THE USE OF THE PLUPERFECT IN MODERN GREEK
AND SERBIAN LANGUAGE

Panagiotis ASIMOPOULOS
Hellenic Army Academy, Cholargos, Greece

Abstract

An indisputable truth is considered to be the fact that the comparative method occupies a prestigious place in the current linguistic studies, since it aims at a translucent access to the deeper constructions that characterize the phonological, syntactic and semantic coordinates of the common proto-language. The role of the literary texts harmonized with the aligned object is presented as a valuable parameter, since in a crucial way it contributes to an unhampered drawing of conclusions and a complete illustration of various issues concerning lexical data in every language. The spreading of this phenomenon is particularly evident in the narrative means which tend to the eloquent recounting of past events and essential reconstitution of realistic, verifiable, fictional incidents. Accordingly, this study is based on Dido Sotiriu's legendary text "Ματωμένα χώματα" ("Farewell to Anatolia") and its excellent translation portrayal in Serbian with the inspired title "Земља натопљена крвљу" by award-winning Gaga Rosić. The fundamental axis of our paper is on the one hand the limited use of the authentic historical tense of the Pluperfect in Modern Greek and on the other hand its equivalent presence in the colloquial and literary expression in contemporary Serbian, as it emerges from the parallel enumeration of the characteristic cases to any tense and syntactic nuance. The extensive analysis of data related to the use and function on the question of the past tenses leads to their expected identification and well-grounded distinction.

Key words: *Pluperfect*, *Serbian*, *Greek*, *comparative method*, *literary text*

Résumé

Il est incontestable que la méthode comparative occupe une place importante dans les études linguistiques actuelles, parce qu'elle vise à l'accès aux constructions plus profondes qui caractérisent les coordonnées phonologiques, syntaxiques et sémantiques de la protolangue commune. Le rôle des textes littéraires harmonisé avec l'objet est présenté comme un paramètre de valeur, du moment où il a une contribution essentielle dans la délimitation des conclusions et dans l'illustration complète de différents aspects qui concernent les informations lexicales de toutes les langues. La propagation de ce phénomène est évidente dans les moyens narratifs qui tendent à l'évocation éloquente des événements du passé et à la reconstitution essentielle des incidents réalistes, vérifiables, fictifs.

Par conséquent, cette étude est fondée sur le légendaire texte de Dido Sotiriu "Ματωμένα χώματα" ("Adieu, Anatolie"), ainsi que sur l'excellente traduction en serbe avec le titre inspiré "Земља натопљена крвљу", traduction réalisée par le renommé Gaga Rosić. L'axe fondamental de notre travail est, d'une part, l'utilisation limitée du temps historique authentique plus-que-parfait en grec moderne et, d'autre part, sa présence équivalente dans l'expression colloquiale et littéraire en serbe

contemporain, comme il en ressort de l'énumération parallèle des cas caractéristiques à chaque temps et à chaque nuance syntaxique. L'analyse détaillée des données relatives à l'utilisation et au fonctionnement des temps du passé conduit à leur identification ainsi qu'à une différenciation fondée.

Mots-clés: *plus-que-parfait, langue serbe, langue grecque, méthode comparative, texte littéraire*

1. Introductory remarks

Over the last fifty years more intense and extensive research attempts have been noticed aiming at a clear, cross-language clarification of syntactic nuances and semantic parameters concerning the Pluperfect. In this way the credibility of the exposed conclusions is significantly re-examined by selective considerations, while establishing the fundamental principles of an authentic linguistic approach to a multilateral structure of that past tense.

2. The Pluperfect in modern Serbian language

The precise illustration of the syntactic nuances of the Pluperfect and clear meaning definition of temporal features (anteriority, simultaneity, posteriority) are related to its primary observation as a relative tense, i.e. a verbal form that indicates an action performed in the past before another (see Ивић, 1980: 93; Милошевић, 1978: 105; Милошевић, 1982: 135). Generally speaking this topic is presented as a vague one, but the erroneous, dominant view according to which this preterite verbal form is characterized by use of limited domain is based exactly on this difficulty.

2.1. Definition review of the Pluperfect

As a common denominator are considered to be the claims of outstanding syntacticians that "the Pluperfect indicates past actions, something that existed and was committed or (very rarely) occurred in the past before another, also past action" (Пипер и др., 2005: 411) or it is about a verbal tense that expresses an action that "took place (or was very seldom occurring) in the past, prior to the commencement of an action marked by another preterite form or expressed implicitly" (Стевановић, 1974: 664).

According to Musich (Мусић, 1927: 141) the Pluperfect describes a past action "regardless of any other activity", but he adds that "the Pluperfect tense explicitly outlines that the situation beyond the first committed action to which belongs the performance of the second action is past in regard to the present". To this statement Klein opposes the view according to which (Клајн, 2005: 123) the Pluperfect as a specialized grammatical means "denotes an action completed before another past one". Simich (Симић, 2002: 132) associates this tense with a related past and its indirect determination towards the time of speaking about it (Станојчић – Поповић, 1999: 394). In this way at the moment of speaking the annulment of the results of an action denoted by the Pluperfect is achieved, since in the meantime another action happened that has unrealized it (Милошевић 1973; Танасић 1996, 2005, 2005a, 2009; Thomas 2004).

