VIOLETTA KOSESKA-TOSZEWA[1,A], **JOANNA SATOŁA-STAŚKOWIAK**[1,B], **MAKSIM DUSZKIN**[1,C]

[1]Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
[A]amaz@inetia.pl , [B]joannasat@op.pl , [C]demaksid@gmail.com

POLISH-BULGARIAN-RUSSIAN, BULGARIAN-POLISH-RUSSIAN OR RUSSIAN-BULGARIAN-POLISH DICTIONARY?

Abstract

The trilingual dictionary (M. Duszkin, V. Koseska, J. Satoła and A. Tzoneva) is being elaborated based on a working Polish-Bulgarian-Russian electronic parallel corpus authored by Maksim Duszkin, Violetta Koseska-Toszewa and Joanna Satoła-Staśkowiak, and works by A. Tzoneva. It is the first corpus comparing languages belonging to three different Slavic language groups: western, southern and eastern. Works on the dictionary are based on *Gramatyka konfrontatywna bułgarsko-polska* (*Bulgarian-Polish confrontative grammar*) and the proposed there semantic-oriented interlanguage. Two types of classifiers have been introduced into the dictionary: classic and semantic. The trilingual dictionary will present a consistent and homogeneous set of facts of grammar and semantics. The Authors point out that in a traditional dictionary it is not clear for example whether aspect should be understood as imperfective / perfective form of a verb or as its meaning. Therefore in the dictionary forms and meaning are separated in a regular way. Imperfective verb form has two meanings: state and configuration of states and events culminating in state. Also perfective verb form has two meanings: event and configuration of states and events culminating in event. These meanings are described by the semantic classifiers, respectively, state and event, state1 and event1. The way of describing language units, mentioned in the article, gives a possibility to present language material (Polish, Bulgarian, Russian) in any required order, hence the article's title.
Keywords: trilingual dictionary, form, meaning, semantic classifiers, state, event, classic classifiers, intransitive, transitive, temporal-aspect relation.

The dictionary we want to present here concerns three languages covering the southern, eastern and western groups of Slavic languages. Its authors are Maksim Duszkin, Violetta Koseska-Toszewa and Joanna Satoła-Staśkowiak on the Polish side, and Anastasja Tzoneva on the Bulgarian side. We are planning to publish it as a book consisting of six issues. The dictionary is being elaborated based on

a **working electronic parallel corpus** authored by Maksim Duszkin, Violetta Koseska-Toszewa and Joanna Satoła-Staśkowiak, and works by A. Tzoneva.

Classic and semantic classifiers in the Dictionary. We intend to elaborate the entries in all the languages to enable easy establishment of a database for future dictionaries, **also electronic ones.** This means, among others, that entries should contain meanings and classifiers in each of the languages, in opposition to traditional bi- and tri-lingual dictionaries, which provide the meanings and classifiers in one language only.

Our requirement causes a lot of problems. As it is well known that there are significant differences in **classification of the parts of speech** in different linguistic schools, therefore unification of classifiers for two and three languages is not an easy task. An additional challenge faced by the Team in the **Dictionary** project is introduction of three classifier types. The first and the second group will consist of traditional classifiers, which we call *classic* here. Classic classifiers include separate parts of speech: adjective, verb, noun, together with their morphological characteristic adopted in the literature, e.g. gender, number, etc. Classic classifiers like *książ. (lit.), pot. (coll.)* are also taken into consideration. The dictionary will also employ syntactic classifiers with the *transitiv* and *intransitiv* indicating transitivity and intransitivity of the verbum, respectively. By a **transitive** verb we will understand one that can be followed by a direct object in a sentence. In Polish and Russian sentences, a **transitive** verb is followed by a nomen in the accusative case. However, **intransitivity** excludes the above possibility. Intransitive verbs cannot be followed by a direct object, and in Polish the verbum form can be followed by all case forms except the accusative case. As our dictionary is not a valence dictionary, the above definition should satisfy our recipient. Examples:

(Pol.) **strajkować** *vi., state, intransitiv* — (Bulg.) **стачкувам** *vi., state, intransitiv* — (Russ.) **бастовать** *vi., state, intransitiv*

(Pol.) **zastrajkować** *vp., event, intransitiv* — (Bulg.) **започна (обявя) стачка** *vp., event, intransitiv* — (Russ.) **забастовать** *vp., event, intransitiv*

