

Functions of *I*-participles

Abstract

An *I*-participle, or rather *I*-form (from the synchronic point of view), is a verb form derived by the suffix *-I-* from an infinitive verb stem. In order to express the subject-predicate agreement, a gender and number ending is added to this complex. The *I*-form together with various types of auxiliary verbs constitute the analytical form of the preterite (e.g., Ru *ja rabotal* 'I worked') that evolved from the Common Slavic perfect tense. In those Slavic languages that have multiple forms for expressing the past, the *I*-participle and auxiliary verb constitute the perfect tenses (e.g., Bg *sa storili* 'they have done some work'). There are also the antepreterite or pluperfect forms with *I*-participle in the Slavic languages (e.g., Sk *bol som prišiel* 'I had come') and, to a limited extent, the analytical future containing the *I*-participle (e.g., Sn *bom napisal* 'I will write'). The *I*-participle is also a part of the analytical conditional, which has two types in certain Slavic languages (cf. Cz *chtěl bych* 'I would like [something real]' and *byl bych chtěl* 'I would like [something unrealistic]'). In Bulgarian and Macedonian, the *I*-form constitutes the renarrative mood expressing some mediated information. This mood has a number of forms parallel to the forms of the indicative mood.

Contents:

Preterite and Perfect with *I*-participle

Antepreterite and Pluperfect with *I*-participle

Future, Future Perfect and Past Future with *I*-participle

Conditional Mood with *I*-participle

Renarrative Mood with *I*-participle

The *I*-participles share a part of their formal structure and their semantics with the deverbative *I*-adjectives like Cz *prošlý* 'expired' (cf. past tense *prošel* 'he passed' – infinitive *projít* 'to pass') or Po *nawykły* 'accustomed to something' (cf. *nawykł* 'he got accustomed' – infinitive *nawykać* 'to get accustomed', etc.). The *I*-adjectives express a state or condition, while the verbal *I*-participles express a process.

The *I*-participles of Slavic verbs originated probably from [Proto-Indo-European](#) verbal adjectives with the final suffix **-lo*. These adjectives had semantics of the 'ability to perform certain action' or 'a characteristic feature of certain person or thing' (Damborský 1967: 145, see also Wiemer 2014: 1645). In several Indo-European languages, and especially in Slavic languages, the adjectives ending with **-lo* had been used as a basis for derivation of agent nouns (*nomina agentis*), e.g., Cz *kecal* 'somebody who chats' (from *kecat* 'to chat'), *vrzal* 'somebody who squeaks' (from *vrzat* 'to squeak', about bad musicians, typically). Some of these adjectives were also used as a basis for derivation of common, frequent, and very typical Moravian surnames, e.g., *Kvapil* (from *kvapit* 'to rush'), *Látal* (*látat* 'to patch'), or *Vykydal* (*vykydat* 'to muck out'; see Damborský 1967: 126, 146). In Slavic languages as well as in Armenian and Tocharian, the adjectives ending with **-lo* were developed into the participles for using in analytic tense forms where, typically, the auxiliary verb 'to be' (CS **byti*) occurs.

Because of the aforementioned adjective origin of this form, the analytic tense forms containing *l*-participle express two grammatical categories of the noun, using the nominal endings: the number and the gender. For instance, cf. the Czech past tense *spal-ø jsem* ‘I slept’ (said by a man; with the zero morpheme expressing the singular and masculine gender together), *spal-a jsem* ‘I slept’ (said by a woman; with morpheme *-a*), *spal-o jsem* ‘I slept’ (potentially, said by a child; with morpheme *-o* expressing the neutral gender), and *spali jsme* ‘we slept’ (said by a group of people containing at least one male member). The Slavic languages distinguish, to a certain extent, the gender also in the plural forms of analytic tenses containing the *l*-participles (e.g., Cz *spal-y jsme* ‘we slept’, where the subjects are all female).