It is worth noting that Stevanovich (Стевановић, 1991: 668 - 669) emphasizes the necessity of considering the whole contextual framework as a fundamental fact of unquestionable importance, while Ivich (Ивић, 1980: 95) between the realization moment of the second action and the main temporal point notices the reversal of the

first action embodied by the predicate in past perfective tense, in view of the fact that "Perfect₂ [Pluperfect] and Future₂ [Future Perfect] are tenses associated with a particular situation of performing within that basic temporal relation to which they actually belong". (Ивић, 1958: 146)

2.2. Syntactic – semantic nuances

On the basis of Vuk Karadjich's language ("Али се одмах у њој распали гњев и навали на мене с укором и са псовком, које ја све поднесем не одговоривши ни речи, јер *сам* већ *био почео* признавати да сам крив" ["But immediately in her anger she disintegrates and attacks me with reprimand and curse which I bear it all without answering a word, because *I had* already *started* to recognize that I was guilty"]) Belich (Белић, 1962: 148) attributes the character of simultaneity to this tense.

Apart from the simultaneous performance of actions Radovanovich (Радовановић, 1990: 185-191) confirms nuances of posteriority and anteriority presenting appropriate syntactic means:

a) Simultaneity:

1) Present Participle:

- <u>Враћајући се</u> из Лондона [...], она *је била застала* крај једне куће. (ЦМ: II, 60)
- ➢ <u>Returning</u> from London [...], she *had stopped* near a house.

2) Prepositional construction (prepositions *при* [near, at], *у* [in, at] + Locative):

- <u>При уласку</u> у место *срели су били* и једну палму. (ЦМ: II, 177)
- ➢ <u>On entering</u> the place *they had* also *met* a palm tree.

3) Temporal clause:

- *Била је затворила* очи, <u>док му је рекла</u>, тише, да се, од данас, уопште, сасвим слаже са њим, у свему. (ЦМ: II, 187)
- ➢ *She had closed* her eyes, <u>as she told</u> him quietly that from that day on she agreed in general and on everything with him.

b) Posteriority:

1) Temporal clause:

- <u>Кад су га довукли близу обале</u>, око њега *су се били окупили*,... (ЦМ: I, 346)
- ➢ <u>When they dragged him off the coast</u>, *they had been gathered* around him…

2) Causal clause:

- <u>Пошто је учио доста математике и геометрије</u>, као артиљеријски официр, те форме *су* га *биле одушевиле.* (ЦМ: I, 325)
- ➢ <u>Since he has studied a lot of mathematics and geometry</u>, as an artillery officer these forms *had fascinated* him.

3) Predicate in clauses of consequence:

- Велики Шкот *био је застао*, па <u>су</u> сви били <u>стали</u>. (ЦМ: I, 324)
- ➢ Great Scot *stopped*, so everyone <u>had stopped</u>.

c) Anteriority:

1) Directly – implicitly defined precedence:

- *Била је изишла* из плићака и стајала и чекала, полугола. <u>Била је олићена мла-дост</u>. (ЦМ: I, 338)
- ➢ *She had come out* of the shoal and she was standing half naked and waiting. <u>She was the personified beauty</u>.

2) Distantly – implicitly defined precedence:

- Нада *је била заволела* чун, на језеру, <u>у Вершају</u>. Чун на води.(ЦМ: I, 63)
- ➢ Nada *had loved* the rowboat on the lake, <u>at Versailles</u>. The rowboat on the water.
  3) Unspecified precedence:
- *Био је решио* да то пређути, али јој је, ето, испричао.(ЦМ: I, 177)
- ➢ *He had decided* to keep it secret, but finally he told her.

2.3. Formation of the Pluperfect tense

The Pluperfect tense is mostly formed by the Perfect and more rarely by the Imperfect of the auxiliary verb „*бити*" ("to be") whose differentiated semantic nuance is illustrated by Musich (Мусић, 1927: 134): "the difference between *бјece* (more rarely *бијаce*: he was) and *био је* (he has been) according to the overall differentiation could be focused on the fact that the time which is stated by the form '*бјece*' is defined, while that expressed by the form '*био је*' is undefined":

- Отац ми <u>беше певао</u> песму и залепио банку тамбурашу на чело.
- ➢ My father <u>was singing</u> a song and stuck a ten – para coin on tamburitza player's forehead.
- Отац ми <u>је био певао</u> песму и залепио банку тамбурашу на чело.
- ➢ My father <u>had sung</u> a song and stuck a ten – para coin on tamburitza player's forehead.

2.4. Gradual disappearance of the Pluperfect

Although the Pluperfect seems to be the main expressive means in the literary and artistic style, as in the conversational communicative act and additionally it reflects a genuine expressiveness and picturesque experientiality, we may notice a remarkable differentiation concerning the researchers' opinions about its gradual elimination in contemporary Serbian language.