(Pol.) **rozgraniczać** *vi. state, transitiv* — (Bulg.) **разграничавам** *vi. state, transitiv* — (Russ.) **разграничивать** *vi. state, transitiv*

(Pol.) **rozgraniczyć** *vp. event, transitiv* — (Bulg.) **разграничa** *vp. event, transitiv* — (Russ.) **разграничить** *vp. event, transitiv*

The next group of classifiers will be **semantic classifiers**, which have been isolated during the many years of work on a semantic contrastive study little known in Poland, but first such in the world. It was conducted in the work called ***Gramatyka konfrontatywna języka polskiego i bułgarskiego*** z *semantycznym językiem-pośrednikiem* [Contrastive Grammar of Polish and Bulgarian with Semantic Interlanguage] (Koseska-Toszewa 2006), consisting of 12 monographs. We realize that semantic classifiers are not easy to isolate, and in order to do it, a consistent separation of the form and the meanings is necessary. For example, are the imperfective and perfective aspects used as classifiers in commonly known dictionaries forms of a verb, or its meanings?

Let us return to the question about the **form and the meaning.** The issue
is fundamental, and still difficult. This can be seen in traditional linguistics, where
still very often the form is not distinguished from its meaning. As we know, a lan-
guage form is a unit which plays a specific function in the language, e.g. semantic
or syntactical one. The actual function of a form is established based on its use
(occurrence), that is, its relations with the meanings of other forms in speech and
text. The meaning of a form is the value of its function. We will show this issue
on the example of the semantic categories of time and aspect elaborated in the
Contrastive Grammar (Koseska-Toszewa 2006). Regardless of whether aspect is a
grammatical, morphological or semantic category, it cannot be disregarded during
the analysis of temporal relations, especially in Bulgarian. The discussions on that
subject between Bulgarian linguists representing the so-called temporal school with
representatives of the so-called aspectual school are well known. The works classi-
fied to the temporal school are those by L. Andrejchin, V. Stankov, M. Dejanova,
and to the aspectual school — those by Ju. Maslov, E. Demina, S. Ivanchev. As we
know, languages possessing aspect are characterized by a small number of tenses,
like north-Slavic languages, while languages devoid of aspect have a higher number
of tenses (like Latin or French). As a result, South-Slavic languages could be ex-
pected to exhibit two different tendencies: the first towards reducing the number
of tenses (like in Serbian and Croatian), and the second involving disappearance
(or insufficient development) of aspect while maintaining a large number of tenses.
This tendency was claimed to exist e.g. in Bulgarian. However, in the eastern
group of South-Slavic languages the aspect category exists, and yet the number of
tenses does not decrease in them. From the typological viewpoint, South-Slavic
languages, and in particular their eastern group, constitute a transitory stage be-
tween Greek and Latin on the one hand (a large number of tenses, absence of the
aspect category) and North-Slavic languages (the aspect category, a small number
of tenses) on the other hand. Hence the problems of temporal relations in southern
Slavic lands are especially important both for clarifying the Slavic aspect category
and for the semantics of tenses in Slavic languages.

In view of the above, it is worth while to remind the hypothesis by S. Ivanchev
(1971:129), in whose opinion there is a genetic connection between the imperfective
aspect and imperfectum. He does not examine the aorist : imperfectum relation
as an either temporal or aspectual one, but as a joint **temporally-aspectual
relation.** In Serbian, the imperfectum form could only be built for imperfective
verbs and had a clearly aspectual character, in opposition to the Serbian aorist
form, which could be perfect, but also imperfect (though very rarely) (Vuković
1967: 276–313.) Linguistic facts from old Bulgarian sources confirm that the ratio
of imperfectum forms of perfective verbs to imperfectum forms of imperfective
verbs is 1:99 (Dostál 1954). On that basis, some scholars consider the bi-aspectual
nature of aorist and imperfectum forms as an archaic state of things (Koschmieder
1963: 19). However, in the **Bułgarian and Macedonian area this is a live
phenomenon, which is not transient at the present stage of language
development.**

The connections between aspect and temporality in South Slavic languages (ex-
cept for Slovenian) confirm **Kuryłowicz's thesis about the semantic charac-**

ter of aspect (Feleszko, Koseska-Toszewa, Sawicka 1974: 183–187.), (Bogusławski 2003), (Karolak 2008). In turn, Gołąb, Heinz and Polański, when examining the notions of aspect and its strict connections with the category of time, propose a chart which fully explains the differences in meaning that distinguish both the categories. The chart reduces to the fact the exponents of time position a given activity with respect to the speech state (the so-called moment of speaking), while exponents of aspect position the same activity with respect to the point that represent the moment of ending the action, regardless of the speech state, see (Gołąb, Heinz, Polański 1968), (Koseska-Toszewa 1974: 213–226).