Preterite and perfect with *l*-participle

Many Slavic languages lost their former inventory of past tenses (aorist, imperfectum, perfectum, etc.; Dalewska-Greń 2002: 278) and the past tense with *l*-form is the sole or, at least, the main and unmarked past tense in the system. In East South Slavic languages (Bulgarian, Macedonian), the tense forms with *l*-participle preserved their original meaning, i.e., the meaning of perfect (Andrejčin 1978: 198), both in the past (perfect, pluperfect, and the so-called past future perfect) and in the future tense (future perfect, i.e., futurum exactum). This section deals primarily with the analytic preterite; it discusses the basic characteristics of *l*-participles in the context of analytical verb forms in Slavic languages (Běličová 1998: 83; Spencer 2001: 291; Dalewska-Greń 2002: 356), including Bulgarian and Macedonian. The perfect tense forms that occur in Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Upper Sorbian are also described in this section.

The main formal differences among Slavic languages are found in the use of the auxiliary verb “to be” in the past tense. Russian, Belarusian, and Ukrainian, where the subject is required in the sentence, do not use the auxiliary verb in preterite: e.g., Ru *Počti každyj den’ on pisal bratu po pis’mu* ‘Almost every day, he wrote a letter to his brother’, Br *Ja vedaŭ, što klinika hêtaja ŭžo adčynilasja* ‘I knew that this clinic has opened’, Uk *Ty zaraz mymovoli skazav pravdu* ‘You have told the truth inadvertently’. The morpheme *-l-* that occurs in Russian alternates with *-ŭ-* in Belarusian and *-v-* in Ukrainian (in the singular, masculine only). Past tense with *l*-participle is the only way in which to express the past in Russian and Belarussian grammatically. In Ukrainian, the antepreterite also exists (see below).

Czech, Slovak, and Polish use the past tense with an auxiliary verb in both 1st and 2nd person, but not in the 3rd person: e.g., Cz *Celé odpoledne jsem se díval na televizi* ‘I have been watching TV all afternoon’ (with the reflexive morpheme *se*: *dívat se* ‘to watch’), Sk *Mala si dost’ peňazí?* ‘Did you have enough money?’ (a woman is asked, as the noun ending *-a* shows). In Czech and Slovak, the auxiliary verbs (Cz 1.SG *jsem*, 1.PL *j sme*; Sk 1.SG *som*, 1.PL *sme* – Cz 2.SG *jsi*, 2.PL *jste*; Sk 2.SG *si*, 2.PL *ste*) are essentially free morphemes. They are clitics and occupy the second position in the clause, after the first stressed word. When the clause contains several clitics, the auxiliary verb occurs at the beginning of the group of clitics, after the full verb (Sk *Smial som sa mu do tváre* ‘I laughed in his face’, where *sa* is a clitic reflexive morpheme and *mu* the dative form of a pronominal clitic). In the 3rd person, the position of the auxiliary verb is empty in Czech, Slovak, and Polish: Cz *Skončili brzy* ‘They finished in a short time’, Sk *Zdvihla hlavu* ‘She raised her head’.

There is a specific situation in Polish: the reduced form of an auxiliary verb of 1st-person singular (-*m*) and 2nd-person singular (-*ś*) is attached to the verb as a fixed morpheme and it is not possible to move this morpheme, unlike in Czech and Slovak, where it is ordinary: e.g., Po **Wyglądał** (3.SG.M) *dokładnie tak samo, jak zapamiętałeś* (2.SG.M) *na zdjęciu w jakiejś książce o filozofii* 'He looked exactly the same as you remembered him from the photo in a book about philosophy'; *Nikogo nie pytałem* (1.SG.F) 'I did not ask anyone'. A similar phenomenon occurs in the Czech past tense, but in 2nd-person singular only where the fixed morpheme -*s* occurs: **Dals** *to zpátky na místo?* 'Did you put it back to its place?'. In 3rd-person singular and 3rd-person plural, there is a zero auxiliary verb in Czech, Slovak, Polish, and also in South Slavic (Macedonian, e.g., Mk *Od vas nikoj ne slušnal* *inkriminirački iskaz* 'None of you have heard an incriminating statement').

