'Evidentiality' and point of view in Bulgarian*

Barbara Sonnenhauser (Münich)

В статье рассматривается эвиденциальность в българском языке. В центре внимания находятся различия между простыми формами на –л с вспомогательным глаголом в 3-ем лице и без него. Автор доказывает, что употребление или опущение вспомогательного глагола имеет решающее значение для эвиденциальной семантики этих форм, так как оно кодирует точку зрения, с которой представлены события. Это может быть точка зрения „рассказчика" или „не-рассказчика". Выбор позиции „не-рассказчика" обусловлен влиянием контекстуальных факторов, а также факторов, связанных со знаниями о жанре и типе текста. Учитывая взаимодействие семантических и дискурсивных факторов, можно описать интерпретативный охват форм на –л и их текстообразующие и нарративные функции.

The present paper is concerned with 'evidentiality' in Bulgarian, focusing on the difference between the simple 'l-forms' with and without the 3rd person auxiliary. The usage or omission of the auxiliary is argued to be the decisive contribution to the evidential-like semantics of these forms, in that it serves the coding of a point of view from which the narrated events are presented. This point of view may be the 'narrator' or some 'non-narrator'. The specification of 'non-narrator' is triggered by contextual factors and factors such as knowledge about genre and text type. Based on this interaction of semantics and discourse factors, the interpretational range of the l-forms can be accounted for, as well as their text structuring and narrative functions.

Key words: Bulgarian, auxiliary variation, point of view, narrative

---

1. 'Evidentiality' in Bulgarian

As is well-known, Bulgarian possesses verbal forms composed out of the *l*-participle and the auxiliary *săm*, which is omitted in the 3rd person. These so-called 'renarrative' forms (*preizkazni formi*) are problematic for linguistic description in various respects: on the formal plane, as regards their semantics, and concerning the question of usage conditions on the text level.

Traditionally, they are subsumed under a separate paradigm, distinguished from the perfect by the omission of the auxiliary in the 3rd person and the possibility of being based also on the imperfect *l*-participle. Since imperfect *l*-forms with the 3rd person auxiliary are encountered as well, a further paradigm is postulated – that of the conclusive (e.g. Bojadžiev et al. 1999, Nicolova 2008). This yields a set of partly or fully homonymous forms and paradigms, as illustrated in table 1 for the 1st and 3rd persons singular and plural:

Table 1

category:	perfect	renarrative		conclusive	
basis:	aorist	aorist	imperfect	imperfect	aorist
	pisăl săm	pisăl săm	pišel săm	pišel săm	pisăl săm
	pisăl e	pisăl ∅	pišel ∅	pišel e	pisăl e
	pisăli sme	pisăli sme	pišeli sme	pišeli sme	pisăli sme
	pisăli sa	pisăli ∅	pišeli ∅	pišeli sa	pisăli sa

As regards semantics, renarrative forms are assumed to convey, roughly speaking, second-hand or indirect information, i.e. information on events the speaker has not witnessed himself. Jakobson (1971) was among the first to call these forms 'evidential', citing them as an example of verbal categories that take "into account three events – a narrated event, a speech event, and a narrated speech event" (1971: 135). Basic to their 'evidential' character is the narrated speech event as the source of information. With the growing interest in evidentiality, Bulgarian has been getting into the focus of attention, with the type of evidentiality and the interaction with epistemicity being among the main matters of debate (e.g. de Haan 1999 for a general discussion, Plungjan 2001 on 'modalized evidential systems' in the Balkan languages, Nicolova 2008 for an analysis of the Bulgarian verbal system, Wiemer & Kampf to appear on lexical expressions in Bulgarian).

However, contrary to what one might expect from the renarrative or the evidential characterization, these forms are not necessarily used in contexts which indicate the source of information or which presuppose the non-witnessed character of the information conveyed. One case in point is reported speech. As can be seen from (1), forms other than the renarrative may appear in the embedded clause, such as in (1b) and (1c) the perfect and the future tense.

(1) a. Приятелят на Лейди ГаГа – Тейлър Кини съобщи, че *имал* съв-сем нормална връзка с певицата. (http://www.bliasak.bg/news/p3_18697_0.html, 26.10.2012)

   b. Вицепрезидентът на БФС Йордан Лечков и член на Изпълкома обяви, че на практика вече *е напуснал* постовете си. (http://www.gol.bg, 6.7.2011)

   c. […] директно каза, че от нея *ще зависи* оценката на комисията в следващия   доклад […] (www.capital.bg, 4.5.2012)

Another context in which these forms are not obligatory, even though they might be expected given their alleged renarrative and evidential semantics, are news reports.[1] According to Nicolova (2008: 389f), the choice of forms depends on whether the journalist intends to express some distance towards the message or the degree of belief in the source of information. Thus, the usage of forms may vary as illustrated in (2), with the aorist, renarrative and present tense.[2] Similar to reported speech, the question arises as to whether there can be observed specific patterns of usage for the different forms.

(2) Пет тежки катастрофи *станаха* в пиринския край за по-малко от 15 часа. В петък сутринта на главен път Е-79 лек автомобил „Фолксваген Голф" *направи* каскада, за щастие без сериозно пострадали. 35-годишни-ят санданчанин Д.С. *пътувал* към ГКПП-Кулата. […] Шофьорът и 2-го-дишното му дете *са прегледани* във ФСМП-Сандански и *са освободени*, […] (www.standartnews.com, 3.11.2012)

Furthermore, the usage of renarrative forms and the type of news and kind of newspaper seem to correlate: renarrative forms are preferred in crime stories, which are found in the yellow press mainly (*Standart* and *Trud* even have a special rubric, *Krimi*, for such stories). This confirms Nicolova's (2008: 390) observation that the usage of renarrative forms tends to cause a lowering in style from a formal to a more colloquial register, which is characterized by rumor and chatter.

