It's All Under Control!
On Perfective Present Forms in BCS Main Clauses

Marco Biasio
Università degli Studi di Padova, Italia

Abstract   This study aims to provide a unified analysis of the syntax-pragmatics interface of the (allegedly) anomalous licensing of the perfective present (Pres[PF]) in BCS present-tensed main clauses. Although Pres[PF] forms cannot usually refer to eventualities that are anchored to the utterance time (UT), there seem to be three apparent exceptions to this structural constraint. They are as follows: 1) abusive metonymic performatives; 2) live demonstrations; and 3) nonveridical contexts introduced by the epistemic operator *možda* 'maybe'. It is claimed that for Pres[PF] forms to be licensed in BCS main clauses, control needs to be specified as a variable at the level of the so-called 'Seat of Knowledge' in the SpeechActP layer.

Keywords   Verbal aspect. Perfective present. Control. Štokavian. Speech act phrase. Syntax-pragmatics interface.

Summary   1 Introduction. – 2 Breaking the Law? Anomalous Pres[PF] Forms in Main Clauses. – 2.1 Abusive Metonymic Performatives. – 2.2 Live Demonstrations. – 3 Control as a Variable in SpeechActP. – 4 Conclusions.

1 Introduction

It is widely known that both in the Old- and the Neo-Štokavian dialectal groups of the BCS[1] continuum, there is a pervasive grammatical constraint on the licensing of independent perfective present forms (henceforth Pres_PF) that refer to different kinds of eventualities in certain syntactic environments, such as present-tensed main clauses.[2] The unavailability of Pres_PF forms in BCS main clauses is exemplified in (1) below, where the replacement of the inflected Pres_IPF form of the ambitransitive predicate *pisati* 'to write' with the correspective Pres_PF form of *napisati* yields absolute ungrammaticality:[3]

(1) *Pišem*_WRITE.1.sg.PresIPF (**Napišem*_WRITE.1.sg.PresPF) sve ovo kao upozorenje novopostavljenim direktorima na moguća neprijatna iznenađenja. [SrpKor, viva0104_n.txt, Viva (April 2001)]
'I'm writing all this to warn all the newly appointed directors of possible unpleasant surprises'.

1 Throughout this article I will adopt the umbrella label BCS (shortly for Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian) in order to refer collectively to the different varieties of the South Slavic dialectal continuum which are nowadays spoken in most of the national republics that emerged after the collapse of Jugoslavia. BCS is to be taken here as a synonym of 'Serbo-Croatian', which was the standard working term in linguistics at least up to the first major outbreak of Jugoslav Wars in 1991. The term however has been sidelined in this paper to prevent the emergence of unwarranted political associations. The Author of the present study acknowledges the scientific validity of the views stated in the Declaration on the Common Language (*Deklaracija o zajedničkom jeziku*) and supports the general claim that Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, and Montenegrin should be viewed as national variants (each with equal rights) of the same standard South Slavic polycentric language (for more technical evidence in support of this claim see also Bailyn 2010). The text of the Declaration is available at the following link: https://jezicinacionalizmi.com/deklaracija. Where not specified otherwise, all translations are by the Author.

2 *Eventuality* is here used (in the original spirit of Bach 1986) as a cover term for both states and non-states (processes, events), while the definition of a *main clause* (i.e. a clause which can stand on its own, in opposition both to matrix and subordinate clauses) is given after Haspelmath (2020, 603).

3 In linguistic theory the concept of *grammaticality* has proved to be notoriously hard to disentangle from the (apparently overlapping) notion of *acceptability*. For the sake of clarity we stick to the results of the discussion recently elaborated in Leivada, Westergaard 2020 and Leivada, Murphy 2021, 4-5, where it is claimed that (un)grammaticality, unlike (un)acceptability, is more of a twofold concept (on the axis 'absolute'-'relative') than a scalar notion.

This constraint has drawn considerable attention over recent decades. In the cognitive literature the functional markedness of grammatical forms with present time reference – resulting from the combination of the aspectual category 'perfective' and the temporal category 'present' – has been labelled as the *present perfective paradox* (cf. among others De Wit 2017). It has been proposed that such markedness holds cross-linguistically, and is mainly triggered by the cognitive difficulty of processing and representing as a single whole an eventuality token still unfolding at the UT.[4] In other words, either the eventuality is predominantly represented as holding at the UT (thus focusing on its outer temporal anchoring), or is seen as a single whole (thus zooming in on its inner temporal properties). In more formal terms, adopting a Kratzerian definition of PF according to which the event time interval needs to be included within the reference time interval (i.e. for present-tensed eventualities, the near-instantaneous UT), Todorović (2015, 87-8) argues that the impossibility of satisfying the inclusion requirement of PF within the time interval selected by the UT in SpecT leads to the impossibility for the event to be temporally located, and consequently triggers the absolute ungrammaticality of main clause PresPF forms.[5]

De Wit (2017, 38) claims that languages can solve the present perfective paradox resorting to three main repair strategies, i.e. assigning a futural (the *prospective strategy*), past (the *retrospective strategy*), or non-actual reading (the *structural strategy*) to eventualities realised with PresPF forms. Unlike East Slavic languages, where main clause PresPF forms have been prototypically reanalysed as aspectual futures (e.g. Russian *pročitaju*READ.1.sg.PresPF 'I will read'), or even West Slavic languages, where main clause PresPF forms can be alternatively used either as aspectual futures or modally nuanced non-actual presents (e.g. Czech *koupím*BUY.1.sg.PresPF 'I will buy', 'I buy'), in almost all the South Slavic languages spoken in the Balkans[6] PresPF forms have retained only their non-actual function, and thus are unable to refer to eventuality tokens which are anchored to the UT.

Old- and Neo-Štokavian dialects of BCS seemingly adopt a reinforced structural strategy[7] as the licensing of non-actual PresPF forms

---

is restricted to embedded clauses (cf. (2), whereby *pročitam*_{READ.1.sg.}
_{PresPF} 'I read' is licensed inside a clause of purpose introduced by
the complementizer *da*),[8] interrogative-negative contexts[9] (cf. *ne
dođete*_{COME.2.pl.PresPF} 'you don't come' and *ne probate*_{TRY.2.pl.PresPF} 'you don't
try' featured in the whimperative structure in (3)) or even chains of

---

er languages of the *Balkansprachbund*. In Modern Greek, for instance, present tense
forms built from the aoristic stem (*synoptikoi* 'momentaneous') cannot occur in main
clause contexts and can be licensed either in embedded environments introduced by
the subjunctive marker *na* (e.g. *Mporṓ na alláxō*_{CHANGE.1.sg.PresPF} *tis glṓsses óses forés thélō*
'I can change languages as many times as I want') or, as emphasised by an anonymous
reviewer, as complements of the future marker *tha* (e.g. *Tha to peis*_{SAY.2.sg.PresPF} 'You will
say it'; cf. Giannakidou 2009). This last use bears some resemblance to the distribu-
tion of Pres^{PF} forms in the Serbian variety of BCS, which can replace the bare infinitive
and be licensed by the complementizer *da* after an inflected proclitic form of the (vo-
litional) future marker (e.g. *On će* [*da dođe*]_{COME.3.sg.PresPF} 'He will come' instead of *On će
doći*_{COME.InfPF}). The possible reasons for the difference between BCS and Modern Greek
on one hand, the other South Slavic languages on the other are left for future research.