Here we understand the semantic category of **time** like in the Polish-Bulgarian Contrastive Grammar — as a category that orders states and events with respect to the speech state using the precedence-succession relation (Koseska-Toszewa 2006). For the basic notions — states and events — as elements of aspectuality and temporality, see (Mazurkiewicz 1986).

As we have already mentioned, our dictionary entries should obligatorily distinguish between the language form and its content. The **semantic** classifiers concerning aspect and time will be the notions of *event* and *state* presented in the dictionary. An *Event* is either 1. an event, or 2. a configuration of states and events ending with an event. These are two contents of perfect forms of verbs. In turn, a *State* is an abbreviation representing either 1. a state, or 2. a configuration of states and events ending with a state. These two contents are possessed by imperfect forms of verbs.

Here the notions of states, events and their configurations are understood as in the **network-based description of time and aspect**. Namely, we assume that an event has no duration (it begins, ends or breaks states), while a state lasts, and is begun or ended with an event. For more details on the Petri net theory and its application to natural languge, see (Mazurkiewicz 1986), (Koseska-Toszewa, Mazurkiewicz 1988), (Koseska-Toszewa 2006), (Koseska-Toszewa, Mazurkiewicz 2010). We assume that if a verb form is denoted by „*ndk*", then its meanings will be presented as *state 1.* — a state or *state 2* — a combination of states and events ending with a state, while a verb form denoted by „*dk*" will have the semantic classifier *event 1.*, i.e. an event, or *event 2.* — a combination of states and events ending with an event. Meanings 1 and 2 for an event and meanings 1 and 2 for a state can be clearly shown in the temporally-aspectual relation, i.e. when the verbal form expresses a specific tense. This is why the infinitive form, which is "tense-free", will be accompanied by state and event abbreviations only.

We will use the example of the praesens form (present tense form) to show what are its basic temporal meanings in Bulgarian and Polish, as well as in Russian. The above form does not represent the present tense only in any of these languages, see: (Grochowski 1972), (Koseska-Toszewa 1972). The present tense form has the following meanings:

1. The present tense of a verbal form with a *state 1* classifier, expressing a state.
   Bulg. Анета спи в моята стая.,
   Pol. Aneta śpi w moim pokoju.
   Russ. Анета спит в моей комнате.

2. The future tense of a verbal form with a modal meaning expressing possibility (rather than truth or falsity) is outside this classification.

Bulg. Утре идвам в два, а не в три часа.
Pol. Jutro przychodzę o drugiej, nie o trzeciej.
Russ. Я завтра прихожу в два, а не в три часа.

3. The past tense of a verbal form expressing a configuration of events and states ending with a state, has the *state 2* classifier:

Bulg. И чак тогава той разбира своите грешки.
Pol. I dopiero wtedy on rozumie swoje błędy
Russ. И только тогда он понимает свои ошибки.

4. Habituality — the verbal form expresses configuration of states and events without any information about the ending state, and is outside this classification. A discussion is rightly pending whether a habitual meaning is a tense.

Bulg. Той всеки ден са разхожда поне един час.
Pol. On codziennie spaceruje przynajmniej jedną godzinę.
Russ. Каждый день он гуляет хотя бы один час.