Facing problems like these and given data like that collected by Roth (1979), Friedman (1986: 176f) argues against analyzing the omission of the 3rd person auxiliary as marking evidentiality. Instead, he regards *l*-forms with or without the 3rd person auxiliary as implying non-confirmativity but not

---

[1] Up to 1989, usage of the renarrative was obligatory for news from non-communist agencies such as Reuters (e.g. Nicolova 2008: 389; cf. also Zambova 2000).

[2] Examples like (2) lead Levin-Steinmann (2004: 326) to conclude that in journalistic texts a renarrative semantics expressed by –aux forms does not play a role at all, since this is already presupposed as meta-information. Still the question remains as to whether there can be found specific context conditions triggering the preferred usage of those forms.

specifying this feature. Lindstedt (1994: 44f), too, concludes that "the auxiliary drop did not become an unambiguous marker of indirective in Bulgarian (let alone a marker distinguishing between the 'Reportative' and the 'Inferential' […])" (1994: 46; cf. also 2000: 377) and argues against the assumption of the three different paradigms illustrated in table 1. Levin-Steinmann's (2004: 345f) analysis yields the same result: auxiliary drop is not tied to the semantic component of renarration. Renarration is one out of many possible context-triggered interpretations of these forms, but there is no need to assume a separate paradigm for it. Rather, *l*-forms without the 3rd person auxiliary are to be regarded as variant of the perfect (Levin-Steinmann 1999: 161).

Because of their deficient formal and semantic distinction, it has been proposed to capture the forms listed in table 1 within one common paradigm subsuming the *l*-participle in both aspects, based on both aorist and imperfect, with or without the third person auxiliary. Ivančev (1988) includes these variants within a *perfektopodoben kompleks*, Alexander (2001) speaks of a 'generalized past', Friedman (2001) of an 'unmarked past'. Instead of assuming separate categories, the usage or omission of the 3rd person auxiliary is regarded as being conditioned by discourse-pragmatic factors. One of the first to point out the discourse basis of the 'auxiliary variation' was Friedman (1982). Lindstedt (1994) notices the relevance of the presence vs. absence of the 3rd person auxiliary for narrativity, and Fielder (e.g. 1995, 1999) has shown its text structuring function.

However, discourse-based pragmatic functions do not come out of nowhere, but need to be grounded in some semantic basis. This semantic basis has to account for the interpretations of the forms in question as well as for their narrative and text structuring functions. Here it will be argued that the interpretations and the functions derive from the coding of a point of view by these forms, with the auxiliary variation playing a decisive role.

2. Speaker and observer

The relevance of the notion of 'point of view' for a functional account of the Bulgarian *l*-forms has already been pointed out in the literature on this topic.[3] Penčev (1994), for instance, introduces an 'observer' as one of the participants of the denoted situation. This observer may differ from the speaker or coincide with it. In (3a), the only explicitly coded participant is

---

[3] Cf. also the oftentimes proposed relation of these forms to epistemic modality. Evidentiality and modality are assumed to overlap in the domain of epistemicity, since here, "the probability of P is evaluated" (Plungjan 2001: 354). Plungjan (ibid.) argues that even though an epistemic value is not necessarily included in evidentiality, the assumption of a correlation between reliability and directness of information may be grammaticalized, resulting in a "modalized evidential system". As one example for this kind of system he cites the Balkan languages. Here, the issue of the relation between evidentiality and epistemicity will not be focused upon.

the speaker (indicated by the pronoun *mi*), whereas in (3b), the speaker may have participated in the situation or not, i.e. may have witnessed it or not. In the latter case, the speaker does not function as observer, but as somebody 'knowing' about the state of affairs:

(3) a. Той ми е говорил за тебе. (Penčev 1994: 31)
     b. Той ти е говорил за мене. (ibid.)

Thus, with the perfect, i.e. +aux forms, a past event is included in the speaker's current knowledge, but there is no commitment as to whether the speaker has witnessed the situation as an observer or simply knows about it (Penčev 1994: 35). This second possibility can be expressed unambiguously by the –aux forms. Accordingly, Penčev's approach distinguishes two points of view (speaker or observer) and two roles for the speaker (witnessing or knowing). As a witness, the speaker functions as observing participant of the situation, whereas if he simply knows about the situation, there must be some other observer. Knowing about a situation can appear in two variants: *znam če*, which is associated with the +aux forms, and *kazaha mi, če* as associated with the –aux forms (1994: 36). That is, +aux and –aux forms may both express 'knowing', but the exact nature of this knowledge differs between 'knowing not as a witness' and 'knowing from somebody else'. These relations are summarized in table 2:

Table 2

Form	aorist	+aux	-aux
Role	witnessing	knowing	
		znam	*kazaha mi*

Nicolova (1993: 140) refers to the speaker's state of consciousness in accounting for the meaning of the *l*-forms . According to her analysis, they are characterized by the inclusion of information concerning past cognitive states of the speaker. These cognitive states serve as additional 'moment of reference' in the Bulgarian verbal system (1993: 143). They are also part of the presuppositions associated with the *l*-forms . For the 'conclusive' forms, Nicolova (2008: 294f) distinguishes speaker and witness, and interprets the past cognitive state as the presupposition *az znaja ne kato svidetel, če p*, which is basic to the assertion *az tvărdja, če p*. The 'renarrative' forms, on the other hand, presuppose *az znaja, če X tvărdi, če p* and assert *az tvărdja, če X tvărdi, če p* (2008: 363f). For the conclusive, thus, there is only one point of view, but with two roles, whereas for the renarrative, two points of view are

involved. These two different presuppositions can be interpreted as spelling out the different kinds of 'knowing' noted by Penčev (1994). For the semantic analysis of the perfect, Nicolova does not include an explicit reference to the speaker. Implicitly, however, it is present – in terms of the inclusion of the reference time interval, which follows up an event in the past and includes the time of utterance (2008: 294f). As can be seen from the descriptions, the explicit distinction between points of view – *az*/speaker vs. *X* – is related to the –aux forms, whereas for +aux forms, the speaker may assume two roles. For the aorist, no specification of roles or points of view is relevant.