Stevanovich (Стевановић, 1967: 120) states about this phenomenon: "The Pluperfect is included in the group of preterite tenses that have disappeared in some Slavic languages. This form is also relatively rarely used in the Serbo-Croatian language, while it is of significantly rarer use in recent years in comparison with the previous period. But we can't claim that it disappears, since till today, especially in the literary language we can meet its forms more frequently than those of Imperfect. In addition we find this form in writers in whose texts there isn't any form of Imperfect or it is extremely rare". This opinion is totally adopted by Lalevich (Лалевић, 1962: 91): "And the Pluperfect is quite rare in use".

Furthermore Maretich (Маретић, 1931: 544) argues that the Pluperfect is a form more frequent with perfective verbs than with those of imperfective aspect (except verba dicendi), while pointing to the description of an action that took place in the past before another action reflects "the events occurred after others". In relation to this Mrazovich – Vukadinovich (Мразовић – Вукадиновић, 1990: 123) emphasize that perfective forms reflect "perfectivity of a previous action in the past", whilst imperfective ones denote their imperfectivity.

Eventually Radovanovich (Радовановић, 1975: 166) notes that "we should probably ask for the reasons concerning the elimination of the imperfective verbs from the engagement sphere of the Pluperfect in the stressed resultativity that the semantic nature of the Pluperfect has and in the perfective aspect as a typical carrier of semantic resultativity".

However Miloshevich (Милошевић 1973, 1982) expresses an opposite opinion

which records its significant distribution in oral communication. He justifies the semantic and stylistic indispensability by Aorist or Perfect through the following facts:

a) A dependent (subordinate) clause demonstrates a relationship of posteriority:

- Кад сам ја дошла, они <u>су били отишли</u>.
- ➢ When I arrived, they <u>had gone.</u>

A possible use of perfective Perfect instead of Pluperfect would change the temporal localization of the action stated in the subordinate clause: "the verb forms, especially the temporal ones act as a diagnostic means of relative chronology in cases where neither of the other two agents (conjunction, aspect) differentiate enough the type of the relative chronology" (Милошевић, 1982: 134).

b) The result of a past action expressed by the Pluperfect may be de-actualized:

- Кад је Ђорђе умро, она <u>се била зарекла</u> јавно, пред целом родбином да се ни- кад неће удавати. Али се ускоро у селу појавио нов учитељ и настанио у ку- ћи преко пута њене. Не прође ни година, а она <u>се удаде</u> за њега (Ивић, 1980: 97).
- ➢ When George died, publicly, in front of all her relatives she <u>had vowed</u> that she would never get married. But the new teacher appeared soon in the village and he took up residence in a house opposite hers. Not even a year passed and she <u>married</u> him.

The replacement disrupts the sense of the narrative inner dynamics, since the Pluperfect "keeps the reader's attention and introduces an element of tension" (Thomas, 2004: 118).

3. The Pluperfect in Modern Greek

In Greek syntacticians' conclusions exposed at linguistic works that are devoted to the diachronic semantic framework of the Pluperfect in the Greek language we may notice a remarkable uniformity.

3.1. Tsolakis

According to Tsolakis (Τσολάκης, 1979: 203) "The Pluperfect notes that whatever is marked by the verb is over in the past before another temporal point in the past that either is mentioned or is implied":

- Της τηλεφώνησα, αλλά <u>δεν είχε γυρίσει</u> ακόμα στο σπίτι.
- Звао сам је, али још <u>се не беше вратила</u> кући.
- ➢ I called her up, but <u>she hadn't returned</u> home yet.

3.2. Hadjisavidis – Hadjisavidis

The Pluperfect belongs to the group of periphrastic tenses (with the Perfect and Future Perfect) and mainly reflects an action "held in the past before the beginning of another that also happened in the past" (Χατζησαββίδης – Χατζησαββίδη, 2011: 126):

- Ο αντιπρόεδρος <u>είχε φύγει,</u> όταν τον ζήτησαν στο τηλέφωνο.
- Потпредседник <u>је био отишао</u>, када су га тражили а телефону.
- ➢ The vice president <u>had gone</u>, when they called him on phone.

In addition, the aforementioned authors emphasize two other common functions of the Pluperfect:

1) The Pluperfect describes an action that took place in the distant past, but it isn't attached to another activity. In such cases the forms of the Pluperfect are very often replaceable by Aorist:

- Κάποτε η αδελφή του Γιώργου <u>είχε κερδίσει</u> στο λαχείο.

- Једном је Ђорђева сестра <u>била добила</u> новац на лутрији.
- Once George's sister <u>had won</u> money in the lottery.
- Κάποτε η αδελφή του Γιώργου <u>κέρδισε</u> στο λαχείο.
- Једном Ђорђева сестра <u>доби</u> новац на лутрији.
- Once George's sister <u>won</u> money in the lottery.

    2) With the particle *θα* (= will, would) the Pluperfect records an undone action, although it was possible to be performed in the past:

- Κάθε λογικός άνθρωπος εκείνη την ώρα <u>θα είχε φύγει</u>. Ο Γιώργος όμως δεν έφυγε.
- У то време сваки разуман човек <u>би био отишао</u>. Ипак Ђорђе није отишао.
- At that time every reasonable man <u>would have gone</u>. However George didn't leave.