We should add that sentences (1) are in the present tense; they are in the indicative form, and hence have the value of either truth or falsity. From this viewpoint, sentences (1) differ e.g. from sentences (2) in the future tense, which do not have the value of either truth or falsity, i.e. are not in the indicative form. Instead, they have a third value — possibility, which is a modal value. Are the sentences: *Jan ponoć teraz jest na spacerze.* *Ян бил сега на разходка.* / *Ян уж е сега на разходка. Ян сейчас будто бы на прогулке.* actual present tense sentences, or just sentences with a present tense form? Certainly, they are not sentences with the value either truth or falsity, and hence they cannot be sentences expressing present tense. This is proven, among others, by Bulgarian, where the *бил* form is a signal of an imperceptive modality rather than present tense, see *Той сега е на разходка.*, where we have present tense. Sentences with various types of a possibility modality, not only the imperceptive one like above, often occur with the praesens form. However, they also have a third value — possibility, so during the speech state we do not know if the state or the combination of a state and events exist or not. In such a case, we cannot speak about the present tense, but only about a present tense form, see e.g.: *On jakoby jest złodziejem.* / *Той май е крадец.* / *Той бил крадец.* / *Он якобы вор.* The interpretation of the above sentences as present tense ones is a good example of not distinguishing between a verbal form and its temporal function. Defining present tense more precisely, it is worth stressing that the present, and hence what is happening now according to the carrier of the speech state, should be understood as either a state concurrent with the speech state or as a combination of the event beginning or ending a state concurrent with the speech state. Very roughly speaking, we can also understand it solely as a state concurrent with the speech state. However, Bulgarian grammars commonly use formulations of the type: „this a metaphorical meaning of present tense", though the present tense is the meaning of the present tense form (Stankov

1969). Such formulations amount to speaking about another meaning of some meaning — in other words, to a tautology.

It should be stressed that Bulgarian, where we meet aorist forms not only of perfective verbs, but also of imperfective verbs, and imperfectum forms not only of imperfective verbs, but also of perfective verbs, allows us to notice temporally-aspectual meanings rendered in other Slavic languages not only using verb forms, but also through other lexical means. This requires distinguishing between the *state 1* and *state 2* classifiers, and *event 1* and *event 2* classifiers. In turn, this distinction shows that temporally-aspectual relationships constitute a semantic whole, which consists of the meanings of aspect and time. However, in the dictionary we only leave the *state* and *event* classifiers at the entries with infinitive forms, since *state 1* and *state 2*, and *event 1* and *event 2*, can only be distinguished when the verbal form expresses tense, i.e. when it is not an infinitive. Hence the *state 1* and *state 2,* as well as *event 1* and *event 2* classifiers, will only appear with perfective and imperfective verbs expressing temporal meanings in Bulgarian, Polish and Russian texts.

In the dictionary, only entries in the first language are ordered alphabetically. If that language is Polish, then only Polish entries are ordered alphabetically, while the entries given in the Bulgarian and Russian sections are not ordered alphabetically. It should be emphasized that Bulgarian and Russian entries are language forms, just like Polish entries. The meanings of Bulgarian and Russian entries correspond to the meanings of Polish entries. From the working procedure viewpoint, this looks as follows. We choose an entry in the first language, e.g. in Polish, and determine its main meaning. Then we look for entries in the second and third language that have the same meaning. Since the initial form of the entry may have a different number of meanings in each language, we order them, marking absence of a meaning in some of the languages, if such occurs. It is worth emphasizing that we base determination of semantic classifiers on the semantic interlanguage developed in the Bulgarian-Polish Contrastive Grammar, concerning the semantics of time and aspect, see (Koseska-Toszewa 2006), (Koseska-Toszewa, Mazurkiewicz 2010). We have begun our work with distinguishing between the forms of aspect and time in all the three language and the appropriate meanings of those forms. This choice can be explained by the fact that only in Slavic languages the aspect category has a formal paradigm.

The classifiers used for marking the entries are the same in all the three languages. Graphically, the dictionary will represent a three-column table. The first column of the table will describe, for example, Polish material, the second — Bulgarian, and the third — Russian one. Each row of the table will contain a separate tri-lingual entry article, consisting of the material from the three columns of the given table row.

Samples of a few entries created in line with the above assumptions are given in the Table 1.

Table 1.

babc|ia, -i, -ie *n. f.*	**баб|а, -и** *n. f.*	**бабушк|а, -и, -и** *n. f.*
1. 'father's or mother's mother':	1. 'father's or mother's mother':	1. 'father's or mother's mother':
Latem w ogrodzie naszej babci kwitną kwiaty.	*През лятото в градината на нашата баба цъфтят цвета.*	*Летом в саду у нашей бабушки цветут цветы.*
2. 'old woman'	2. 'old woman'	2. 'old woman'
Na ławce siadły dwie babcie zmęczone spacerem.	*На пейката седнаха две баби уморени от разходката.*	*На скамейке уселись две бабушки, уставшие после прогулки*

siatk|a, -i, -i (*na zakupy*) *n. f.*	**мреж|а, -и** *n. f. (за покупки)*	**авоськ|а, -и, -и** *n. f.*
'a kind of shopping bag'	'a kind of shopping bag'	'a kind of shopping bag'
Kupiłam nową siatkę na zakupy.	*Купих нова мрежа за покупки.*	*Я купила новую авоську.*