Assuming a particular point of view requires also clarifying its 'object'. With the auxiliary variation, this object is the narration (including the events and their presentation), which is captured by Gerdžikov´s (e.g. 1982) notion of 'način na izkazvaneto'. Through the use of these forms, the narration and the point of view of presentation get distanced (cf. also Chvany 1988). This is why –aux forms may serve to foreground the narration and background the narrator, as Fielder (e.g. 1995) has shown.

As illustrated by this short overview, *l*-forms in Bulgarian are assumed to include an explicit statement concerning some point of view. Distinguishing different points of view is of special importance for 3rd person narratives. Whereas the 1st and 2nd persons are included in the communicative setting and are thus as a default included in the time of utterance, the third person is outside the communicative setting. Therefore, the necessity arises to distinguish and specify the exact point of view. Bulgarian has overt means for this disambiguation: usage of the 3rd person auxiliary indicates anchoring to a point of view which may be the speaker's or not, omitting the 3rd person auxiliary indicates a non-speaker's point of view.

In what follows, it will be shown that the notion of 'point of view' is highly relevant in order to account for the usage patterns of *l*-forms on the text level. In order to do so, two questions have to be clarified: the integration of point of view into the semantics of these forms and the notion of point of view itself. Simply assuming it to be the standpoint of the speaker obscures the difference between speaker and observer, the importance of which has been illustrated in this section.

3. Semantics

A semantic description of the *l*-forms requires analyzing the contributions of the participle and the presence/absence of the 3rd person auxiliary. Moreover, it is necessary to examine how these contributions are compatible with the 'evidential' interpretations ascribed to these forms.

3.1 *l*-forms
3.1.1 Participle

The *l*-participle is a constitutive part of the Bulgarian *perfektopodoben kompleks*. It is well known that cross-linguistically perfects tend to assume evidential meanings or interpretations (e.g. Lindstedt 2000: 378f on the developmental path of the perfect). As regards Bulgarian, Lindstedt (2000: 376) sketches the evolution from perfect to an "evidential form that can be characterized as an Indirective Aorist", with the latter having been the model for further 'indirective tenses'.

Izvorski (1997: 223f) proposes a time-relational semantic analysis of the perfect and its relation to evidentiality. She accounts for this affinity in terms of the relation of the perfect to the present. The contribution of the perfect consists in the assertion of the existence of a consequent state *CS* at a moment *t*, and the non-existence of the event *e* which has preceded and brought about *CS*, cf. (4).

(4) $\text{hold (CS(e), t)} \ \& \ \neg \ \text{hold (e, t)}$

The notion of 'consequent state' is slightly misleading in this context. Importantly, it is not necessarily to be understood as 'resultant state', but more generally as a state following up a preceding event to which it stands in a causal – but not causative – relationship. This relationship distinguishes the *l*-forms from passive participles, which denote a consequent state in isolation, i.e. without linguistically presupposing the relation to a prior event (cf. also Guentchéva & Desclés 1982: 48).

The contribution of the present consists in the specification of *t* as time of utterance *TU*. *CS* is asserted to hold at *TU*, cf. the representation in (5):

(5) $\text{hold (CS(e), TU)} \ \& \ \neg \ \text{hold (e, TU)}$

Izvorski (1997: 234) then goes on to transfer this semantic description into the interval analysis proposed by Klein (1995). Central to Klein's approach is the distinction between the situation time *TSit* and the topic time (or time of assertion) *TT* as the time for which an assertion is made. Along these lines, the perfect is characterized by two conditions: *TSit* is not included in *TT*, and *TT* is part of *TU*. The first condition captures the fact that the event took place within *TSit*, but is not asserted within *TT*, the second captures the fact that *TT* is included in *TU*, with *TT* asserting the existence of *CS* following up *e*. This is represented in (6):

(6) $\text{e} \not\subseteq \text{TT} \ \& \ \text{CS(e)} \subseteq \text{TT} \ \& \ \text{TT(CS)} \subseteq \text{TU}$

The situation in Bulgarian is further complicated by the fact that the participle introducing the CS is specified in terms of aspect (pf/ipf) and tense

(aorist/imperfect). Guentchéva & Desclés (1982: 55) describe the contribution of aorist and imperfect in terms of the specification of the closure of a process as open (excluding initial and final boundary) or closed (including initial and final boundary).[4] The perfective and imperfective aspects specify whether that process has been terminated (accomplished) or completed (achieved), i.e. whether it has reached an inherent limit or not. The thus specified process is followed by a complementary phase involving a state which is validated within the act of utterance.

Accordingly, the semantics of the participle can be analyzed as describing a closed process, with the nature of the closure being specified by means of aspect and aorist/imperfect. Following up this closed process is a subsequent state which is related to the time of utterance, where it is validated.

3.1.2 Auxiliary variation

The time of utterance, which is a basic component of the semantic analysis of the *l*-forms , is usually understood as being the speaker's. However, relating the asserted *CS* to the speaker is problematic in (at least) two respects: first, for linguistic analyses the notion of 'speaker' might be useful for dialogical settings, but it is too indifferent for narrative contexts (on the distinction between dialogues and narratives, and its linguistic relevance especially for deictic expressions cf. Padučeva 1996). One possible way to be more precise is provided by Ducrot's (1984) distinction between the physical producer of an utterance, the narrator (*locuteur*) and some character in the text (*énonciateur*).[5] In dialogical settings, the speaker equals the physical producer of an utterance and hence coincides with the narrator. Narrative settings, however, include two further instances: the narrator and one or more character(s) in the text. Whereas the author as physical producer is not linguistically relevant, the latter two need to be distinguished as possible points of view. Second, simply assuming a speaker as playing a role for the semantics of the l-forms cannot account for the distinctions between 'speaker'/'observer' and 'witnessing'/'knowing'. In order to incorporate the narrative instance of the 'observer' as non-narrator into the semantic analysis of these forms, Padučeva's (1996) notion of 'standpoint' or *točka otsčeta TO*, which she introduces in her analysis of the Russian aspecto-temporal system, will be made use of. This standpoint *TO* does not necessarily have to coincide with that of the narrator, i.e. it does not have to be included

---

[4] Guentchéva & Desclés (1982) define intervals in set theoretic terms, i.e. as consisting of sets of instances. Open-bounded intervals I_o do not include the first and the last instance out of the set of instances ($I_o = \{x, a < x < b\}$), whereas both are included with closed-bounded intervals I_c ($I_c = \{x, a \leq x \leq b\}$).