8   It must be added, however, that the licensing of Pres^{PF} forms in BCS subordinate
clauses is subject to further restrictions. Todorović (2017, 88-90) points out that, on
the one hand, Pres^{PF} forms cannot occur in propositional complements of intensional
verbs such as *v(j)erovati* 'to believe', at least when their temporal argument is not or-
dered according to a relation of anteriority ($<$) or posteriority ($>$) with respect to the UT,
hence the ungrammaticality of sentences such as **V(j)eruje da Jovan prevede*_{TRANSLATE.3.sg.}
_{PresPF} *p(j)esmu* (intended: '(S)He believes that Jovan has translated a poem (just now)').
In addition, as a result of a more general constraint on the distribution of PF (which
possibly holds cross-linguistically), in the Serbian variety of BCS Pres^{PF} forms cannot
be licensed as complements of phasal verbs such as *počinjati* 'to begin' (**Počinjem da
prevedem*_{TRANSLATE.1.sg.PresPF} *pesmu*, intended: 'I'm beginning to translate the entire po-
em (just now)'). Generally speaking, as pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, pred-
icates that select either subjunctive or infinitive forms in Romance languages can li-
cense Pres^{PF} forms in BCS. This is, for instance, the case of verbs such as *pokušavati*
'to try', whose tenseless complements do not yield a future interpretation whatsoever
(**Pokušava da sutra prevede*_{TRANSLATE.3.sg.PresPF} *pesmu*, intended: '(S)He is trying to trans-
late the entire poem tomorrow') and can always enter an aspectual opposition with the
corresponding Pres^{IPF} forms. On the other hand, predicates selecting indicative forms
in Romance languages block the licensing of Pres^{PF} forms in BCS. Among them are as-
sertive predicates such as *tvrditi* 'claim', e.g. **Tvrdim da Ivan dođe*_{COME.1.sg.PresPF} (intend-
ed: 'I claim/am claiming that Ivan is coming').

9   Pres^{PF} forms can appear in other nonveridical or anti-veridical contexts as well. With
a small group of telic eventualities (e.g. *dati* 'to give', *pustiti* 'to let', *dozvoliti* 'to allow',
doći 'to come'), negative Pres^{PF} forms are regularly licensed. These forms, which fall
outside the scope of this paper, seemingly behave like light verbs and are prototypi-
cally marked with 1st (singular and plural) or 2nd (singular and plural) bound person-
number indexes, as in (i):

> (i) E, vidite, ja *ne dam*_{GIVE.1.sg.PresPF} taj trenutak, tu epohu, tu kristalnu kocku vedrine,
> "svečanost tragične vedrine", *ne dam*_{GIVE.1.sg.PresPF} da to nestane. [HNK, vj20021110ku03]
> 'So, you see, I won't give away that moment, that age, that "crystal cube of serenity"
> [Kristalna kocka vedrine – a house of culture in Sisak], the "celebration of a tragic sereni-
> ty" [a theatre play by Tomislav Durbešić], I won't let it disappear'.

Vojvodić's (2015, 55-6) hypothesis that BCS elliptical constructions such as *ne dam* are
derived via transformation of future-oriented negative volitional sentences of the type
Neću [*da dam*] (lit. 'I won't give (it)') requires a more thorough examination.

habitual eventualities which however need to be explicitly marked as such[10] (in (4) the non-actuality of the eventualities realised with the Pres[PF] forms *popijem*[DRINK.1.sg.PresPF] 'I drink' and *iscijedim*[SQUEEZE.1.sg.PresPF] 'I squeeze' is signalled by the complex temporal adjunct *svaki dan <nakon jela>* 'every day <after meals>' and by the conjoined adjunct *ujutro i navečer* 'in the morning and in the evening'):[11]

---

[10] Main clause (Štokavian) Pres[PF] forms can also be licensed in isolation, as long as the temporal anchoring of the clause remains unordered with reference to the UT. Unlike West and East Slavic languages, however, in contemporary BCS modal (dynamic) readings of Pres[PF] have been – to the best of my knowledge – replaced entirely either by overt modal constructions governed by *moći* 'can' or by (stylistically unmarked) Pres[IPF] forms, cf. (ii):

> (ii)[7] On u jednoj ruci *digne*[LIFT.3.sg.PresPF] (može [da *digne*][LIFT.3.sg.PresPF] / može *dići*[LIFT.InfPF] / *diže*[LIFT.3.sg.PresIPF]) 25 kg. (Galton 1976, 92)
> 'He can lift 25 kg with one arm'.

Other similar contexts include popular sayings (cf. (iii)) and semi-lexicalised expressions (cf. (iv)). Interestingly, in both cases 3rd p. sg. Pres[PF] forms can freely alternate with Aor[PF] forms, which in some cases are homographs and can thus be distinguished only prosodically (cf. *dôđe*[COME.3.sg.PresPF] 'he/she comes' vs. *dóđe*[COME.3.sg.AorPF] 'he/she came'). Note also that Aor[PF] forms in the given contexts do not trigger any anterior reading whatsoever:

> (iii) Ko *se* dima *ne nadimi*[SMOKE UP.3.sg.PresPF/3.sg.AorPF], taj *se* vatre *ne nagrije*[HEAT UP.3.sg.PresPF] / nagreja[3.sg.AorPF].
> 'Results demand sacrifice (lit. 'He who does not catch the smoke catches no heat from the fire')'.

> (iv) On mi *dođe*[COME.3.sg.PresPF] brat. (Dickey 2000, 199)
> 'He is my brother (lit. 'He comes to me as a brother')'.

