Verbal Categories of Hopi" Language 14.275-286.
- Xajdakov, S.M. 1975. Sistema glagola v dagestanskix jazykax. Moscow: Nauka.