[5] There are other proposals as well, such as the various variants of polyphony (for an overview cf. Gévaudan 2008), or Desclés & Guibert's (2011) elaboration of an *analyse énonciative de textes*. For the purposes of this paper, the distinction between producer, narrator and character suffices.

within his *TU*. Importantly, *TU* in narrative settings is not to be understood as the speaker's (= author's), but as the narrator's time of utterance. Since it is not tied to the moment of the physical production of the text, it is dynamic and may move and change as the narrative evolves.

As regards the relation of *TO* to *TU*, the role of the auxiliary becomes important: using the auxiliary includes *TO* within *TU*, omitting it indicates that *TO* is not included in *TU*. Since *CS* is validated from *TO* (instead of simply from *TU*), *TO* is included in *TT*, the asserted time interval. Therefore, the contribution of the auxiliary variation to the interpretation of the *l*-forms consists in the specification of the relation between *TO* and *TU* as inclusion/ non-inclusion, and this relation's relation to *TT*, cf. (7):

(7) a. +Aux: $TO \subseteq TT(CS)$ & $TO \subseteq TU$
     b. −Aux: $TO \subseteq TT(CS)$ & $TO \nsubseteq TU$

Taking into account the contribution of the participle, the semantics of the generalized past can be summarized as in (8):

(8) a. *l*-participle +Aux: $[e \nsubseteq TT$ & $CS(e) \subseteq TT]$ & $[TO \subseteq TT(CS)$ & $TO \subseteq TU]$
     b. *l*-participle −Aux: $[e \nsubseteq TT$ & $CS(e) \subseteq TT]$ & $[TO \subseteq TT(CS)$ & $TO \nsubseteq TU]$

In both cases, *TT(CS)* is validated from *TO*. Being included in *TU*, *TO* equals the point of view of the narrator, (8a). Being excluded from TU, the validation of *CS* does not happen from the narrator's point of view but from that of some 'non-narrator', (8b). This non-narrator is further specified within the context.

There are two important aspects associated with this semantic analysis: the 'distance' towards the narrated event emerges from the fact that it is presupposed and not asserted, and the follow-up state is anchored to the relation of *TU* and *TO*. This relation is basic to the various interpretations: *TO* being included in *TU* allows for interpretations such as the classical perfect, the narrative usage of the perfect, or conclusive interpretations. The non-inclusion of *TO* in *TU* allows for quotative interpretations (if the non-narrator is specified), hearsay and inferential interpretations (if the non-narrator is left unspecified) or 'mythological', fairy-tale like interpretations (if there is no narrator). This will be elaborated in more detail in section 4.

Based on this semantic description, Penčev's distinction between knowing and observing can be accounted for, as well as that between *kazaha mi, če* vs. *znam, če*. 'Witnessing' does not require reference to a point of view, hence the aorist is used, which does not refer to some *TO*. 'Knowing' and 'being told', however, require a source of knowledge or information. Including an

observer's point of view, the relation $TO \subseteq TU$ is basic to *znam, če* (+aux forms), the relation $TO \nsubseteq TU$ to *kazaha mi, če* (–aux forms).

Next, it needs to be investigated how far this semantic description can be related to the evidential potential ascribed to these forms.

3.2 Inferential evidentiality

Lindstedt (1994, 2000) regards the Bulgarian evidentials as 'indirective' insofar as they may give rise to inferential and quotative interpretations. The close relation between inferential and quotative has also been noted by de Haan (2001, 2005). He relates it to the basic deictic character of evidentiality, which marks "the relation between the speaker and the action s/he is describing" (2005: 379). According to this conception, indirect evidentials denote "the relative distance between the speaker and the action" (2005: 379). The deictic property of evidentials is also basic to the two semantic oppositions de Haan (2001, 2005) proposes for a description and classification of evidentiality: direct vs. indirect evidence [±Dir], and 1st vs. 2nd hand evidence [±1st hand]. The need to assume both oppositions instead of merely one gets obvious with inferential evidentiality. Since [+Dir] pertains also to 'evidence after the fact', such as consequent / follow-up states, inferentials are directly evidential in this respect. However, since they indicate that there is no sensory information about the event, they are also [-1st hand] (2001: 195). Inferentials therefore are characterized by the ambiguity of the speaker's role (2001: 217); the speaker being "aware of the evidence for the action" they are "a hybrid direct/indirect evidential category" (2005: 387).

Based on this analysis of evidentiality, the place of Bulgarian can be determined in more detail. By the *l*-participle, a two-component event description is introduced. This can be regarded as the prerequisite for the application of de Haan's two features. While the event itself is not witnessed by the speaker (or rather narrator), i.e. the feature [±1st hand] is specified negatively, he may or may not have direct evidence of the consequent state. Depending on the usage or omission of the auxiliary, the feature [±Dir] is specified positively or negatively. Accordingly, we get the evidential characterizations for the auxiliary variation as shown in (9), with an exemplary set of possible interpretations each:

(9) a. +Aux: [+Dir], [-1st hand]: e.g. perfect, conclusive
     b. -Aux: [-Dir], [-1st hand]: e.g. quotative, inferential

The description in (9) captures the fact that with +aux forms, the event itself is not observed but the narrator has direct evidence of its follow-up state (*TO* included in *TU*), whereas with –aux forms, neither the event nor the follow-up state is witnessed by the narrator; he knows about the event and the state from some other observer (*TO* not included in *TU*). With quotatives „another person […] becomes responsible for the information", i.e. "[t]he speaker [here

narrator] is not a reference point" (de Haan 2001: 217). Plungjan's (2001: 353) characterization of the quotative is similar in that he, too, regards the speaker (here narrator) as being "separated from the situation by the barrier of another observer". For the Balkan languages, he regards the quotative as a contextual variety within indirective markers (2001: 353). This can be seen from his classification of evidential values in table 3 (2001: 354), which is here applied to the markers of Bulgarian.