3.3. Djevelekou

In accordance with the "Basic New Greek Grammar" (Τζεβελέκου, 2007: 128) the Pluperfect tense in Modern Greek has a dual use:

a) when it describes a past action that was performed in the past before another:

- Όταν έφτασε η βοήθεια, το πλοίο <u>είχε βυθιστεί</u>.
- Кад је помоћ стигла, брод <u>је био потонуо</u>.
- When the help arrived, the ship <u>had sunk</u>.

b) when it refers to an activity completed in the distant part:

- Ο πατέρας του <u>είχε παντρευτεί</u> νέος και <u>είχε αποκτήσει</u> τρία παιδιά.
- Млад <u>се</u> његов отац <u>био оженио</u> и <u>био је стекао</u> троје деце.
- His father <u>had married</u> when he was young and he <u>had obtained</u> three children.

3.4. Textbooks of Modern Greek as a non-native language

At the most acknowledged textbooks of Modern Greek as a non-native language, namely "Modern Greek for foreigners" (Βαλσαμάκη – Τζεκάκη, 2001) and "New Greek language" (Μπαμπινιώτης, 2003) we find an identical approach to the use of the Pluperfect. More specifically Valsamaki – Djevelekou (Βαλσαμάκη – Τζεκάκη, 2001: 180) states that this tense "indicates an action that was completed in the past before another":

- Όταν ο Κώστας έφτασε στο σχολείο, το μάθημα <u>είχε</u> ήδη <u>αρχίσει</u>.
- Кад је Коста стигао у школу, час <u>је</u> већ <u>био почео</u>.
- When Costas arrived at school, the course <u>had</u> already <u>begun</u>.

    On the other hand Babiniotis (Μπαμπινιώτης, 2003: 402) highlights that the Pluperfect tense "refers only to the past and indicates an action finished before another one or a certain time"

- <u>Είχαν φύγει</u> από το Λονδίνο, όταν πήγα εγώ.
- <u>Били си отишли</u> из Лондона, кад сам ја ишао.
- They <u>had gone</u> from London, when I went.

3.5. Formation of the Pluperfect tense

The active Pluperfect is constructed by the form "*είχα*" (= I had), that is the Imperfect of the auxiliary verb "*έχω*" (= have) and the Infinitive of Aorist or the neuter gender of the Past Participle:

- γράφω (= write)
  είχα γράψει – είχα γραμμένο (= I had written)
- διαβάζω (= read)
  είχα διαβάσει – είχα διαβασμένο (= I had read)

The passive Pluperfect is formed in combination with the form „*είχα*" (= I had) and the Infinitive of Aorist or by the form „*ήμουν*" (= I was), that is the Imperfect of the auxiliary verb "*είμαι*" (= be) and the Past Participle:

- γράφομαι (= be written)
  είχα γραφτεί (= I had been written)
  ήμουν γραμμένος, η, ο (= I was written)
- διαβάζομαι (= be read)
  είχα διαβαστεί (= I had been read)
  ήμουν διαβασμένος, η, ο (= I was read)

4. Analysis

For the essential purpose of this paper the material is excerpted from: a) the Greek original text, i.e. the novel "Farewell to Anatolia" and b) its translation in Serbian. The total number of examples found in Greek is sixty one.

In order to achieve a more effective study and an unobstructed view we distinguish the Greek material in two subcategories: a) active Pluperfect and b) passive Pluperfect.

a) Active Pluperfect (40 examples)

We have to note that the active Pluperfect forms are constructed exclusively by I) the structure „*είχα*" + Aorist Infinitive:

I) „*είχα*" + Aorist Infinitive (40 examples)

2 G[1]. Κόσμος <u>είχε κάνει</u> κύκλο γύρω της και χάζευε. (p. 13)
2 S. Свет <u>је направио</u> круг око њега, уживајући у представи. (p. 11)
2 E. People<u> had made </u>a circle around her and were gazing.

3 G. […] γιατί μ' αυτές <u>είχαμε δέσει</u> την ύπαρξή μας. (p.14)
3 S. […] и са њима <u>у вези је било</u> наше постојање. (p. 11)
3 E. […] because we <u>had </u>our existence <u>tied</u> with them.

4 G. […] <u>είχαμε μάθει</u> να τα λέμε όλα με τα μάτια ... (p.16)
4 S. […] <u>научили смо</u> да се споразумевамо погледима... (p. 13)
4 E. […] we <u>had learned</u> to tell everything with eyes…

6 G. Ο Θεός <u>είχε ρίξει</u> στα μέρη μας και μιαν άλλη ευλογία... (p. 19)
6 S. Бог нас <u>је још нечим <u>благословио</u>... (p. 15)
6 E. God <u>had thrown</u> another blessing to our places…

7 G. <u>Είχαν αποτελέψει </u>και τα κρυφομιλήματα για τα νέα συνοικέσια….(p. 20)
7 S. <u>Престала су</u> и говоркања која су се тицала проводаџисања...(p. 16)
7 E. The rumors that concerned the matchmaking <u>had stopped</u>…

8 G. <u>Είχε διαλέξει</u> το δικό μας γάιδαρο να τον πηγαινοφέρνει. (p. 22)
8 S. <u>Изабрао је</u> нашег магарца за ове шетње. (p. 18)
8 E. He <u>had chosen</u> our donkey to move him back and forth.