motyl, -a, -e *n. m. anim.*	**пеперуд|а, -и** *n. f.*	**бабочк|а, -и, -и** *n. f.*
'insect with two pairs of colourful wings, long abdomen, and rather long feelers, feeding itself with flower and blossom nectars and plant juices'	'insect with two pairs of colourful wings, long abdomen, and rather long feelers, feeding itself with flower and blossom nectars juices'	'insect with two pairs of colourful wings, long abdomen, and rather long feelers, feeding itself with flower and blossom nectars and plant juices'
Z daleka ten motyl przypominała różnobarwny kwiat.	*Отдалеч пеперудата приличаше на пъстро цвете.*	*Издалека эта бабочка напоминала пестрый цветок.*

strajk|ować, -uję, -ujesz *vi., state, intransitiv*	**да стачкува|м, -аш, -а** *vi., state, intransitiv*	**баст|овать, -ую, -уешь** *vi., state, intransitiv*
'participate in a strike (industrial action)'	'participate in a strike (industrial action)'	'participate in a strike (industrial action)'
Kolejarze znów chcą strajkować	*Железничарите искат отново да стачкуват.*	*Железнодорожники вновь хотят бастовать*

zastrajk|ować, -uję, -ujesz *vp., event, intransitiv*	да започн|а, -еш, -е (обявя) стачка *vp., event, intransitiv*	забаст|овать, -ую, -уешь *vp. , event, intransitiv*
'announce a strike (industrial action)'	'announce a strike (industrial action)'	'announce a strike (industrial action)'
Robotnicy rozpoczęli strajk.	*Работниците започнаха стачка.*	*Рабочие начали страйк*

artykuł, -u, -y *n. m. inanim.*	стати|я, -и, *n. f.*	стать|я, -и, и *n. f.*
1. 'separate publication in a newspaper or a journal'	1. 'separate publication in a newspaper or a journal'	1. 'separate publication in a newspaper or a journal'
kontrowersyjny artykuł	*оспорвана статия*	*спорная статья*
2. 'traded object'	2. — no meaning (see сток|а, -и *n. f.,* артикул, -и *n. m.*)	2. — no meaning (see товар *n. m.*)
artykuły gospodarstwa domowego; artykuły spożywcze		
3. *spec.* 'section (item) in a legal document, part of a document representing a separate whole from the viewpoint of contents (legal term)'	3. — no meaning (see член *n. m.,* параграф *n. m.*)	3. *spec.* 'section (item) in a legal document, part of a document representing a separate whole from the viewpoint of contents (legal term)'
artykuł 123 Kodeksu Karnego		*статья 123 Уголовного кодекса*
4. *spec.* 'entry article' (term referring to a short text in a dictionary)	4. *spec.* 'entry article' (term referring to a short text in a dictionary)	4. *spec.* 'entry article' (term referring to a short text in a dictionary)
artykuł hasłowy	*речникова статия*	*словарная статья*

Both each Polish entry and its Russian and Bulgarian analogues are elaborated in the dictionary in as much detail as possible, without any bias towards information on any of these three languages.

Each of the languages in our dictionary is elaborated in the same way — each language is assigned the appropriate classic and semantic classifiers. As a result, it is of no consequence which language appears in the first column of the dictionary table.

Here is another example of a trilingual dictionary, where the starting point is not Polish but Bulgarian:

Bulgarian	Russian	Polish
авари|я, -и *n. f.*	**авари|я, -и, -и** *n. f.*	**awari|a, -i, -e** *n. f.*
1. 'damage to a machine or other technical device'	1. 'damage to a machine or other technical device'	1. 'damage to a machine or other technical device'
тежка авария (на бензиностанция)	*крупная авария (на газовой станции)*	*ciężka awaria (na stacji benzynowej)*
2. 'accident'	2. 'accident'	— no meaning (see **wypadek** *wypadek samochodowy*)
авария на кола	*автомобильная авария*	

The starting point can also be Russian, see e.g.:

Russian	Bulgarian	Polish
гла|дить, -жу, -дишь *vi, state, transitiv*	**глад|я, -иш, -и** *vi. state, transitiv*	**pras|ować, -uję, ujesz** *vi, state, transitiv*
1. 'smooth down fabric using a hot iron, an ironing device, etc.'	**1.** 'smooth down fabric using a hot iron, an ironing device.'	**1.** 'smooth down fabric using a hot iron, an ironing device.'
гладить костюм утюгом	*гладя костюм с ютия*	*prasować garnitur żelazkiem*
2. 'pass one's hand over something in a delicate way, usually caressing it'	**2.** 'pass one's hand over something in a delicate way, usually caressing it'	**2.** no meaning (see **gładzić, głaskać**)
гладить рукой по щеке	*гладя с ръка по бузата* (see *милвам*)	

Russian	Bulgarian	Polish
покупа|ть, -ю, -ешь *vi, state, transitiv*	**купув|ам, -аш, -а** *vi., state, transitiv*	3
1. 'purchase something at a certain price, for a certain amount of money'	1. 'purchase something at a certain price, for a certain amount of money'	1. 'purchase something at a certain price, for a certain amount of money'
покупать клубнику	*да купувам ягоди*	*kupować truskawki*
2. *met.* (кого-либо) 'secure somebody's support, favour for oneself by giving them money, gifts, a bribe'	*met.* 'secure somebody's support, favour for oneself by giving them money, gifts, a bribe'	2. — no meaning (see **przekupywać**)
покупать чиновника	*да купувам чиновника*	

Russian	Bulgarian	Polish
проведа|ть, -ю, -ешь *vp, event, transitiv*	**навест|я, -иш, -и** *vp. event, transitiv*	**odwiedz|ić, -ę, -isz** *vp., event, transitiv*
1. 'pay somebody a visit'	1. 'pay somebody a visit'	**1.** 'pay somebody a visit'
навестить больного	*навестя болен*	*odwiedzić chorego*
2. 'learn about something (most often from rumours, accidentally)'	**2.** — no meaning (see **узная, разузная, науча)**	**2.** —no meaning (see **dowiedzieć się**)
проведать о тайных планах, проведать о приезде писателя		

Russian	Bulgarian	Polish
турк|а, -ки -ки *n. f.*	**джезв|е, -ета** *n. n.*	**dżezw|a, -y, -y** n. f.
'kitchen utensil, equipped in a long handle and resembling a small pot, used for preparing coffee'	'kitchen utensil, equipped in a long handle and resembling a small pot, used for preparing coffee'	'kitchen utensil, equipped in a long handle and resembling a small pot, used for preparing coffee'
заварить кофе в турке	*да варя на кафе в джезве*	*zaparzyć kawę w dżezwie*

    The dictionary we are developing is positioned within the framework of contemporary research on semantics and on contrasting languages. It will not be a collection of finished conclusions regarding differences and similarities between lexical units of various languages, but a collection of semantic and grammatical facts indicating similarities and differences in the studied languages, consistently and uniformly registered and COMPARED WITH EACH OTHER. We hope that these facts can be used as a foundation for further studies on Polish, Bulgarian and Russian and their contemporary development.

References

Bogusławski 2003: A. Bogusławski, *Aspekt i negacja*, Warszawa.

Dimitrowa, Koseska, Satoła 2012: L. Dimitrowa, V. Koseska-Toszewa, J. Satoła-Staśkowiak, *About Neologisms in Bilingual Digital Dictionaries (on example of Bulgarian-Polish Dictionary)*, (In this volume).

Dostál 1954: A. Dostál, *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnštině*, Praha.

Feleszko, Koseska, Sawicka 1974: K. Feleszko, V. Koseska-Toszewa, I. Sawicka, *Związki aspektu z temporalnością w językach południowosłowiańskich*, SFPS XIV: 183–187.

Gołąb, Heinz, Polański 1968: Z. Gołąb, A. Heinz, K. Polański, *Słownik terminologii językoznawczej*, Kraków.

Grochowski 1972: M. Grochowski, *Znaczenia polskiego czasownika: aktualne, potencjalne, uniwersalne, w świetle kategorialnego znaczenia form „czasu teraźniejszego"*, Studia semiotyczne, vol. III, Wrocław.

Isachenko 1966: A. Isachenko, *Grammaticheskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s slovackim*, Morfologija, vol. I, Bratislava, page 26.

Ivanchev 1971: S. Ivanchev, *Problemi na aspektualnostta v slavjanskite ezici*, Sofija.

Karolak 2008: S. Karolak, *Semantyczna kategoria aspektu, GKBP*, vol. 8, Warszawa.