Table 3

direct evidence	indirect evidence	
	reflected evidence (inferentials and presumptives)	mediated evidence (quotatives)
personal evidence		
aorist	+aux	−aux

Interestingly, both de Haan's and Plungjan's classifications resemble that proposed by Penčev (1994), and all of them capture the complex status of the ±aux forms and their interpretations.

The close relation between inferential and quotative interpretations is obvious in (10), where the –aux form *dala* can be interpreted as pointing out that the statement is based not on personal witness, but on inferences (inferential) or on foreign information (quotative). What is basic to both possible interpretations is the semantically coded relation *TO ⊄ TU*. Within the range provided by this semantic basis, various interpretations – such as the quotative and the interential – are possible.

(10) „Че откъде са попаднали у вас?" [...] "Ами синът Ви ги *дал* на дъщеря ми вчера в забавачката." (Olga Šurbanova, *Vkus na Mocart*)

Along the lines of the semantics for the *l*-forms developed here and in accordance with de Haan's approach to evidentiality, the discourse behavior and the narrative patterns of the auxiliary variation can now be accounted for.

4. Point of view in texts

The text structuring and narrative function of the auxiliary variation has already been pointed out in the literature. Lindstedt (1994: 46) regards the auxiliary drop in Bulgarian as being "associated with some kinds of narrative contexts". He emphasizes that this possibility is available in non-witnessed context only (1994: 47). Presumably, these are third-person narratives, i.e. those contexts that lack a default anchor provided by the first and second persons

(cf. section 2). The function to structure longer texts has been pointed out by Fielder (e.g. 1995). Based on their distancing function, the –aux forms serve to foreground the narration and background the narrator.

In order to illustrate the discourse relevance of the semantic description proposed above, two aspects will be focused upon: the disambiguation and anchoring of the 'non-narrator' in the text, and the interrelation of auxiliary variation and text types.

4.1 Anchoring

The notion of 'non-narrator', which emerges for –aux forms from the relation $TO \not\subseteq TU$, is specified in the particular context of usage. There are basically three possibilities: specification as 'no narrator', as 'non-narrator' and as 'character in the text'. By anchoring the proposition expressed, this contributes to specifying the contextually relevant interpretations of the ±aux forms.

'No narrator' is the most probable specification for *ne mogli* in (11). It is semantically based on the relation $TO \not\subseteq TU$ and triggered by world knowledge. Being a mere stereotype, the proposition expressed (women cannot drive) does not necessarily have to be anchored to some specific narrator. Anchoring to a specific narrator is not precluded, of course, but in this specific example, the context strongly supports the 'no narrator' interpretation: (11) relates to a video clip showing a highly sophisticated way of parking a car – with a woman getting out of it. This 'no narrator' interpretation is also basic to the strong distancing of the narrator from this proposition, noted by native speakers:

(11) Кой каза, че жените *не могли* да карат? (http://vbox7.com/play: 5f196108, 4.11.2012)

The 'no narrator' specification can also be triggered by knowledge about the genre. A characteristic case in point are fairy tales, cf. (12), which are regarded as prototypical contexts for the usage of –aux forms. If the genre-specific –aux forms were replaced by other forms, e.g. aorists, the "legendary overtones" and the "fairytale atmosphere" would get lost (Čakărova 2004).

(12) *Имало* едно бедно момче, сираче. Родителите му *оставили* само един железен топуз. Милостиви хора го *прибрали* и го *отгледали*. Но и те *били* бедни, едва се *прехранвали*. […] (*Motăk i tri samodivi*)

Neither (11) nor (12) are interpreted as quotative in the sense defined above. Rather, the –aux forms used indicate the 'non-actualisation' (cf. Čakărova 2004) of the events described. Crucially, this type of 'no narrator' is to be distinguished from instances, where the notion of 'narrator' and 'point of view' does not play a role at all, i.e. texts based on the aorist (cf. section 4.2).

Another possibility of specifying $TO \not\subseteq TU$ consists in the indication of some 'non-narrator'. Contrary to the above instances of 'no narrator', there is a narrator, even though s/he is not further specified. This is the case in (13), where the –aux forms indicate that the 'mechanisms of the accident' are reconstructed based on evidence:[6]

(13) Адвокатката на близките […] контрира: "Няма спор за механизма на катастрофата. Колата навлязла в насрещното движение, отишла на тротоара и помела шестимата. Автомобилът се обърнал по таван". (www.trud.bg, 5.11.2012)

Whereas (13) is based on indirect evidence, the +aux form *e karal* in (14) indicates – based on the inclusion of *TO* in *TU* – that the conclusion is drawn on the basis of available proofs. This is contextually supported by *dokazva*:

(14) Първата експертиза доказва, че Д.[7] *е карал*. (www.trud.bg, 5.11.2012)

The relation $TO \not\subseteq TU$ can also be specified as expressing the point of view of some character in the text. This is of special importance in reported speech, which is ambiguous as regards the anchoring of the embedded clause to the narrator or to the subject of the matrix clause. Using –aux forms excludes *TO* from *TU* and hence introduces a point of view different from the narrator's, more precisely: that of the matrix subject. In (15), this is the *seržant*:[8]

(15) Сержант Д. Х. *каза, че* инцидентът *станал* в 16,30 часа […]. Сержантът *уточни, че* Тайсън *нанесъл* удар на папарака, който *паднал* на земята и *си ударил* челото.
(www.standartnews.com, 12.11.09)

A quotative interpretation, i.e. the anchoring of $TO \not\subseteq TU$ with a character in the text, can be found in (16), which is an excerpt from an interview with the boxer Kubrat Pulev. Using the –aux forms, the interviewer indicates that he is reproducing what Pulev told him about his father:

(16) Родолюбието на Пулев е предадено от баща му, който *четял* много книги и *имал* тайници у дома, за да ги крие от доносниците. (http://www.dnevnik.bg, 5.11.2012)

---

[6] Note that being introduced by *njama spor*, this example also contradicts the assumption of a necessary relation between indirect evidence and restricted or diminished reliability (cf. footnote 3).