The rest of <xref>South Slavic languages</xref> (<xref>Bulgarian</xref>, <xref>BCMS</xref>, <xref>Slovene</xref>) and also the <xref>West Slavic</xref> <xref>Upper and Lower Sorbian</xref> manifest the auxiliary verb in all grammatical persons of the past tense, i.e., in the 3rd person, as well: e.g., Bg *Vlakăt tăkmo e potegnil* 'The train has just left'; Sr *Pola sata kasnije poslao je ženi telegram* 'Half an hour later, he sent a telegram to his wife' (the former -*l* is vocalized to -*o* in the form *poslao*); Cr *Molili su se da snijeg ne padne i ne prekrije te tragove prema svijetu* 'They prayed that the snow would not fall and cover those tracks to the world'; Sn *Učil je tvogega očeta* 'He taught your father'; US *Někotři Němcy su přečiwo tomu byli* 'Some Germans were against it'. If there is a reflexive morpheme *se*, the 3rd-person auxiliary verb is sometimes replaced by this morpheme, but only in BCMS (e.g., Cr *Čamac se približio obali* 'The boat approached the shore'). The auxiliary verb is potentially orthotonic in BCMS, Slovene, and Upper and Lower Sorbian (and also in Macedonian), i.e., it may have its own stress (this is impossible in Czech or Slovak mentioned above): e.g., Sn *Sem se sporazumel o tem* 'I agreed on that'; US *Sym wědzala, zo čakaš* 'I knew you were waiting'. Whereas in Macedonian, Slovene, and Upper and Lower Sorbian there is no formal or graphic difference between orthotonic and non-orthotonic auxiliary verbs, there are two types of auxiliary verbs, both orthotonic and non-orthotonic forms, in BCMS. In these languages, the orthotonic forms are used especially in questions and answers (Sr *Jesmo li sve shvatili?* 'Did we get/understand it all?'; Cr *Jesi li me razumio? – Jesam* (with a contextual ellipse of the full verb in answer) 'Did you understand me? – Yes, I did', literally 'I am').

The constructions with *I*-participles is not the only past tense that is being used in the South Slavic (except of Slovene, where the inventory of tenses is similar to Czech or Slovak), and in Upper Sorbian, there is also a wider inventory of past tenses. The past is also expressed in South Slavic languages and Lower Sorbian using the aorist, e.g., Bg *Po-minalata večer xodix na kino* 'I went to the movies last night', or the imperfect, e.g., Sr *Prolaznici se zaustavljahu naglo i posmatrahu izdaleka* 'The passers-by stopped abruptly and were looking from a great distance'. The semantics of past tense with *I*-participle is (to various degrees) more archaic here, i.e., perfectal (Běličová 1998: 85; Dalewska-Greń 2002: 355): this analytic form focuses on the present result of some past action in Bulgarian and Macedonian, while the perfectal meaning of tense with *I*-participle is not distinct in BCMS and Upper Sorbian.

In general, Bulgarian and Macedonian have much in common with non-Slavic languages such as English owing to distinguishing fine temporal nuances, cf. Bg *Lăgal se bjax* (past perfect, see below), *kato mislex* (imperfect) *predi, če rodopčankite sa gledali* (present perfect) *cvetnite livadi, za da izvezat* (present) *svoite zeleno-červeno-žalti prestilki* 'I was mistaken thinking before, that the Rhodopian women were looking at the colored meadows to

decorate their green-red-yellow aprons'; Mk *Žak i reče* (aorist) *na policijata deka vo avtomobilot sme bile* (present perfect) *i jas i brat ti* 'Jacques told the police that your brother and I were in the car'.