Additionally, in several Kajkavian and Čakavian dialects Pres[PF] forms can also be reinterpreted as aspectual futures, most frequently alongside a temporal operator such as *sutra* 'tomorrow': compare *sutra dođem*[COME.1.sg.PresPF] 'Tomorrow I'll come', *sutra ti javim*[LET KNOW.1.sg.PresPF] 'I'll let you know tomorrow', *sutra naprintam*[PRINT.1.sg.PresPF] 'I'll print tomorrow' and the like (I am thankful to Mladen Uhlik and an anonymous reviewer for providing me with these as well as similar other examples). As for Štokavian areal variation, Polovina (1985, 98-9) illustrates an interesting spoken exchange between two Belgrade-based youngsters around mid-eighties where an apparently independent Pres[PF] form seems to be freely licensed in a future-oriented context (*Dobro, izađeš*[COME OUT.2.sg.PresPF] *u 7, kažeš imam autobus u 7.30...* 'Fine, you come out at 7 o'clock, you say I've got my bus at 7.30…'). However, a closer look at the communicative situation reveals that the speaker is revisiting a potential future schedule for their interlocutor, in a way similar to the so-called narrative future (Dickey 2000, 149-54), which in turn is usually considered a peculiar instantiation of the historical present template. Since perfective aspectual futures are virtually ungrammatical in Štokavian dialects, then, a comprehensive analysis of these contexts falls outside the scope of the present paper.

[11] It should be kept in mind that in both interrogative-negative and explicitly habitual contexts, Pres[IPF] forms (*dolaziš*, *pijem*, *cijedim*) can always occur. Unlike Pres[IPF] forms however, the use of Pres[PF] forms in examples like (3) is linked to the emergence of particular pragmatic inferences which have to do with the contextual actualisation either of circumstantial or dynamic modal meanings (among others Tanasić 1996, 169-70), while in examples like (4) the use of Pres[PF] forms is generally preferred with telic eventualities which are measured out by their (referential) internal argument (among others Dickey 2000, 68-71; Vojvodić 2019, 17).

(2) Kada sam stigao kući, seo sam da *pročitam*_{READ.1.sg.PresPF} nekoliko radova koje su naši mali domaćini napisali na času veronauke povodom Vaskrsa. [SrpKor, po-li100402.txt, Politika (02.04.2010.)]
'Once I came back home, I sat and read some works which were written by our little hosts during their religion hour for Easter'.

(3) Mnogo prirodnih ledenih zidova svih stepena težine Vas očekuje u i oko Livinja. Zašto *ne dođete*_{COME.2.pl.PresPF} i *probate*_{TRY.2.pl.PresPF}? [srWaC.4276.7, #4275]
'Lots of ice walls with all degrees of difficulty await you in and around Livig-no. Why don't you come and try yourself?' (⊃ 'Come and try! You are invited!').

(4) "Svaki dan nakon jela *popijem*_{DRINK.1.sg.PresPF} jedno Tomislav pivo, a ujutro i navečer čašicu žestokog pelinkovca. U kavu obavezno *iscijedim*_{SQUEEZE.1.sg.PresPF} pola limuna, i doktor, vjerujte, meni ne treba […]" [HNK, gs20040327sb29520]
'Every day after meals I drink a bottle of Tomislav beer, while in the morning and in the evening [I drink] a shot of Pelinkovac. In my coffee I squeeze half a lemon by default, and believe me, I don't need any doctor'.

However there seem to be three apparent exceptions to this higher-level constraint applied to present-tensed main clauses. The first one involves the so-called abusive metonymic performatives (Dick-ey 2015), as shown in (5) below:

(5) Da prevedem na srpsko-hrvatski-bošnjački: *poserem se*_{SHIT.1.sg.PresPF} na svoj život u državi u kojoj ste vi ministar. (Dickey 2015, 254)
'Let me put it in Serbo-Croato-Bosniak: I shit on my life in a state in which you are a minister'.

The second one involves the aspectual marking of a special subtype of running commentaries, live demonstrations, such as in the recipe instructions reported in (6):

(6) *Zapalim*_{SET ON FIRE.1.sg.PresPF} joj kožu na vratu, pa *preklopim*_{FOLD.1.sg.PresPF} na leđa i *učvrstim*_{FASTEN.1.sg.PresPF} čačkalicama. Potom grabilicu *napunim*_{FILL.1.sg.PresPF} rakijom lozovačom, *zagrijem*_{WARM UP.1.sg.PresPF} i *zapalim*_{SET ON FIRE.1.sg.PresPF}, te *polijem*_{POUR.1.sg.PresPF} puricu. [HNK, vj20091226pis010]
'I sear the skin [of the turkey] on the neck, then I fold it on the back and I fasten it with toothpicks. Then I fill the ladle with lozovača [home-made grape rakija], warm it up and set it on fire, then I pour it on the turkey'.

The third one involves the possible licensing of Pres^{PF} forms in a particular type of nonveridical context featuring the epistemic operator *možda* 'maybe', as in (7):

(7) Nakon teniske karijere, posvetit ću se humanitarnom radu, a možda *nađem*_{FIND.1.sg.PresPF} i ženu s kojom ću zasnovati obitelj, kazao je 31-godišnji Chang. [HNK, vj20030202sp08]

'After my tennis career is over I'll devote myself to voluntary work, and maybe find a woman I can start a family with, said the 31-year-old Chang'.

In this paper it is claimed that these three contexts of Pres[PF] use do not constitute an exception to the pattern we regularly find in Štokavian dialects. On the contrary, they can be subsumed under a unified analysis which, building on some theoretical tenets advocated by the so-called neoperformative hypotheses (among others Speas, Tenny 2003), aims at mapping the feature of (cognitive) control in the higher portion of the clausal spine, above CP. The article is structured as follows: in § 2 I will discuss the aforementioned 'exceptions' in more detail with regard to the suppression of independent Pres[PF] forms from Štokavian main clauses; in § 3 I will reframe the issue at the syntax-pragmatics interface, providing some evidence for a proper syntacticization of the parameter of (cognitive) control inside SpeechActP; in §4 I will draw some preliminary conclusions.

2 Breaking the Law? Anomalous Pres[PF] Forms in Main Clauses

In this section I will address each of the three case studies of this paper: abusive metonymic performatives (§ 2.1), live demonstrations (§ 2.2), and nonveridical contexts featuring *možda* (§ 2.3).