[7] If personal names of non-public interest are given in full in the original, they are rendered here with their initials only.

[8] In this way, –aux forms also serve to disambiguate the de re / de dicto ambiguity typical of reported speech (cf. Sonnenhauser 2011).

By their viewpoint-inducing semantic basis, –aux forms also contribute to the perspectival structuring of texts. The aorist (and imperfect) forms in (17) describe a sequence of events. Then Baba Jova is introduced as a character in the text, telling about Djado Matejko's last hours. The subsequent –aux forms indicate a non-narrator's point of view, which is ascribed to Baba Jova. The auxiliary variation thereby serves to differentiate the plane of the narrator from the plane of the character:

(17) Когато се *разнесе* из село новината, че дядо Матейка починал – никой не *повярва*, защото той *обичаше* да се шегува, па и по-напред такова нещо с него не бе се случвало. Ала когато баба Йова *разправи* за последния му час, всички се *увериха*, че тоя път той не се шегува. *Върнал* се човекът от дърва, *разтовари* магаренцето си, *вързал* го, *турнал* му сенце и щом *влязал* в къщи, та *приседнал* край огъня и *запалил* лулата си, нещо го *прерязало* през половината, той *легнал*, *заохкал* и ... (Elin Pelin, *Na onja svjat*)

Furthermore, the function of foregrounding the narration and backgrounding the narrator, pointed out by Fielder (1995, 1999), can be related to this semantic basis. This helps to account for a very typical pattern of a specific type of news reports. The aorist *narpravi* in (18) introduces the main event and locates it on the temporal axis. In what follows, a series of –aux forms describes in detail the events that (must) have lead to this main event; by excluding *TO* from *TU*, the narration is foregrounded. The two present tense forms at the end of this passage constitute a kind of frame to *napravi* at the beginning, serving to anchor the main sequence of events related to the actual accident and its consequences.

(18)=(1)В петък сутринта на главен път Е-79 лек автомобил „Фолксваген Голф" <u>направи</u> каскада, за щастие без сериозно пострадали. 35-годишният санданчанин Д.С. *пътувал* към ГКПП-Кулата. *Навлязъл* с колата си в лентата за насрещно движение, возилото *се завъртяло*, *излязло* от шосето и се *преобърнало*. Шофьорът и 2-годишното му дете <u>са прегледани</u> във ФСМП-Сандански и <u>са освободени</u>, тъй като нямали наранявания.
Пробата с техническо средство за алкохол <u>е отрицателна</u>.
(www.standartnew.com, 3.11.2012)

In the next section it will be shown that the preference of certain genres and text types for the usage of ±aux forms can also be related to their viewpoint inducing semantics.

4.2 Narrative instances and text types
As has been pointed out above, the interpretation and usage of –aux forms partly depends on and is characteristic of certain genres and registers. This has already been pointed out, e.g. by Fielder (2001: 190f), Čakărova (2004) and Nicolova (2008: 385-392), with 'genre' being defined primarily in terms of

content and function. A structural differentiation of texts is possible in terms of text types,[9] which can be classified, among others, by the role of the narrator. Based on this criterion, Schmid (2008: 10) distinguishes narrative texts telling a story from non-narrative texts describing some state of affairs. Narrative texts can be further divided into those that exhibit a narrative instance ('narrating texts') and those that do not have such an instance ('mimetic texts'). Possible narrative instances are the narrator and some character in the text. These text types can be defined in linguistic terms, relying on the semantics of the *l*-forms and their differences to aorist and present tense.[10] Crucial in this respect is also the fact that these forms take different 'objects of reference' (cf. also Sonnenhauser 2012).

On the text level the relation of *TO* and *TU* may be interpreted in terms of the introduction of specific narrative instances and their distanced relation to the presented event(s). Thereby, *l*-forms have the narration as their object of reference (cf. also Fielder 1995), and hence, they are characteristic of narrative texts. Texts based on the aorist do not define a specific narrative instance; they serve the presentation of events and are thus instances of the mimetic text type. Descriptive texts, too, lack a narrative instance, but contrary to mimetic texts they describe states of affairs.

The correlation of text type, verbal form and 'object of reference' (state of affairs, event, and narration) is summarized in table 4:

Table 4

	text type		
	descriptive	mimetic	narrative
form	present, imperfect	aorist	*l-forms*
semantics	$TO \subseteq TT \subseteq TU$ $TO \subseteq TT < TU$	$TT < TU$	$TO \subseteq TT \ \& \ TO \not\subseteq TU$ (-aux) $TO \subseteq TT \ \& \ TO \subseteq TU$ (+aux)
object	state of affairs	event	narration

---

[9] This is based on Lee (2001), who distinguishes genre as being determined by external criteria (such as intended recipients, underlying intentions) from text types as being determined on the basis of internal, linguistic criteria. Text types may comprise different genres, i.e. „two texts may belong to the same text type […] even though they may come from two different genres because they have some similarities in linguistic form" (2001: 39).

[10] This is closely related to – but not identical with – approaches dealing with narrative systems, i.e. the interaction of specific aspecto-temporal forms for the expression of anteriority, simultaneity and posteriority (e.g. Marovska 2005: 102). The first to distinguish and describe narrative systems was Mutafčiev (1964), who separates the visual narrative (based on the historical present) from the reminiscing narrative (based on the aorist).