---

[1] G: Greek, S: Serbian, E: English.

9 G. Εγώ πια άνοιγα μάτια και αφτιά να ρουφήξω όλα εκείνα τα πρωτάκουστα που τα <u>είχα μάθει</u> απόξω όπως το «Πάτερ ημών» (p. 23)
9 S. Ja sam samo širio oči i ćulio uši da upijem sve ono što sam prvi put čuo u životu i što <u>sam naučio</u> kasnije napamet kao „Oče naš". (p. 19)
9 E. I was only opening eyes and pricking ears up in order to absorb all those unheard I <u>had learned</u> by heart as the "Our father".

10 G. Έτσι τον <u>είχανε βαφτίσει</u> τα παιδιά τον κυρ Πυθαγόρα…(p. 24)
10 S. Takav <u>su</u> nadimak <u>nadenuli</u> učenici gosn Pitagori...(p. 20)
10 E. The children <u>had</u> Mr. Pythagoras <u>nicknamed</u> like this…

13 G. Σαν κατάρα <u>είχανε δει</u> τον ξεσκλαβωμό τους από τη δουλεία... (p. 35)
13 S. Svoje oslobođenje <u>su smatrali</u> prokletstvom... (p. 29)
13 E. They <u>had considered</u> their liberation to be a curse…

14 G. Την απόκριση αυτή την έδωκε γιατί <u>είχε μάθει</u> πως ο βοσκός του …(p. 40)
14 S. Ovo je objašnjenje dao, jer <u>je čuo</u> da njegov pastir... (p. 33)
14 E. He gave this answer, because he <u>had heard</u> that his shepherd…

15 G. <u>Είχαν αράξει</u> στο πόρτο της Σμύρνης …(p. 44)
15 S. <u>Razbaškarili su se</u> u izmirskoj luci... (p. 37)
15 E. They <u>had moored</u> the ship in the port of Smyrna…

16 G. Όλες οι κινήσεις του και η σβελτάδα του κι οι τρόποι του δείχνανε πως <u>είχε δουλέψει</u> κι η αφεντιά του παραγιός. (p. 47)
16 S. Svi njegovi pokreti, živost i način ponašanja, odavali su da <u>je</u> i njegovo gospodstvo nekada <u>bilo</u> šegrt. (p. 39)
16 E. All his movements, agility and behavior showed that his mastership <u>had worked</u> as an apprentice.

18 G. […] ν' αλλάξω τη γνώμη που <u>είχα σχηματίσει</u> γι' αυτόν... (p. 50)
18 S. […] da promenim mišljenje koje <u>sam stekao</u> o njemu... (p. 42)
18 E. […] to change the opinion I <u>had formed</u> about him…

19 G. <u>Είχε καθαρίσει</u>, σου λέει, κάμποσους και το είχε καύχημα. (p. 56)
19 S. Njom <u>je presudio</u> mnogima, čime se ponosio. (p. 47)
19 E. It was clear, he <u>had killed</u> a few men and he was proud of it.

22 G. <u>Δεν είχε περάσει</u> μήνας απ' όταν ο Τίμος Σεϊτάνογλου γύρισε… (p. 68)
22 S. <u>Nije prošlo</u> ni mesec dana od kada se Timos Sejtanoglu vratio... (p. 58)
22 E. Neither a month <u>had passed</u> since Timos Seitanoglou returned…

23 G. Μας <u>είχε γεννήσει</u> και τους δυο λαούς η ίδια γη. (p. 70)
23 S. Oba naroda <u>je izrodila</u> ista zemlja. (p. 59)
23 E. The same land <u>had born</u> both nations.

24 G. <u>Είχε αρχίσει</u> από ψάλτης... (p. 81)

24 S. <u>У почетку</u> *je био* појац ... (p. 69)
24 E. He <u>had begun</u> as a chanter…

27 G. Τα σύγνεφα που αποβραδίς <u>είχαν αρχίσει</u> να μαζεύονται... (p. 90)
27 S. Облаци, који <u>су</u> још с вечери <u>почели</u> да се тмуре... (p.76)
27 E. The clouds that <u>had begun</u> to gather overnight…

28 G. Ακόμα <u>δεν είχαν αρχίσει</u> οι μαχαιριές. (p. 91)
28 S. Убоди ножем <u>нису</u> још <u>били почели</u>. (p. 77)
28 E. The stabs <u>hadn't begun</u> yet.

29 G. <u>Είχε χάσει</u> τα λογικά της κι αναγκαστήκανε να τήνε δέσουνε…(p. 93)
29 S. ...<u>изгубила je</u> разум па су били приморани да je завежу... (p. 78)
29 E. She <u>had lost</u> her mind, so they were compelled to tie her…

32 G. <u>Είχε φτιάσει</u> γερό κομπόδεμα. (p. 98)
32 S. Новчане залихе <u>су</u> му <u>биле</u> повелике. (p. 83)
32 E. He <u>had made</u> a great hoard.

b) Passive Pluperfect (21 examples)
    In the original text we have found 11 examples expressed by the structure II) „είχα" + Aorist Infinitive (5, 11, 17, 25, 26, 30, 34, 35, 42, 55, 57) and 10 examples formed by the structure III) „ήμουν" + Past Participle (1, 12, 20, 21, 31, 38, 40, 54, 56, 59):

        II) „είχα" + Aorist Infinitive (11 examples)
5 G. <u>Είχανε σκιαχτεί</u> και τα παλικάρια του χωριού και δεν τήνε ζυγώνανε. (p. 17)
5 S. А и сеоски момци <u>су се уплашили</u> и нису joj прилазили (p. 15)
5 E. The lads of the village <u>had been frightened</u> and they didn't approach her.