2.1 Abusive Metonymic Performatives

The label *abusive metonymic performatives* (henceforth AMP; the term was first coined in Dickey 2015, 254-9; 268-70) applies to a closed class of obscene and disparaging phrases which, although lacking most of the characteristics ascribable to explicit performative utterances,[12] share some interesting illocutionary similarities

---

12 By *explicit performative utterance* we define a token of the utterance set U(x), actualising a proposition P(x) with an explicit performative verb in its abstract logical form, which amounts to the action expressed in P(x) when uttered under felicitous circumstances by an agent who is endowed with (or granted) the necessary authority. An explicit performative utterance has to be self-referential, pragmatically felicitous and grammatically well-formed; moreover, it must not satisfy any inherently antiperformative condition. Finally, it has to be categorically defined by the speaker in the speech act event and recognised as such by the hearer (Eckardt 2012, 47-8).

Unlike AMPs, the prototypical tempo-aspectual form licensed in explicit performative utterances (cf. the commissive illocutionary act exemplified by *obećavati*[IPF] 'to promise' in (v)) is Pres[IPF], while Pres[PF] forms are regularly ruled out. It should be mentioned, however, that Pres[IPF] forms can be opposed by Fut[PF], although only to a limited extent and as long as certain preconditions at the syntax-pragmatic interface (which cannot be explored in detail here) are met:

with them as well. In other words, AMPs, which refer to purely re-sultative eventualities and are typically a main clause phenomenon, do not constitute a simple depiction of the eventuality token actual-ised in the sentence; they also figuratively perform on the insulted hearer the action that the utterance refers to (hence the term 'met-onymic'). Relevant examples of Štokavian AMPs are reported in (5) above and (8) below:

(8) *Nabijem*~STICK.1.sg.PresPF~ te na kurac! (Dickey 2000, 200)
     'I thrust you onto my cock!'

Although AMPs are coded with Pres^PF^ forms in other Slavic languag-es, most notably those of the Western branch (which is in line with the Slavic East-West aspect division laid out in Dickey 2000), such marking stands out as peculiar in BCS. Comparing this usage with some exceptional cases of Pres^PF^ forms used performatively – both in Old Church Slavonic and Old Slovene – Dickey (2015, 268-70) claims that perfective AMPs should be considered a grammatical archaism inherited from Common Slavic, and credits 'absolute control of the speaker' as a key factor for their aspectual marking.

Even though in Dickey (2015) the working definition of 'absolute control of the speaker' is not formalised, I have argued elsewhere (Biasio, forthcoming) that the author's claim is sound, and that there is both historical, formal (i.e. morphosyntactic), as well as even evo-lutionary evidence to back it up.[13] It is also worth mentioning that AMPs can neither be coded as Pres^IPF^ in their derogatory, performa-tive-like function (#*Nabijam*~STICK.1.sg.PresIPF~ *te na kurac* could only report an ongoing event, if any), nor can they be marked with person-num-ber bound indexes different from 1st sg. (*Nabiješ~STICK.2.sg.PresPF~ *ga na kurac!*) or negated (*Ne nabijem~STICK.1.sg.PresPF~ *te na kurac!*). Additional-ly, other outrageous expressions that do not denote purely resultative eventualities resist marking with Pres^PF^ forms: cf. *Jebem*~FUCK.1.sg.PresIPF~ (*Odjebem~FUCK OFF.1.sg.PresPF~ / *Zajebem~SCREW UP.1.sg.PresPF~) *ti mater* 'Fuck you', lit. 'I fuck (*fuck off / *screw up) your mother'. The data seemingly suggests that the parameter of control may play a pivotal role in the aspectual coding of resultative eventualities in egophoric utterances.

(v) Navijačima *obećavam*~PROMISE.1.sg.PresIPF~ (*obećam~PROMISE.1.sg.PresPF~ / ^?^*ću obećati*~PROMISE.1.sg.FutPF~) mak-simalno zalaganje, borbu za napad i svaku odbranu i to će, valjda, doneti željeni rezultat. [SrpKor, poli010303.txt, Politika (03 March 2001)]
'I promise our supporters absolute commitment and a relentless fight for attack and de-fence and this, I hope, will bring about the desired outcome'.

13 Although I believe it is safer to assume that AMPs and other 'perfective' perform-atives in Old Church Slavonic and Old Slovene actually belonged to a general aspect (Biasio, forthcoming), in contemporary BCS such preverbed predicates are unambig-uously interpreted as PF.

2.2 Live Demonstrations

There is a large body of literature concerning the aspectual marking of running commentaries in Slavic languages (cf. among others Galton 1976, 95-7; Dickey 2000, 155-74), which are usually analysed as a peculiar instantiation of the historical present – irrespective of the significant variation they display both in their temporal anchoring and their extradiegetic properties. Instead, for the sake of clarity, in this subsection only a particular subset of running commentaries is taken into account, i.e. live demonstrations (experiments, recipes etc.). As Dickey (2000, 161) appropriately points out, live demonstrations are interesting because of their complex temporal nature. Phrased otherwise, they are at the same time both (non-actual) generalisations over a definite set of propositions (possibly built upon a deficient anankastic-oriented model of the type 'if you want to X, you have to Y') and the report of their ongoing actualisation in the utterance (i.e. the eventualities are actually unfolding at the UT).

As shown in (6) above and again in (9) below, Pres$_{PF}$ forms can be freely licensed in the given context. They can be contextually replaced by PF imperative or infinitive forms (which however constitute different types of speech acts) or even alternate with Pres$_{IPF}$ forms, especially with unbounded eventualities. Person-number bound verbal indexes may vary, mostly (but not exclusively) along the conjugation axis 1st p. sg./pl.:[14]

(9) Pecnicu *zagrijemo*$_{\text{WARM UP.1.pl.PresPF}}$ na 250 stepeni i *pecemo*$_{\text{BAKE.1.pl.PresIPF}}$ lepinje na drugoj od vrha mrezi […] Pecene lepinje *pokriti*$_{\text{COVER.InfPF}}$ krpom i *ostaviti*$_{\text{LEAVE.InfPF}}$ desetak minuta da se ohlade prije rezanja. [sic!] (https://www.coolinarika.com/recept/bosanske-lepinje-f9c5e5f6-63db-11eb-8e23-0242ac120027) 'We preheat the oven to 250° and bake our buns on the rack (not the one on the top) […] Cover the baked buns with a cloth and let them cool down for some ten minutes before cutting'.

---

14 Variation in number (e.g. from singular to plural) is likely to be triggered by a different structural configuration of discourse roles, which can be brought about in turn by a variation in the intensity of the illocutionary force assigned to the utterance. For instance, in her analysis of Russian 'mental performatives' (i.e. a subclass of expositives which are frequently used to mold the rhetorical structure of written texts and public speeches in order to make them logically consistent, e.g. *opredelit'*^{PF} 'to identify', *predpoložit'*^{PF} 'to suppose', *podčerknut'*^{PF} 'to emphasise' and the like), Rjabceva (1992, 24) argues that the use of the 1st p. pl. of the perfective non-past (*opredelim…*, *predpoložim…*, *podčerknem*) is instrumental in underlining the impositive illocutionary character of such predicates, in that the speaker, while unfolding their reasoning in a step-by-step fashion, expects their addressee(s) to follow the same logical steps and infer the same conclusion(s).