124

The following examples serve to illustrate this correlation.

Descriptive and mimetic texts are both characterized by the lack of coding a narrative instance. They differ in their objects of reference. Descriptive texts describe a state of affairs, cf. the description of the *Pametnik na svobodata* in Ruse (19):

(19) Символът на Русе *е проектиран* в началото на XX век от италианския скулптор Арнолдо Цоки. По ирония на съдбата „бащата" на идеята за монумента *е* от съседна на голия австриец държава. С течение на времето паметникът *е придобил* значение като една от емблемите на града и *е част* от герба му.

Композицията *е пирамидална*. Статуята на върха *представлява* фигура на жена, която *държи* меч в лявата си ръка, [...] (http://standartnews. com, 4.11.2012)

Mimetic texts present events, as is the case in (20), which gives a short summary of the latest events of a tennis tournament:

(20) Водачът в световната ранглиста Новак Джокович и олимпийският шампион Анди Мъри *се класираха* за полуфиналите във финалния турнир от сериите „Мастърс" в Лондон. Сърбинът *спечели* и трите си мача в групата, докато любимецът на домакините *победи* с 6:2, 7:6 (3) Жо-Вилфред Цонга.

В първия мач за деня Джокович *затвърди* предимството си и се наложи с 6:2, 7:6 (6) срещу Томаш Бердих. Сърбинът *имаше* превъзходство и с успеха си *заслужи* първото място в групата.

Мъри *не допусна* изненада срещу Цонга. Шотландецът *спечели* със 7:3 тайбрека във втория сет и след 97 минути игра *взе* втората си победа в надпреварата, с което заслужи и второто място. (www.dnevnik.bg, 10.11.2012)

In (19) and (20), the narrator is excluded by using forms that do not refer to a point of view since for their semantics the relation *TO–TU* does not play a role.

Another possibility to exclude the narrator is by using forms which may make the lack of a narrative instance explicit – by their coding of the relation *TO ⊄ TU*, cf. (11) and (12) above. Since in this latter case the lack of a narrative instance is made explicit, these are to be classified as narrative texts. The specification of the narrative instance as 'no narrator' is basic to the 'non actualized' character of the events presented. Above it has been shown that this is typical of fairy tales. Such uses can be found also in genres other than fairy tales. In his novel *Tri istorii za provala*, Vasil Georgiev uses exclusively –aux forms (except for a short introduction) and thereby achieves the effect of

non-actualization and 'legendary overtones', supporting the absurdness of the story told:

(21) Всички знаят тази история, в която Лора интервюира по телефона министър Божидар Димитров, а той каза онова за шибания народ. […]
Горе-долу подобни глупости ги *ръсил* министърът в интервюто, но все пак то *вървяло* в рамките на приличната естетика на любезния разговор. Поводът *бил*, че на остров Свети Иван […] екип от археолози *открил* малък мраморен саркофаг с кокали, които същият този екип *обявил* за мощите на Свети Йоан Предтеча – братовчед и кръстник на нашия Спасител и Господ Иисус Христос. (Vasil Georgiev, *Tri istorii za provala*)

The importance of the influence of genre and text type on the interpretation of the forms in question can be seen from the fact that sequences of –aux forms do not have to be interpreted as 'non actualized'. The –aux forms in (22) are interpreted as anchoring the reference to the narrated events not to the narrator, but to some non-narrator, which is introduced by *razpravjacha*. Note again the clear distinction of the narrator's plane (the aorist forms) and the character's plane (the –aux forms):

(22) Както казва приятелката ни Люба Кирова […] знаем се от три-четвърти чорапи. В музикалната гимназия бяхме в една паралелка. Двете свирехме на пиано, а той – на кларинет. *Разправяха*, че като *се родили*, Тони *била* шишкаво бебе, докато Сашо едва *дишал* от слабост, демек, тя го *подяждала* в утробата. […]
(Olga Šurbanova, *Vkus na Mocart*)

Aorist forms are used to introduce and present events as matter of fact and to locate them on the temporal axis, whereas –aux forms serve their elaboration, which can be seen in (23): *izbjaga* and *napadna* at the beginning and *objasnjava* at the end constitute the main story line, the *l*-forms in-between give the details of the attack:

(23) Огромен ротвайлер <u>избяга</u> от стопанина си и <u>нападна</u> деца близо до СОУ "Черноризец Храбър" във Велики Преслав. Ужасяващата случка *се разиграла* към 7,20 часа във вторник сутринта, когато към школото *отивали* децата от началния курс.
Ротвайлерът *нападнал* четирима малчугани на 8, 9 и 12 г.. Първоначално ги *закачал, подтичвал* след тях сякаш *искал* да си играе, но изведнъж *станал* адски настъпателен.
Силното куче, тежко поне 80 кг., *повалило* на земята 8-годишната Антоанета. Куче и дете *започнали* да се търкалят по прашната поляна близо до училището. Хора, които *станали* свидетели, *започнали* да мятат камъ-

ни, за да я спасят. Никой обаче *не смеел* да излезе срещу ротвайлера и да го доближи. […]

„Тогава реших да форсирам колата и да го уплаша. Кучето наистина се спря, пусна детето, но после пак го настигна до една ограда и се нахвърли върху него. Сякаш искаше да си играе, но беше страшно", <u>обяснява</u> спасителят.