11 G. <u>Είχε ξετρελαθεί</u> να γίνει πλούσιος … (p. 34)
11 S. <u>Ухватило</u> га <u>je</u> лудило да се обогати...(p. 28)
11 E. He <u>had got crazy</u> to become rich…

17 G. <u>Είχα</u> μόλις <u>γνωριστεί</u> με τη Σμύρνη... (p. 48)
17 S. Тек сам се био упознао са Измиром... (p. 40)
17 E. I <u>had</u> just <u>met</u> Smyrna…

25 G. Πρόβες θηριωδίας <u>είχανε γίνει</u> πριν κηρυχτεί ο πόλεμος του '14... (p. 87)
25 S. До првих зверстава <u>je дошло</u> пре објаве рата 1914... (p. 74)
25 E. Atrocity rehearsals <u>had happened</u> before the war of 1914 was declared…

26 G. <u>Είχε έρθει</u> η αράδα του Κώστα και του Πανάγου να φύγουνε... (p. 88)
26 S. <u>Дошао je</u> ред на Косту и Панагоса да крену... (p. 75)
26 E. Kosta's and Panago's turn <u>had come</u> to go…

30 G. <u>Είχε μυριστεί</u> πως τρεχοβολούσα εδώ κι εκεί …(p. 95)

124

30 S. <u>Намирисала је</u> да сам се петљао ... (p. 80)
30 E. He <u>had figured out</u> that I was wandering around…

34 G. <u>Είχα γίνει</u> τροφοδότης μιας ομάδας. (p. 106)
34 S. <u>Постао сам</u> снабдевач једне такве групе. (p. 90)
34 E. I <u>had become </u>a team feeder.

35 G. <u>Είχανε γίνει</u> ένα με το κορμί τους. (p. 112)
35 S. <u>Постале су</u> им део тела. (p. 94)
35 E. They <u>had become</u> one with their bodies.

42 G. <u>Είχαμε βολευτεί</u> σε τούτο το χτήμα... (p. 139)
42 S. Удобно <u>смо се сместили</u> на том имању... (p. 118)
42 E. We <u>had settled </u>comfortably in this farm…

55 G. <u>Είχε σταθεί</u> σε αυτό το μέρος μόνο και μόνο… (p. 285)
55 S. На овом <u>се</u> месту <u>задржао</u> само зато што ... (p. 246)
55 E. He <u>had retained</u> in this place just because …

57 G. Η Αφρούλα […] <u>είχε εγκατασταθεί</u> πλάι μας …(p. 308)
57 S. Афрула […] <u>распрострла је своје ствари</u> поред нас ... (p. 266)
57 E. Afroula […] <u>had settled</u> next to us…

III) „ ήμουν" + Past Participle (10 examples)
1 G. Καθώς <u>ήμασταν παραδομένοι</u> στη γλύκα του παιχνιδιού, τσάκωσα με την άκρη του ματιού την όψη του πατέρα να γίνεται σκληρή. (p. 12)
1 S. И док <u>смо били предати </u>својој игри, крајичком ока сам спазио оца који се сав нарогушио. (p. 10)
1 E. As we <u>were surrendered</u> to the sweetness of the game with the corner of the eye I realized that my father's face became wild.

12 G. Τα εκατό τόσα καλύβια των Αραπάδων <u>ήτανε φτιαγμένα</u> από πλεγμένες βέργες αλυγαριάς και ιτιάς... (p. 35)
12 S. Неких стотинак арапских колиба <u>су биле направљене</u> од уплетене шаши и траке…(p. 29)
12 E. One hundred huts of Arabs <u>were made</u> by braided wicker and willow rods…

20 G. Οι τοίχοι <u>ήτανε σκεπασμένοι</u> με ξύλο καρυδιάς … (p. 63)
20 S. Зидови <u>су били прекривени</u> ламперијама од ораховине... (p. 52)
20 E. The walls <u>were covered</u> with walnut…

21 G. Στην κάμαρη που τήνε λέγανε μπουφέ <u>ήταν στρωμένα</u> τραπέζια... (p. 63)
21 S. У соби коју су звали бифе <u>били су постављени</u> столови... (p. 53)
21 E. In the room called buffet tables <u>were set</u>…

31 G. Το σπιτικό του Στρατή <u>δεν ήτανε χτυπημένο</u>. (p. 97)
31 S. Стратисова кућа <u>није била на удару</u>. (p. 82)

31 E. Strati's household <u>wasn't beaten</u>.

38 G. Αίμα είχε τρέξει […] <u>ήτανε συναγμένες</u> εκατομμύρια ψείρες. (p. 117)
38 S. Крв му је цурила […] <u>скупили су се</u> милиони ваши. (p. 99)
38 E. The blood had run […] many lice <u>were gathered</u>.