Dickey (2000, 168) further notes that in BCS this kind of PF-marked live demonstration cannot be overtly anchored to the UT by means of temporal operators such as *sad(a)* 'now' (here we gloss over some technicalities on the multilayered semantic nature of such deictic elements). For Pres^{PF} forms to be licensed, reference needs to be made instead to the steps of the whole procedure as it is performed by the speaker. Moreover, if the eventualities are not presented as bounded, Pres^{IPF} forms can replace Pres^{PF}, cf. (10):

(10) Najpre *uzmem*_{TAKE.1.sg.PresPF} (*uzimam*_{TAKE.1.sg.PresIPF}) bocu sodium nitrata i *sipam*_{POUR.1.sg.PresIPF} sadržinu u retortu; onda *upalim*_{LIGHT.1.sg.PresPF} (*palim*_{LIGHT.1.sg.PresIPF}) Bansenovu lampu i *zagrejem*_{WARM UP.1.sg.PresPF} (*zagrejavam*_{WARM UP.1.sg.PresIPF}) do tačke ključanja…
(Dickey 2000, 168)
'First I take the flask of sodium nitrate and pour the contents into this beaker; then I light the Bunsen burner and heat it to a boil…'

Dickey (2000, 173) goes on to suggest that the ban on the contextual presence of *sad(a)* alongside PF-marked live demonstrations is linked to the reportive character of the speaker's speech, who would be in control of the flow of the events as they present them to their addressee(s) who are already ordered in a causal chain. Again, then, the aspectual coding of externally and/or internally bounded eventualities in semi-actual contexts seems to be dependent on the role of the point of view (POV) of a sentient individual in egophoric utterances.

2.3 Contexts with *možda* 'Maybe'

Pres^{PF} forms are regularly found in present-tensed main clause environments featuring the epistemic operator *možda* 'maybe', as in (7) above or (11) below. Variation can occur with respect to aspectual marking (unbounded eventualities, or presented as such, can be realized with Pres^{IPF} forms) and person-number bound verbal indexes other than 1st p. (sg./pl.), as shown in (12):

(11) Kad je mogao Dule, zašto ne bismo mi koristili taj recpet [*sic!*]. Možda *pozovem*_{INVITE.1.sg.PresPF} Vujoševića da provede dva meseca s nama. [srWaC.883681.21, #883680]
'If Dule could, why wouldn't we use this recipe? Maybe I can invite Vujošević to spend two months with us'.

(12) Prvo je i osnovno pravilo da sebe učiniš srećnom osobom, da budeš srećan čovek. Onda imaš šanse i nekog drugog da usrećiš, možda *napraviš*_{MAKE.2.sg.PresPF} i *odgajiš*_{RAISE.2.sg.PresPF} neku srećnu decu. [srWaC.1189461.10, #1189460]
'The first and most basic rule is to make yourself a happy person, to be happy. Then you can have chances to make someone else happy, maybe you can make and raise some happy children'.

This type of Pres^{PF} use, which is sometimes mentioned in passing even in prescriptive grammars (cf. Barić et al. 1997, 409), is worthy of attention as, unlike AMPs and running commentaries, it involves purely nonveridical contexts, seemingly aligning itself with interrogative-negative structures (cf. (3)) and negative presents (cf. (i)). Should this pattern be consistent, we would expect Pres^{PF} forms to be licensed even alongside other epistemic operators semantically akin to *možda*, such as *verovatno*$_{SR}$/ *vjerojatno*$_{HR}$ 'probably' or *moguće* 'possibly', but this is not the case as (13) clearly shows:

(13)   – Za sledeći put, i neki vikend... – Da, možda (*verovatno / *moguće) *dođem*$_{COME.1.sg.}$
       $_{PresPF}$ na vikend ovde, da. [srWaC.1128436.4, #1128435]
       '– Next time, maybe some weekend… – Yes, maybe I'll come here for a weekend, sure'.

On the basis of (surface) syntactic and prosodic evidence, one could be inclined to look at *mòžda* as the result of the univerbation of the epistemic modal *mòže*$_{CAN.3.sg.PresIPF}$ (from *mòći* 'can') and a 'hidden' complementizer *da*, which, following Veselinović (2019, 46-58), occupies a position in SpecC and takes a clausal complement (much in the spirit of the 'declarative' *da* proposed in Vrzić 1996).[15] While this may very well account for the diachronic derivation of the operator, it fails to provide a satisfactory structural explanation as it does not provide reasons for the general acceptability of (14a) and (15),[16] nor does it clarify why the same pattern does not hold for *vàljda* 'probably', 'I guess' (cf. (16)-(18)).[17]

---

[15]   Note, however, that there is no general agreement on the structure of the clausal architecture in BCS and that alternative hypotheses involving different makeups of the BCS clausal spine have been put forth as well (cf., for instance, Todorović 2012, where it is proposed that the two *da* in BCS are not complementizers *senso strictu*, but rather operators introducing either veridical or nonveridical complements). Note also that Kovačević (2008, 197-202) points out that *možda* alongside Pres^{PF} can license Fut and Fut^{IPF} forms as well (*Možda kupim*$_{BUY.1.sg.PresPF}$ / *ću kupiti*$_{BUY.1.sg.FutPF}$ / *budem kupio*$_{BUY.1.sg.FutI-}$ $_{IPF.masc.}$/-*la*$_{1.sg.FutIPF.fem.}$ *kuću na moru*). A further analysis of the range of variations within the pattern, particularly in relation to the licensing properties of *valjda*, is left for future research.