There is also another specific phenomenon in Bulgarian: the zero form of the auxiliary verb in the 3rd person of analytic forms with *I*-participle indicates the renarrative mood that is parallel to the indicative mood and has forms that cover the past and the present completely (see below in the special section).

In Slavic languages, the past tense with *I*-participle always expresses gender in the singular, but only Czech, Serbian, Croatian, and Slovene express gender differences in the plural, cf. Cz *oni četli* 'they read' (plural subject are *masculina animata* here, from *číst* 'to read'), *ony četly* (*masculina inanimata* or *feminina*), *ona četla* (neutral subject in plural); BCMS *oni čitali* (masculine, from *čitati* 'to read'), *one čitale* (feminine), *ona čitala* (neuter); Sn *oni brali* (masculine, from *brati* 'to read'), *one brale* (feminine), *ona brala* (neuter). The difference between Cz *četli* and *četly* is merely orthographic (not phonological).

In Polish plural forms of the *I*-participle, only the difference between animate subjects and inanimate subjects is distinguished, cf. animate *Jeszcze nigdy nie byli ze sobą tak związani jak teraz* 'They (animate subject) have never been as connected as they are now' and inanimate *Możliwe, że były to jakieś bardzo dawne zdarzenia przeniesione w czasy bliższe* 'It is possible that these (inanimate subject) were some very old events that were moved back to closer times'. In Polish, the plural form of *I*-participle in agreement with an animate subject ends in *-i*, with an inanimate subject ends in *-y*. The Upper Sorbian is similar to Polish: in Upper Sorbian, the animate subject in plural is manifested with participle ending in *-i* and inanimate subject in *-e*, but this difference is not obligatory in Upper Sorbian, and the ending *-i* prevails in general, e.g., US *Byrnjež tak móličke byli/byle, móža so tute mikroorganizmy zežiwjeć, dalepohibować a rozplódźować* 'Although these organisms are so small, they can feed themselves, move, and reproduce'.

In other Slavic languages, the plural forms of *I*-participles are unified regarding the gender. The universal plural ending *-i* occurs in Slovak, Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, and Bulgarian, e.g., Bg *Ženite sa storili тази работа* 'The women have done this work', while the ending *-e* is universal in Mk, e.g., *Mnogu i mnogu od nas sedele* (3rd person, i.e., without an auxiliary verb) *tuka, navaleni i opreni na klepaniot, gladok kamen* 'Many and many of us were sitting here, tilted and fitted to the hard, gloomy stone'.

Antepreterite and pluperfect with *I*-participle

Tenses, referring to an action that happened before another past action, are being used in Slovak, Upper and Lower Sorbian, Ukrainian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, BCMS, and Slovene, while these tenses are very rare in Czech and Polish and they do not occur in Russian and Belarusian (Běličová 1998: 84; Dalewska-Greń 2002: 372). In Slovak, Lower Sorbian, Ukrainian, BCMS, and Slovene, the antepreterite is being formed by an auxiliary verb in its past form, and *I*-participle, e.g., Sk *Prisvedčili mu, že sa všetko stane tak, ako bol povedal* 'They told him that everything would happen as he had said'; Uk *Ja vže počav був jisty, koly raptom zajšla jakas' čudna žinka* 'I had already started eating when suddenly a strange woman came'; Sr *Bili smo ga uhvatili, ali nam je umakao* 'We had caught him, but he got away again'; Cr *Bio je izgubio nekoliko kilograma, bio je ispijen i nije mogao napraviti*

dva koraka da daščući ne padne na stolicu ‘He had lost a few pounds, had been drunk, and could not take two steps to keep his chair from falling down’; Sn *Nato se je rahlo priklonil in odšel, prav kakor **je bil prišel*** ‘He then bowed slightly and walked away just as he had come’. The analytic construction auxiliary verb in form of aorist + *I*-participle is being used in Upper Sorbian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian, e.g., US *Pokazachmy wobrazy, kotrež **běchmy zhotowili*** ‘We showed the pictures we made’; Bg *I sām sigurna, če ako **bjaxte vzeli** vāprosa mi na seriozno, štjaxe da otgovorite* (past future tense) ‘And I am sure that if you had taken my question seriously, you would have answered’; Mk *Se razbira, vi se **bev nalutila*** ‘Of course, I was angry with you’ (subject of the sentence is a woman, as the ending of *I*-participle *nalutila* shows).