40 G. <u>Ήμασταν χωρισμένοι</u> σε συνεργεία... (p. 131)
40 S. <u>Били смо подељени</u> у групе ... (p. 111)
40 E. We <u>were divided</u> into groups…

54 G. Το κρεβάτι του <u>ήτανε μουσκεμένο</u> στο αίμα. (p. 269)
54 S. Кревет му <u>је био натопљен</u> крвљу (p. 230)
54 E. His bed <u>was soaked</u> in blood.

56 G. Το χιτώνιό μου <u>ήτανε ξεσχισμένο</u>, όλο αίματα. (p. 294)
56 S. Шињел ми <u>је био исцепан</u>, сав крвав. (p. 255)
56 E. My tunic <u>was torn</u>, all in blood.

59 G. <u>Ήμαστε ξεσκολισμένοι</u> κι οι δυό, ξέραμε πώς να κινηθούμε. (p. 330)
59 S. Обојица <u>смо били обучени</u>, знали смо како да се крећемо. (p. 285)
59 E. Both of us <u>were trained</u>, we knew how to move.

The following tables illustrate the analysis of statistical frequency concerning Greek and Serbian equivalents of the Pluperfect:

Table 1: Active Pluperfect (subgroup I)

Serbian equivalent	Active Pluperfect „είχα" + Aorist Infinitive (40)	
Perfect of perfective aspect	35	87,5%
Perfect of imperfective aspect	1	2,5%
Biaspectual verb „бити" (= be)	2	5%
Collocation with the verb "бити" (= be)	1	2,5%
Pluperfect	1	2,5%

Table 2: Passive Pluperfect (subgroup II)

Serbian equivalent	Passive Pluperfect „είχα" + Aorist Infinitive (11)	
Perfect of perfective aspect	10	90,9%
Pluperfect	1	9,09%

Table 3: Passive Pluperfect (subgroup III)

Serbian equivalent	Passive Pluperfect „ήμουν" + Past Participle (10)	
Perfect of perfective aspect	1	10%
Biaspectual verb „бити" (= be)	8	80%
Collocation with the verb "бити" (= be)	1	10%

Table 4: Pluperfect (subgroups I, II, III)

Serbian equivalent	Pluperfect (61)	
Perfect of perfective aspect	46	75,4%
Perfect of imperfective aspect	1	1,6%
Biaspectual verb „бити“ (= be)	10	16,4%
Collocation with the verb "бити" (= be)	2	3,3%
Pluperfect	2	3,3%

With reference to Serbian translation equivalents we argue that in:
- subgroup I: all Greek examples expressed by the Active Pluperfect correspond to the Perfect of perfective aspect. The exclusions are: one example (13) is recorded by the imperfective Perfect; three examples (3, 16, 24) are noted by the biaspectual auxiliary verb „бити“ and one of them (3) with the collocation is made by the aforementioned verb; finally just one case (28) is constructed by the Pluperfect.
- subgroup II: the use of the perfective Perfect denotes dominant frequency (5, 11, 25, 26, 30, 34, 35, 42, 55, 57) and only one example (17) is marked by the Pluperfect.
- subgroup III: to a considerable extent (1, 2, 20, 21, 40, 54, 56, 59) there is the passive construction composed of the Perfect of the auxiliary verb "бити" and the Past Participle, while the collocation with this verb (31) and the perfective Perfect (38) present per one example.
- all the subgroups: Serbian equivalents expressed by the perfective Perfect (75,4%) constitute three quarters of the examples; a great percentage (16,4%) is recorded by the biaspectual – auxiliary verb „бити“; two equivalent structures, i.e. the collocation with the verb „бити“ and the Pluperfect follow with equal frequency (3, 3%); the translation equivalents marked by the imperfective Perfect present a percentage of 1,6%.

5. Concluding remarks

The corpus analysis of Serbian translation equivalents to the Greek Pluperfect primarily confirms that the morphological identity of Greek verb forms determines the particular viewpoint which embodies the perfective content of the verb, whilst the Serbian aspect is manifested through the dual separation in perfective and imperfective. In parallel we should conclude that with impressive difference in Modern Greek the construction „είχα“ + Aorist Infinitive indicates primary frequency replacing the other variants, without substantial syntactic–semantic diversions. In the statistical hierarchy in Serbian the main translation equivalent is the perfective Perfect that dominates not only in the colloquial, but also in the majority of examples excerpted from the literary production, while the Pluperfect is treated as an obsolete form with reduced pragmatic and conceptual nuances.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Белић, Александар, *Историја српскохрватског језика, књига* II, *свеска* 2, *Речи са коњугацијом,* Београд, Научна књига, 1962.

Ивић, Милка, *Систем личних глаголских облика за обележавање времена у српскохрватском језику,* in "Годишњак Филозофског факултета", no. 3/1958, Нови Сад, Филозофски факултет, p. 139 – 152.

Ивић, Милка, *О значењу српскохрватског плусквамперфекта,* in "Зборнк МС за

филологију и лингвистику", no. XXIII/1, 1980, Нови Сад: Филозофски факултет, p. 93-100.