[16]   According to my consultants, both (14a) and (15) are quite marginal in literary Štokavian and occur with a relative frequency in oral speech (according to an anonymous reviewer, (14a) occurs most naturally as an elicited answer from a prior context). The majority of the Štokavian native speakers I consulted claimed that (14a) can be better parsed as an elicited answer to a previous context, although there is plenty of evidence for such contexts appearing in isolation as well, cf. (vi) below:

   (vi) Možda da jumbo-plakate *dignemo*$_{RAISE.1.pl.PresPF}$ i kat više, pa uz onu narodnu "daleko od očiju, daleko od srca", uživamo u nasmiješenim modelima s reklama. [HNK, gs20030701os21879]
   'Maybe we should raise the billboards one floor up and then, in accordance with the old saying "out of sight, out of mind", we enjoy these smiling models from the advertisements'

[17]   According to my consultants, (16) can be uttered either if *kupim*^{PresPF} is replaced by *kupujem*^{PresIPF} or if a relative temporal adverb such as *dotad* 'by then' is added to the

Indeed, *vàljda* displays the same prosodical contour as *mòžda* and can be diachronically derived in a similar manner (i.e. via univerbation of *vàlja* $_\text{3.sg.Pres.IPF}$ from *vàljati* 'to be worth' and *da*):[18]

(14) a. Možda da *kupim*[PresPF] kuću na moru. (Intended: 'Perhaps I should buy a beach house')
b. *Može da da *kupim*[PresPF] kuću na moru.

(15) Možda može da *kupim*[PresPF] kuću na moru.

(16) [?/*]Valjda *kupim*[PresPF] kuću na moru. (Intended: 'I guess I should buy a beach house')

(17) [?/*]Valjda da *kupim*[PresPF] kuću na moru.

(18) [?/*]Valjda valja da *kupim*[PresPF] kuću na moru.

Interestingly, Mirič (2004, 218) points out that in the Serbian variant of the BCS continuum both *možda* and *verovatno* can be used if the realization of the eventuality actualized in the utterance rests entirely on the speaker, while *valjda* implies that such realization is not (completely) under the speaker's control:

(19) – Hoćeš li ti doći večeras? – Možda. / – Verovatno. / – *Valjda.[19]
'– Are you coming this evening? – Maybe. / – Probably.'

---

context (the issue why a Pres[PF] form here could be interpreted as a future perfect cannot be addressed here). (17) and (18) are acceptable only as interrogatives.

18 Although both *možda* and *valjda* can be used either as full modal (epistemic-evidential) operators or parenthetical elements (Zvekić-Dušanović 2019), the two (classes of) items are still assigned different intonational patterns. However, the difference in the epistemic commitment associated with the two operators (with *valjda* being epistemically weaker and, possibly, doxastically stronger than *možda*) does not seem to affect their syntactic properties.

19 It goes without saying that in (19) *valjda* is not ungrammatical *per se*, however its distribution can only be generalised to contexts where the feature of the speaker's control is not prominent. In order to better exemplify the contrast between operators I resort to the following example (vii) (I thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting it to me):

> (vii) Pavlović se nada da nije kraj: Valjda ću odigrati još neki meč za Partizan. (http://beta.admin.mozzartsport.com/fudbal/vesti/pavlovic-se-nada-da-nije-kraj-valjda-cu-odigrati-jos-neki-mec-za-partizan/354132)
> 'Pavlović hopes this is not the end: I will probably play some more games for Partizan' (⊃ 'I hope / suppose I will play some more games for Partizan, but it does not depend on me').

On a side note, *možda* can also stack together with *valja*, as in the following example (viii):

> (viii) Da, možda valja uključiti i moldavski i ukrajinski. (https://twitter.com/srdjan-drago/status/1290913720856698880)
> 'Yes, probably it is worth including both Moldavian and Ukrainian'.

This would suggest that the licenseability of Pres$_{PF}$ forms is not (exclusively) triggered by either the compositionally derived syntactic properties of *možda* (with reference to, for instance, *vjerojatno*$_{HR}$/ *verovatno*$_{SR}$ and *moguće*) or by the nonveridical flavour of the context (cf. the contrast with *valjda*). Another aspect seems to bring *možda*-contexts together with the other case studies under analysis, i.e. the prominent salience of the speaker's control-related POV. In the next section I will elaborate on this idea and argue that control, beside its semantic contribution, is a syntactically relevant element as well.

3 Control as a Variable in SpeechActP

The idea that linguistic components traditionally assigned to discourse-related modules (e.g. the role of discourse participants in the speech act event, other logophoric roles, and the notion of POV) should be encoded in the syntactic structure dates back to the early seventies, and would be brought to light some decades later on the basis of consistent crosslinguistic evidence. Speas and Tenny (2003, 320) were among the first to argue for the existence of a separate functional layer above CP, the so-called 'SpeechActP', where discourse roles (traditionally, the Speaker and the Hearer) are mapped and defined in terms of their structural positions.

In their joint paper, Speas and Tenny note that the restrictions on the inventory of phenomena linguistically dependent on the POV of a sentient individual tend to be crosslinguistically stable, which may hint at the hybrid (i.e. not entirely pragmatic) nature of the properties of such phenomena. They thus propose a further configurational structure in the scope of SpeechActP, a projection called 'Evaluation Phrase', which takes two arguments: the Seat of Knowledge (a "sentient 'mind,' who can evaluate, or process, or comment on the truth of a proposition", p. 332, henceforth SOK), mapped to the specifier position, and the Evidential Phrase, which is linked to the evidential inference(s) on the truth of a given proposition and mapped to the internal argument position (Speas, Tenny 2003, 327-31).

Since Speas and Tenny (2003), there has been much speculation on the exact composition of the inner layer of SpeechActP, including the number of functional projections included within the maximal projected structure and their respective ordering. In this paper I will adopt Zu's (2018, 73 ff., 101-2) slightly revised idea that the SOK appears in the specifier position of a Sentience Phrase and is bound by the base-generated Speaker in declaratives, rhetorical questions and quiz questions. Within this framework, I define cognitive control as the hierarchical and contingent (i.e. not given *a priori*) rela-

tion between the Speaker and the Hearer in the speech act event,[20] which can be modelled as an abstract variable specified at the level of the SOK, checked against by the Speaker (which may or may not be coindexed with the syntactic subject) and spelled out lower in the structure in AspP as PF.