Future, future perfect, and past future with *I*-participle

There is only one Slavic standard language where the future with *I*-participle exists (Běličová 1998: 82; Dalewska-Greń 2002: 376): Slovene, where the participles (of both imperfective and perfective forms) occur together with future forms of the verb *biti* ‘to be’: *bom* ‘I will be’, *boš* ‘you will be’, *bo* ‘he/she/it will be’, *bomo* ‘we will be’, etc., e.g., *Nič ne **bom pisal*** (imperfective) ‘I won't write anything’; *To **bom napisal** kot novelo in **poskusil bom** tudi dramo* (perfective) ‘I will write this as a novella, and I will try the drama as well’. There are similar constructions also in the Kajkavian dialect of Croatian. In standard Polish, there is an optional future of a similar type that is complementarily distributed with the more frequent type *będzie* + infinitive. Unlike Slovene, in Polish only the imperfective verbs can be used in this future tense, e.g., *Nikt nie **będzie pisał*** (or with infinitive: *pisać* ‘to write’) *nam naszych ustaw!* ‘Nobody will write us our laws!’ This future occurs, marginally, also in northeastern dialects of Czech (Bělič 1972: 198).

In Bulgarian, Serbian, and Croatian, the future tense with *I*-participle works in sentence sequences (in subordinate clauses only), where this form expresses actions that occurred before some other future action (Andrejčin 1978: 211). In Serbian and Croatian, there is the auxiliary verb “to be” (1.sg *budem*, 2.sg *budeš*, 3.sg *bude*, etc.), while in Bulgarian, a different verb occurs (*šte* from CS **xotěti* ‘to want’), e.g., Bg *No šte e kāsno, az **šte sām potānala** vdān zemja i nikoj njama da znae kāde sām* ‘But it will be late, I will have sunk to the ground and nobody will know where I am’; Sr *Ništa neću uspeti da uradim sve, dok to ne **budem otkrio*** ‘I will not be able to do anything until I find it out’; Cr *Ako me ikad **budeš trebala**, bit ću ti uvijek na usluzi* ‘If you ever need me, I will always be at your service’. For a limited number of BCMS verbs, contracted forms of this future occur, e.g., *dadbudem* ‘I will give’, *mogbudem* ‘I can’, *znadbudem* ‘I will know’ (these forms are rather archaic). Semantically, the mentioned Bulgarian future (*šte sām potānala*) is closest to what is called future perfect in other languages: futures with *budem* in BCMS have a not-so-distinct semantics of “perfectivity.”

There is also a past future tense in Bulgarian formed with *I*-participle and tense form *štjax* (imperfect from CS **chotěti* ‘to want’), literally ‘I wanted’ (2nd- and 3rd-person *šteše*, etc.): e.g., *Az **štjax da sām pisal*** ‘I would have written’. Past future expresses a past action, which is future with respect to a past action, which itself is prior to another past action (Andrejčin 1978: 214).

In all the Slavic future tenses with *I*-participle mentioned above, the agreement in number and gender (due to the subject) is adhered, e.g., Bg *Vinagi **sa** me **učili** da izpālñjavam zapovedi* ‘I have always been taught to obey orders’; Sr *Ako **budem imala** pitanja uvek mogu*

da pitam vas ‘If I have some questions, I can always ask you’; Cr *Ako ne **budete radili** za nas, baciti ću vas ovim momcima* ‘If you do not work for us, I will throw you to these guys’; Sn *Bojim se, da tokrat ne **bova mogla** priti* ‘I am afraid that we would not be able to come this time’ (the auxiliary verb *bova* is the dual form of 1st person, literally ‘we two will be’).