Koschmieder 1963: E. Koschmieder, *Aspect und Zeit*, Opera Slavica IV, Göttingen.

Koseska-Toszewa 1972 V. Koseska-Toszewa, *System temporalny północno-zachodniej gwary bułgarskiej na tle języka literackiego, SFPS* XII, pages 233–245.

Koseska-Toszewa 1974: V. Koseska-Toszewa, *Z problematyki temporalno-aspektowej w języku bułgarskim (relacja imperfectum : aoryst)*, SFPS XIV, pages 213–226.

Koseska-Toszewa 1982: V. Koseska-Toszewa, *Semantyczne aspekty kategorii określoności / nieokreśloności (na materiale języka bułgarskiego, polskiego i rosyjskiego)*, Wrocław, Ossolineum.

Koseska-Toszewa 2006: V. Koseska-Toszewa, *Gramatyka konfrontatywna bułgarsko-polska*, t.7*, Semantyczna kategoria czasu*, SOW, Warszawa.

Koseska-Toszewa, Mazurkiewicz 1988: V. Koseska-Toszewa, A. Mazurkiewicz, *Net Representation of Sentences in Natural Languages*. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 340. Advances in Petri Nets*, Springer-Verlag, pages 249–266.

Koseska-Toszewa, Mazurkiewicz 2010: V. Koseska-Toszewa, A. Mazurkiewicz, *Time flow and tenses*, SOW, Warszawa.

Koseska-Toszewa, Roszko 2008: V. Koseska-Toszewa, R. Roszko. Remarks on Classification of Parts of Speech and Classifiers in an Electronic Dictionary. In *Proceedings of the MONDILEX Open Workshop "Lexicographic Tools and Techniques", Moscow, 3–4 October 2008*: 80–88.

Kuryłowicz 1972: J. Kuryłowicz, *Miejsce aspektu w systemie koniugacyjnym*. In *Symbolae polonicae in honorem Stanislai Jodlowski*, Wrocław: 93–98.

Maslov 1963: Ju. S. Maslov, *Morfologija glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom bolgarskom jazyke*, Moskva–Leningrad, page 3.

Mazurkiewicz 1986: A. Mazurkiewicz, *Zdarzenia i stany: elementy temporalności*, [in:] *Studia gramatyczne bułgarsko-polskie*, vol. I, Temporalność, Wrocław, pages 7–21.

Penchev 1967: J. Penchev, *Kym vyprosa na vremenata v syvremennija bylgarski ezik*, Bylgarski ezik XVII, page 134.

Piernikarski 1989: C. Piernikarski, *Typy opozycji aspektowych czasownika polskiego na tle słowiańskim*, Wrocław, page 10.

Poldauf 1964: I. Poldauf, *Podíl mluvnice a nauky o slovníku na problematice slovesného vidu* [in:] Studie a práce linguistické (Sborník k šedesátým narozeninám akademika Bohuslava Havránka), Praha, pages 204–205.

Przepiórkowski 2008: A. Przepiórkowski, *Powierzchniowe przetwarzanie języka polskiego*, Warszawa.

Roszko, D. 2006. *Funkcjonalne odpowiedniki litewskiego perfectum w litewskiej gwarze puńskiej i w języku polskim*, Warszawa.

Safarewicz 1947: J. Safarewicz, *O wyrażaniu dokonaności i niedokonaności w języku łacińskim*, Eos 41, 1940–1946, vol. I, 2, page 198.

Saloni 2002: Z. Saloni, *Czasownik polski*, Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa.

Satoła-Staśkowiak 2010: J. Satoła-Staśkowiak, *Polsko-bułgarskie odpowiedniości przekładowe czasów przeszłych*, Instytut Slawistyki PAN, Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy, ISBN 978-83-89191-96-0, Warszawa, page 144.

Silić, Pranjković 2005: J. Silić, I. Pranjković *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*, Školska Knjiga, Zagreb.

Stankov 1969 : V. Stankov, *Bylgarskite glagolni vremena*, Sofija.

Stieber 1973: Z. Stieber, *Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich, Fleksja werbalna,* Warszawa, page 9.

Śmiech 1971: W. Śmiech, *Funkcje aspektów czasownikowych we współczesnym języku ogólnopolskim*, Łódź, pages 5, 6.

Toporishich 1976: J. Toporišič, *Slovenska slovnica*, Maribor.

Vuković 1967: J. Vuković, *Sintaksa glagola,* Sarajevo, pages 276–313.