The idea that the cognitive feature of the speaker's control may additionally have a syntactic salience stems from the following two observations. The first one echoes the treatment of speech-style particles and markers of politeness in Korean discussed in detail by Portner, Pak and Zanuttini (2019). Abstracting away from the (quite dense) details of their proposal, by replacing SpeechActP with another functional projection called 'cP' ('c' stands for 'context'), the authors argue that different allocutive pronominal forms, syntactically bound by the Hearer ('Interlocutor' in their terms), are spelled out via an operator-variable relationship mediated by a λ-abstractor type that would reflect the alternation of abstract features on the functional head c (Portner, Pak, Zanuttini 2019, 24-6). Judging from our data sample, control is always related to the Speaker notwithstanding the presence of an actual coindexing of the discourse participant role with the syntactic subject (cf. above (12)). In other words, control always seems to be tightly linked with the expression of the Speaker's POV in egophoric utterances. Following Zu's (2018) account, we can thus assume that in declarative contexts the SOK is always bound by the Speaker and that control, which can be overtly expressed whenever a hierarchical relationship between (at least) two participants in the same speech act event is established, seemingly functions as a variable mediated by a λ-operator at the level of the SOK, as tentatively sketched out in (20):

(20) $[_{SpeechActP}[Speaker[_{SenP}[_{SpecSen}SOK[_{Sen}\lambda con]]]]]$

The second observation boils down to the correlation between control and perfective morphology. Dickey's (2000, 25-7) classical proposal of a Slavic East-West aspect division on the basis of the prototypical meaning assigned to PF places BCS in a transitional zone, with Štokavian varieties sharing more commonalities with the Eastern group. The crucial point here is that control can be seen as a contextually determined effect stemming from the aspectual semantic core of PF in Eastern Slavic languages, namely temporal definiteness, i.e. the assignment of an eventuality to a uniquely determined point on the time axis, over which the speaker would then yield full control (Dickey 2018). If we assume that in Štokavian the variable

---

20 A comprehensive discussion of the pragmatic variables of the participant structure lies beyond the scope of the present paper.

for control is specified at the level of the SOK and thus bound by the Speaker, it is possible to claim that the SOK enters an agreement relation with the aspectual projection at a distance (much like probe-goal agreement), consequently triggering the spell-out of the morphological element(s) associated with PF.[21] If this hypothesis is indeed on the right track, an example like (21a) would then have the structural representation in (21b) (note that only the relevant projections of the clausal spine are featured below):

(21) a. Možda *kupim*$_{1.sg.PresPF}$ kuću na moru.
b. [$_{SpeechActP}$[Speaker[$_{SenP}$[$_{SpecSen}$SOK[$_{Sen'}$λ*con*[$_{CP}$[$_{SpecC}$možda[$_{AspP}$[$_{SpecAsp}$PF[$_{VP}$[$_{V}$kupiti[$_{DP}$kuću na moru]]]]]]]]]]]]

4 Conclusions

In this paper, I presented a unified analysis for several contexts featuring the (apparently) anomalous licensing of Pres^{PF} forms in BCS present-tensed main clauses, i.e. abusive metonymic performatives (§ 2.1), live demonstrations (§ 2.2), and nonveridical contexts with *možda* (§ 2.3) *inter alia*. I claimed that for all these cases the feature of (cognitive) control, which can be defined in terms of the hierarchical relation between the Speaker and the Hearer – and thus encoded in the syntactic structure as an abstract variable at the level of the SOK in SpeechActP – bears special relevance. The association between control and perfective morphology can be modelled in terms of a probe-goal agreement between the SOK and the aspectual projection and can be explained as a semantic extension of the prototypical function assigned to PF in the Štokavian varieties of the BCS continuum, i.e. temporal definiteness.

Regrettably, a number of pertinent questions could not be answered in this survey. For instance, it remains unclear why Pres^{PF} forms cannot be licensed in similar semi-actual contexts, whereby control is also shown to play a significant role, e.g. performative utterances (cf. (v)).[22] Furthermore, the role of verbal tenses (more spe-

---

21 It is important to mention that in BCS an eventuality can be realised as PF only if it is externally and/or internally bounded. Internal boundedness here corresponds to what is commonly labelled '(inherent) telicity' (resultativity). Externally bounded eventualities do not need to be telic.

22 It may be the case that, differently from AMPs, the temporal anchoring of performative utterances is assigned a different ordering with reference to the UT. It may also be the case that in regular performative utterances such as (v) the hierarchical relation between the speaker and the hearer is modelled in a slightly different fashion with reference to AMPs, with the speaker still yielding control over the eventuality in their scope (domain) yet being unable to intrude in the hearer's domain and take

cifically, the aorist and the two future tenses) and their interaction with the higher layer of the syntactic structure should be taken into greater consideration. Finally, dialectal internal variation should be reviewed more thoroughly so as to reinforce the core principles of the main argument. All these issues and their interplay are thus worthy topics for future research.

List of abbreviations

Aor[PF]	perfective aorist
fem	feminine
Fut[PF]	perfective future
Fut[IIPF]	perfective future perfect
HNK	Hrvatski nacionalni korpus
HR	Croatian
Inf	infinitive
IPF	imperfective
masc	masculine
p	person
PF	perfective
pl	plural
POV	point of view
Pres[PF]	perfective present
Pres[IPF]	imperfective present
sg	singular
SOK	Seat of Knowledge
SR	Serbian
SrpKor	Korpus savremenoga srpskog jezika
srWaC	Serbian Web Corpus
UT	Utterance Time

it over completely (Dickey, personal communication). I am grateful to Stephen Dickey for the fruitful discussion on these data.

Bibliography

Bach, E. (1986). «The Algebra of Events». *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 9(1), 5-16. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00627432.

Bailyn, J.F. (2010). «To What Degree Are Croatian and Serbian the Same Language? Evidence from a Translation Study». *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 18(2), 181-219. https://doi.org/10.1353/jsl.2010.0000.

Barić, E. et al. (1997). *Hrvatska gramatika* (Croatian Grammar). 2nd ed. Zagreb: Školjska knjiga.

Biasio, M. (forthcoming). «Slavic Performatives Were Originally Marked for General Aspect». Gherbezza, E.; Laskova, V.; Perissutti, A.M. (a cura di), *Atti del VIII Incontro di Linguistica Slava*. Roma: Aracne.

Demirdache, H.; Uribe-Extebarria, M. (2004). «The Syntax of Time Adverbs». Guéron, J.; Lecarme, J. (eds), *The Syntax of Time*. Cambridge; London: The MIT Press, 143-79.

De Wit, A. (2017). *The Present Perfective Paradox Across Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198759539.001.0001.

Dickey, S.M. (2000). *Parameters of Slavic Aspect: A Cognitive Approach*. Stanford: CSLI.

Dickey, S.M. (2015). «The Aspectual Development of Performatives in Slavic». *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 71(2), 249-304.

Dickey, S.M. (2018). «Thoughts on the 'Typology of Slavic Aspect'». *Russian Linguistics*, 42(1), 69-103. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-017-9189-x.

Eckardt, R. (2012). «*Hereby* Explained: An Event-Based Account of Performative Utterances». *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 35(1), 21-55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-012-9110-4.

Galton, H. (1976). *The Main Functions of the Slavic Verbal Aspect*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts.

Giannakidou, A. (2009). «The Dependency of the Subjunctive Revisited: Temporal Semantics and Polarity». *Lingua*, 119(12), 1883-908. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.11.007.