Conditional mood with *I*-participle

There is a certain semantic and formal relation between the analytic tenses using the *I*-participle (various types of past tense and future tense) and conditional mood in Slavic languages (Komárek 2006: 120). The *I*-participle itself has a general semantics of “possibility” or “ability,” inherited from the former IE **lo*-adjectives (cf. Cz noun *kecal* ‘one who chats’ or ‘one who is said to be chatty’). This is why the *I*-participle also occurs in the conditional mood, together with the free conditional morpheme, i.e., *by*. This morpheme is the former aorist tense of the CS verb **byti* ‘to be’, sometimes with some new formal modifications (Běličová 1998: 95; Dalewska-Greń 2002: 383): cf. Cz *přišel bych* ‘I would come’, *přišel bys* ‘you would come’ and Sk *přišel by som*, *přišiel by si* where the morpheme *by* is orthographically separated from morphemes expressing the person and number. Forms of these morphemes are unified with forms of the auxiliary verbs in preterite in Slovak and Polish: this could be another argument for mutual closeness, both formal and semantic, of preterite/perfect and conditional in Slavic. In Polish, the morpheme *by* is orthographically included into the preceding word with own stress, often in the whole morpheme complex of preterite, e.g., *Gdyby tak było, nie **czytali**byśmy żadnych ksiąg naukowych* ‘If that was the case, we would not read any scientific books’, cf. *nie czytali*byśmy ‘we would not read’ and *nie czytali*śmy ‘we did not read’. Conditional mood with *by* is being used in the Slavic north (Croatian, Slovak, Upper and Lower Sorbian, Polish, Russian, Belarusian, and Ukrainian) more frequently, while the indicative forms with *da* are preferred in the Slavic south (Bulgarian, Macedonian, BCMS, and Slovene) in this function, especially in subordinate clauses, cf. Cz *Chtěla, **abych** přišel* (the 1.sg auxiliary verb *bych* is contracted here with the conjunction *a* ‘and’) and Bg *Tja iskaše **da dojd**a*, both meaning ‘She wanted me to come’.

The full inflected auxiliary verb *by* occurs in Czech, Slovak, and Polish: Cz *Rádi **bychom** si objednali* ‘We would like to order’; Sk ***Mali by ste** preto čo najskôr odísť z tábora* ‘You should therefore leave the camp as soon as possible’; Po *Czy **mógłbyś** zacząć jeszcze raz od początku?* ‘Could you start from the beginning again?’. In Upper Sorbian, Bulgarian, and BCMS, the auxiliary verb is inflected, but there is a syncretism in the forms of 2nd and 3rd person, cf. US *Koho **bych** so prašec **móht**?* ‘Who could I ask?’ and Hdy ***by** ty **wědž**ať, kak často mje wón po atlasu wodži* ‘If you knew how often he led me through the atlas’); Bg *Da **bi** ti **poš**ušnal njakoj kakvo te čaka tam pri drugite, ti ne **bi** se **iz**plašila* ‘If someone would whisper to you what awaits you there with the others, you would not be scared’; Sr *Vi **bi** **bile** nervozne* ‘You would be nervous (said to women, as the ending *-e* shows)’; Cr *Vi **bi** se **č**udili, kako je moguće* ‘You would wonder how it is possible’.