Клајн, Иван, *Граматика српског језика*, Београд, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 2005.

Лалевић, Михаило, *Синтакса српскохрватског књижевног језика*, Београд, Завод за издавање Уџбеника народне Републике Србије, 1962.

Маретић, Томислав, *Граматика и стилистика хрватскога или српскога књижевног језика*, Загреб, Обнова, 1931.

Милошевић, Ксенија, *Темпорално значење и синтаксичка вриједност конструкција Cop (praes. perf.) + part. pass. у српскохрватском језику*, in „Јужнословенски филолог", no. XXX/1–2, 1973, Београд, p. 423 - 437.

Милошевић, Ксенија, *О проучавању временских глаголских облика у сербокроатистици*, in „Зборнк МС за филологију и лингвистику", no. XXI/2, 1978, Нови Сад, Филозофски факултет, Београд, p. 93-121.

Милошевић, Ксенија, *Улога глаголских облика у сложеној реченици са темпоралном клаузом у савременом српскохрватском језику*, in „Научни скуп слависта у Вукове дане", no. 11/2, 1982, p. 125-138.

Мразовић, Павица – З. Вукадиновић, Зорица, *Граматика српскохрватскога језика за странце*, Сремски Карловци, Издавачка књижарница Зорана Стојановића; Нови Сад, Добра Вест, 1990.

Мусић, Аугуст, *Прилози науци о употреби времена у српскохрватском језику, I, Времена у народним пјесмама*, in "Глас СКА", no. 121/1927, Београд, p. 111-173.

Пипер, Предраг и др., *Синтакса савременога српског језика, Проста реченица*, Београд, Институт за српски језик САНУ, Београдска књига, Матица српска, 2005.

Радовановић, Милорад, *Значење и функције плусквамперфекта у „Роману о Лондону" Милоша Црњанског, in* "Годишњак Филозофског факултета у Новом Саду", no. XVIII/1, 1975, Нови Сад, Филозофски факултет, p. 165 – 179.

Радовановић, Милорад, *Списи из синтаксе и семантике*, Сремски Карловци, Издавачка Књижарница Зорана Стојановића ; Нови Сад, Добра Вест, 1990.

Симић, Радоје, *Српска Граматика 2, Синтакса*, Београд, Научно друштво за неговање и проучавање српског језика ; Никшић, ЈАСЕН, 2002.

Сотириу, Дидо, *Земља натопљена крвљу*, Београд, Просвета, 2001.

Станојчић, Живојин – Поповић, Љиљана *Граматика Српскога језика, Уџбеник за I,II,III, и IV разред средње школе*, Београд, Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства, 1999.

Стевановић, Михаило, *Функције и значења глаголских времена*, Посебна издања Српске академије наука и уметности, књ. CDXXII, Одељење литературе и језика, књ. 20, Београд, САНУ, 1967.

Стевановић, Михаило, *Савремени српскохрватски језик, Граматички системи и књижевнојезичка норма*, II *Синтакса*, Београд, Народна књига, 1974.

Стевановић, Михаило, *Савремени српскохрватски језик II, Синтакса*, Београд, Научна књига,1991.

Танасић, Срето, *О перфекту и плусквамперфекту имперфективних глагола*, in „Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику", no. XXXIX/1,

1996, Нови Сад, p. 91–97.

Танасић, Срето, *Синтаксичке теме*, Београд, Београдска књига, 2005.

Танасић, Срето, *Статус плусквамперфекта у савременом српском језику*, in "Шести лингвистички скуп Бошковићеви дани", 2005 а, Подгорица, p. 231–239.

Црњански, Милош, *Роман о Лондону*, I и II, Београд, Нолит, 1971, (ЦМ)

Βαλσαμάκη – Τζεκάκη, Φανή, *Τα Νέα Ελληνικά για ξένους*, Θεσσαλονίκη, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης – ΙΝΣ, 2001.

Μπαμπινιώτης, Γεώργιος, *Ελληνική γλώσσα, Εγχειρίδιο Διδασκαλίας της Ελληνικής ως Δεύτερης (Ξένης) γλώσσας*, Αθήνα, Ίδρυμα Μελετών Λαμπράκη, 2003.

Σωτηρίου, Διδώ, *Ματωμένα χώματα*, Αθήνα, Κέδρος, 1983.

Τζεβελέκου, Μαρία, *Βασική γραμματική της Ελληνικής*, Αθήνα, Ινστιτούτο Επεξεργασίας του Λόγου - Ε. Κ. «Αθηνά», 2007.

Τσολάκης, Χρίστος, *Νεοελληνική γραμματική της Ε΄ και ΣΤ΄ δημοτικού*, Αθήνα, Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Διδακτικών Βιβλίων, 1979.

Χατζησαββίδης. Σωφρόνης – Χατζησαββίδη, Άννα, *Γραμματική Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας Α΄, Β΄, Γ΄ Γυμνασίου*, Αθήνα, Οργανισμός Εκδόσεως Διδακτικών Βιβλίων, 2011.

Thomas, Paul – Louis, *Плусквамперфекат – жива граматичка категорија савременог српског језика?*, in "Научни скуп слависта у Вукове дане", 33/1, 2004, Београд, p. 111-122.