Haspelmath, M. (2020). «On the Difference between a Clause and a Sentence». Kibrik, A.A. et al. (eds), Кибрик, А.А. и др. (под ред.), *VAProsy jazykoznanija: Megasbornik nanostatej. Sbornik statej k jubileju V.A. Plungjana* ВАПросы языкознания: Мегасборник наностатей. Сборник статей к юбилею В (VAProsy jazykoznanija: A Mega-anthology of Nano-articles. Collected Papers for V.A. Plungjan's Birthday). А. Плунгяна. Moskva: Buki Vedi, 597-605.

Kovačević, M. Ковачевић, M. (2008). «Konkurentnost dvaju futura i perfektivnog prezenta u savremenom srpskom jeziku» Конкурентност двају футура и перфективног презента у савременом српском језику (Competition of the Two Future Tenses and the Perfective Present in Contemporary Serbian). *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* Зборник Матице српске за славистику (Matica Srpska Journal of Slavic Studies), 73, 195-211.

Leivada, E.; Murphy, E. (2021). «Mind the (Terminological) Gap: 10 Misused, Ambiguous, or Polysemous Terms in Linguistics». *Ampersand*, 8, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2021.100073.

Leivada, E.; Westergaard, M. (2020). «Acceptable Ungrammatical Sentences, Unacceptable Grammatical Sentences, and the Role of the Cognitive Parser». *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(364), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00364.

Mirič, D. Мирич, Д. (2004). «Značenje časticy *valjda* i ee russkie ekvivalenty» Значение частицы ваљда и ее русские эквиваленты (The Meaning of the Particle valjda and Its Russian Equivalents). Anan'eva, N.E.; Karceva, Z.I. (eds) Ананьева, Н.Е.; Карцева, З.И. (под ред.), *Slavjanskij vestnik (K 70-letiju V.P. Gudkova)* Славянский вестник (К 70-летию В.П. Гудкова) [Slavonic Bulletin (For V.P. Gudkov's 70th Birthday)], 2. Moskva: MAKS Press, 215-24.

Polovina, V. Половина, В. (1985). «O upotrebi glagolskih vremena u savremenom srpskohrvatskom razgovornom jeziku» О употреби глаголских времена у савременом српскохрватском разговорном језику (On the Use of Verbal Tenses in Contemporary Spoken Serbo-Croatian). *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* Научни састанак слависта у Вукове дане [Scientific Meeting of Slavists in (o 'During') Vuk's Days], 14(2), 97-103.

Portner, P.; Pak, M.; Zanuttini, R. (2019). «The Speaker-Addressee Relation at the Syntax-Semantics Interface». *Language*, 95(1), 1-36. `https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2019.0008`.

Rjabceva, N.K. Рябцева, Н.К. (1992). «Mental'nye performativy v naučnom diskurse» Ментальные перформативы в научном дискурсе (Mental Performatives in Scientific Discourse). *Voprosy jazykoznanija* Вопросы языкознания (Topics in the Study of Language), 4, 12-28.

Speas, P.; Tenny, C. (2003). «Configurational Properties of Point of View Roles». Di Sciullo, A.M. (ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar*. Vol. 1, *Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam; New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 315-44. `https://doi.org/10.1075/la.57.15spe`.

Tanasić, S. Танасић, С. (1996). *Prezent u savremenom srpskom jeziku* Презент у савременом српском језику (The Present Tense in Contemporary Serbian). Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.

Todorović, N. (Nataša) (2012). *The Indicative and Subjunctive 'da'-Complements in Serbian. A Syntactic-Semantic Approach* [PhD dissertation]. Chicago: University of Illinois.

Todorović, N. (Neda) (2015). «Tense and Aspect (In)Compatibility in Serbian Matrix and Subordinate Clauses». *Lingua*, 167, 82-111. `https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2015.04.007`.

Todorović, N. (Neda) (2017). «If You Can Show the Future, I Know What Your Are Made of: Aspect + Modal-Temporal Domain in Serbian». *Linguistica Brunensia*, 65(2), 87-102.

Veselinović, D. (2019). *The Syntax and Acquisition of Modal Verb Flavors* [PhD dissertation]. New York: New York University.

Vojvodić, D.P. Войводич, Д.П. (2015). «Soveršennyj vid i otricatel'nyj kontekst: vyraženie otkaza vypolnit' dejstvie» Совершенный вид и отрицательный контекст: выражение отказа выполнить действие (Perfective Aspect and Negative Context: Expressing Refusal to Perform an Action). Mišanin, J.A. (pod red.) Мишанин Ю.А. (отв. ред.), *Russkij jazyk v kontekste nacional'noj kul'tury (Materialy III Meždunarodnoj naučnoj konferencii, posvjaščennoj 200-letiju so dnja roždenija M. Ju. Lermontova, Saransk, 21-23 maja 2014 g.; Tom 1)* Русский язык в контексте национальной культуры (Материалы III Международной научной конференции, посвященной 200-летию со дня рождения М.Ю. Лермонтова, Саранск, 21-23 мая 2014 г.; Том 1) [The Russian Language within the Context of National Culture (Materials of the III International Scientific Conference Dedicated to the Two-hundredth Anniversary of M. Ju. Lermontov's Birth: Saransk, May 21-23 2014, Volume 1)]. Saransk: Izdatel'stvo Mordovskogo universiteta, 55-8.

Vojvodić, D.P. Војводић, Д.П. (2019). «O vidsko-vremenskoj sinonimiji i metafori u srpskom, ruskom i drugim slovenskim jezicima» О видско-временској синонимији и метафори у српском, руском и другим словенским језицима (On the Aspectual-Temporal Synonymy and Metaphor in Serbian, Russian and Other Slavic Languages). *Slavistika* Славистика (Slavistics), 23(1), 11-44. `https://doi.org/10.18485/slavistika.2019.23.1.1`.

Vrzić, Z. (1996). «Categorial Status of the Serbo-Croatian 'Modal' *da*». Toman J. (ed.), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The College Park Meeting 1994*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 291-312.

Zu, V. (2018). *Discourse Participants and the Structural Representation of the Context* [PhD dissertation]. New York: New York University.

Zvekić-Dušanović, D. Звекић-Душановић, Д. (2019). «O modalnoj rečci *valjda* u kontekstu» О модалној речци ваљда у контексту (On the Modal Particle valjda in Context). *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* Научни састанак слависта у Вукове дане [Scientific Meeting of Slavists in (o 'During') Vuk's Days], 48(1), 169-78. `https://doi.org/10.18485/msc.2019.48.1.ch14`.