The uninflected auxiliary verb (or rather, the particle) *by* occurs in Lower Sorbian, Russian, Belarusian, Ukrainian, Macedonian, and Slovene, where the person is expressed by the subject in most cases, but not always, as the following sentences show, e.g., LS *Na twojim měšće **by** pšecej za nim **glě**dať* ‘If I were you, I would be careful of him’; Ru *Ne **mogli by** vy postavit’ svoju fotografiju?* ‘Could you put here your photo?’; Uk *Vin zamyslyvsja nad tym, jak **by** do vs’oho c’oho **post**avyvsja vin sam* ‘He wondered, how he personally would react’,

cf. Uk *Ja **b** ne **zmih** staty prezidentom* ‘I would not be able to become a president’ where the reduced form of auxiliary (*b*) occurs, used after a vowel in the sentence context, and the reduced participle where *-l* is dropped (*zmig*); Br *Ja **b** nahljadzeŭ, jak **by** jon **zmoh** sa svaimi ūsmeškami i rukami za spinoju nešta zrabic* ‘I would like to see him doing something with his smile and his hands behind his back’; Mk *Tatko mu **bi** **sakal** sinot da mu studira tehnika ili šumarstvo* ‘His father would like his son to study technique or forestry’ (the inflected auxiliary also occurs in Macedonian, but exceptionally, imitating the Bulgarian conditional, e.g., Mk *bi sum donesol* ‘I would bring’; Běličová 1998: 96); Sn *Tudi jaz **bi** ne **verjel** njima, če **bi** mi kdaj **pripovedovala** nekaj podobnega* ‘I also would not believe them if they ever told me something similar’.

In Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian, Russian, Belarussian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian, there is only one conditional mood with *by* and *I*-participle, as described above. The rest of Slavic languages (Czech, Slovak, Polish, Ukrainian, BCMS, and Slovene) have one more conditional available: the so-called *irrealis* (Uličný 2013), with an even stronger semantics of hypotheticity than the “normal” conditional mood expresses. The past form of the auxiliary verb “to be” is added here to the conditional *by* + *I*-participle, cf. both the conditionals: Cz *Tatínek **by** se **zlobil*** ‘Dad would be angry’ and ***Byl** **bych** počkal, kdybys řekla* ‘I would have waited if you had asked’; Sk ***Chcel** **by** som, aby sme znova mali záhradu* ‘I wish we had a garden again’ and ***Bol** **by** som **chcel**, aby jej spod viečok vystrekli slzy* ‘I would like tears to spur under her eyelids’; Po *Inaczej nie **trzymalbym** tu ciebie tyle czasu* ‘Otherwise, I would not keep you here for such a long time’ and *Aha, jeszcze jedno, **bylbym** zapomniat* ‘Oh, one more thing, I have almost forgotten’; Uk *Za takoji pohody vin u lisi **zamerz** **by** na curku* ‘In such weather he would freeze in a forest’ (the *-l* in the participle form *zamerz* was dropped) and *Pevno ž, ščo bez tebe vin **by** **buv** hovoriv zovsim inakše* ‘Obviously, he would have spoken differently if you had not been there’ (rather peripheral, as in BCMS); Sr *Prema Vama nema apsolutno ničeg što **bih** **morao** da umanjujem ili preuveličavam* ‘According to you, there is absolutely nothing that I would have to downplay or exaggerate’ and *Da si nešto rekao malopre **bio** **bih** te **udario*** ‘If you had said something a moment ago, I would have hit you’; Cr ***Odlazili** **bismo** u prosincu, prije Božića* ‘We would leave in December, before Christmas’ and *Da si rekao, **bili** **bismo** poslali motorni čamac po tebe* ‘If you had told us, we would have sent a motorboat for you’; Sn ***Morali** **bi** se ograditi od tega* ‘They should get out of it’ and ***Bil** **bi** tudi kihnil, a si ni upal niti zganiti se* ‘He would sneeze too, but he did not dare to bend’. In Czech, there is an extended conditional form with the iterative auxiliary verb *bývat* ‘to be (repeatedly)’ that further emphasizes the hypotheticity of some action, cf. the three possible forms of the Czech conditional: *Kdybych to **věděl**, nechodil bych sem* ‘If I knew it, I would not come here (the fact that I knew it, is hypothetical, but real)’; *Kdybych to **byl** **věděl**, nechodil bych sem* (the fact that I knew it, is hypothetical and unreal as well); *Kdybych to **býval** **věděl**, nechodil bych sem* (the fact that I knew it, is hypothetical indeed, and very unreal).

Renarrated mood with *I*-participle

In Bulgarian and Macedonian, the *I*-participle is used in a special mood designated to report a nonwitnessed event without confirmation (*preizkazno naklonenie*), e.g., Bg *Ne znae ništo po-podrobno za Tom, vāpreki če kazva, če godini nared **četjal** edin čikagski vestnik* ‘He does not know anything more about Tom, although he says that he used to read (probably, as someone said) a Chicago newspaper’; Mk *Toj **bil** učen* ‘He was (probably, as someone said)

clever' (Andrejčin 1978: 217; Spencer 2001: 295). The renarrative mood that is parallel to the indicative mood has got a full paradigm for the past present, past, and future. Several forms of the past present paradigm are homonymous with the present perfect (indicative), e.g., *četjal sām* could be interpreted as expressing renarrative mood in its past present form or as the present perfect. But the aforementioned *četjal* (without any auxiliary verb for 3rd-person singular) is in the renarrative mood, while *četjal e* (with auxiliary verb *e* 'is') is the present perfect, i.e., indicative form. The signal of the renarrative mood is, in general, the lack of an auxiliary verb *e* 'he/she/it is' or *sa* 'they are' in 3rd-person singular and 3rd-person plural, in all tenses.

There are two series of the renarrative mood in Bulgarian: the nonmarked and the marked (this one with the past form of the verb "to be" added; for the semantic differentiation between them, see Andrejčin 1978: 220). In the past present in the renarrative mood, the nonmarked series contains forms such as *četjal sām* (1.SG), *četjal si* (2.SG), *četjali sme* (1.PL) etc., while marked series contains forms such as *bil sām četjal* (1.SG), *bil si četjal* (2.SG), *bili sme četjali* (1.PL). In the past tense, the nonmarked series contains forms with a varied stem of the *I*-participle, e.g., *čel sām* (1.SG), *čel si*, *čeli sme*, and the marked series contains forms such as *bil sām čel* (1.SG), *bil si čel* (2.SG), and *bili sme čeli* (1.PL). In the future tense, in the nonmarked series are forms *štjal sām da četa* (1.SG), *štjal si da četeš* (2.SG), *šteli sme da četem* (1.PL), where the *I*-participle of the verb "to want" occurs together with inflected present forms of the verb "to be," the conjunction *da*, and the inflected present form of the full verb (*četa*, *četeš*, etc.). The marked set of renarrated mood forms in the future tense contains the analytic forms with the past-tense added verb "to be," e.g., *štjal sām bil da četa* (1.SG), *štjal si bil da četeš* (2.SG), *šteli sme bili da četem* (1.PL).

Ondřej Bláha – Palacký University Olomouc

References

Andrejčin, Ljubomir 1978. *Osnovna bălgarska gramatika*. Sofia.

Bělič, Jaromír 1972. *Nástin české dialektologie*. Prague.

Běličová, Helena 1998. *Nástin porovnávací morfologie spisovných jazyků slovanských*. Prague.

Dalewska-Greń, Hanna 2002. *Języki słowiańskie*. Warsaw.

Damborský, Jiří 1967. *Participium I-ové ve slovanštině*. Warsaw.

Komárek, Miroslav 2006. *Příspěvky k české morfologii*. Olomouc.

Spencer, Andrew. 2001. The paradigm-based model of morphosyntax. *Transactions of the philological society* 99/2, 279–313.

Štícha, František. 2009. Das attributive Partizip I und der Aspekt. *Studia germanistica* 4, 81–94.

Uličný, Oldřich. 2013. Irrealis (-)by-ový v slovanských jazycích. *Slavia* 77, 205–209.

Wiemer, Björn 2014. Umbau des Partizipialsystems. In: Gutschmidt, Karl et al. (eds.), *Die slavischen Sprachen. Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung*, vol. II. Berlin, 1625–1652.