(http://www.trud.bg, 7.11.12)

The pattern in (23), as well as that in (18) above, proves typical of such kind of texts in the yellow press. This suggests one possible answer to the question raised above on the function of –aux forms in these kinds of texts: by the narrative potential of the –aux forms provided by the relation *TO–TU* and the accompanying introduction of different points of view, events are narrated and not simply presented in an 'objective', narrator-excluding, way as do aorist forms, cf. (20) above. The negative assessments of the usage of –aux forms in these texts may be explained by the clash between the expectations on the genre 'journalistic texts' and the text type 'narrative text'. This impression is further substantiated by the fact that the relation $TO \not\subseteq TU$ is not specified in terms of some character's perspective, but the point of view is left open – it is simply not the narrator's.[11]

5. To conclude

This paper has proposed to analyze the Bulgarian *l*-forms in terms of coding a point of view, which is specified by the usage or omission of the 3rd person auxiliary. The various interpretations of these forms, such as 'non-actualized', 'conclusive', 'inferential', 'quotative', etc., arise from the interaction of the relation between two basic points of view, that of narrator and non-narrator, and contextual triggers. Furthermore, the viewpoint coding semantics has been shown to underlie also the usage patterns of these forms on the text level, which might otherwise appear arbitrary to a certain degree. The analysis elaborated in this paper thus suggests that questions of 'renarrative' or not, of 'perfect', 'renarrative' or 'conclusive', and on the specific type of evidentiality might be better discussed at the interface of semantics and (discourse-)pragmatics, than in strictly paradigmatic terms.

---

[11] Note that –aux forms appearing in journalistic texts of the mimetic type are not judged as diminishing the quality of the text. This can be related to the fact that in these cases, the relation TO $\not\subseteq$ TU is specified as one of the character's perspective and can be interpreted as quotatives, as in the following example, where the –aux forms are anchored to the Meždunarodna federacija po šachmat:

(i) България официално подаде кандидатурата си за домакин, но не е единственият кандидат. Миналия четвъртък в официалния си сайт Международната федерация по шахмат (FIDE) потвърди, че са получени три предложения – от България, Турция и Сингапур. Проблемът бил, че нито една от офертите не отговаряла на «задължителното условие» да бъдат представени банкови гаранции и затова срокът беше удължен до 15 октомври […] (http://www.capital.bg, 10.11.2009)

References

Alexander 2001: A l e x a n d e r, R. Bridging the descriptive chasm: the Bulgarian 'generalized past'. Friedman, V. A. & D. L. Dyer (eds.). *Of all the Slavs my favorites: in honor of Howard I. Aronson*. Indiana, 2001, 13–42.

Bojadžiev 1999: B o j a d ž i e v, T. et al. *Săvremenen bălgarski ezik. Fonetika. Leksikologija. Slovoobrazuvane. Morfologija. Sintaksis*. Sofija, 1999.

Čakărova 2004: Č a k ă r o v a, K. *On the question of narrative variation in Bulgarian prose.* (http://www.belb.net/personal/chakyrova/Prehodi_engl.htm, 17.8.2011).

Chvany 1988: C h v a n y, C. V. Distance, deixis and discreteness in Bulgarian and English verb morphology. Schenker, A. (ed.). *American contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus, 1988, 69–90.

Civ'jan 2005: C i v ' j a n, T. V. *Lingvističeskie osnovy balkanskoj modeli mira*. Moskva, 2005.

de Haan 1999: d e H a a n, F. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: setting boundaries. –*Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18, 1999, 83–101.

de Haan 2001: d e H a a n, F. The place of inference within the evidential system. – *International Journal of American Linguistics* 67/2, 2001, 193–219.

de Haan 2005: d e H a a n, F. Encoding speaker perspective: evidentials. – In: Frajzyngier, Z., A. Hodges, D. Rood (eds.). *Linguistic diversity and language theories*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2005, 379–397.

Desclés, Guibert 2001: D e s c l é s, J . - P ., G. Guibert. *Le dialogue, fonction première du langage. Analyse ènonciative de textes*. Paris, 2001.

Elin Pelin 1995: E l i n P e l i n, Na onja svjat. *Razkazi. Geracite* [Malka učeničeska biblioteka]. Veliko Tărnovo, 1995, 77–81.

Fielder 1995: F i e l d e r, G. Narrative perspective and the Bulgarian *l*-participle. – *The Slavic and East European Journal* 39/4, 1995, 585–600.

Fielder 1999. F i e l d e r, G. The origin of evidentiality in the Balkans: linguistic convergence or conceptual convergence? – *Mediterranean Language Review* 11, 1999, 59–89

Fielder 2001: F i e l d e r, G. Questioning the dominant paradigm: an alternative view of the grammaticalization of the Bulgarian evidential. – In: Friedman, V. A., D. L. Dyer (eds.). *Of all the Slavs my favourites: in honor of Howard I. Aronson*, 2001, 171–201.

Friedman 1982: F r i e d m a n, V. Reportedness in Bulgarian: category or stylistic variant? – In: Naylor, K. et al. (eds.). *Slavic linguistics and poeticsю* Bloomington, 1982, 149–163

Friedman 1986: F r i e d m a n, V. Evidentiality in the Balkans: Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Albanian. – In: Nichols, N., W. Chafe (eds.). *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, 1986, 168–187.

Friedman 2001: F r i e d m a n, V. Hunting the elusive evidential: the third-person auxiliary as a boojum in Bulgarian. – In: Friedman, V. A., D. L. Dyer (eds.). *Of all the Slavs my favorites: in honor of Howard I. Aronson*, 2001, 203–230

Gerdžikov 1982: G e r d ž i k o v, G. Tăj narečeneto preizkazvane i văprosăt z modalnite kategorii, koito glagolăt može da pritežava. – *Săpostavitelno ezikoznanie* 7/4, 21–38

Gévaudan 2008: G é v a u d a n, P. Das kleine Einmaleins der linguistischen Polyphonie. – *Philologie im Netz* 43, 1–10

Guentchéva, Desclés 1982: G u e n t c h é v a, Z., J . - P . D e s c l é s. A la recherché d'une valeur fondamentale du parfait bulgare. – *Săpostavitelno ezikoznanie* № 1–2, 1982, 44–56.

Ivančev 1988: I v a n č e v, S. Minalite razkazvatelni sistemi v bǎlgarskija ezik. – In: Ivančev, S. *Bǎlgarskijat ezik – klasičeski i ekzotičen*. Sofija, 1988, 121–128.

Izvorski 1997: I z v o r s k i, R. The present perfect as epistemic modal. – In: Lawson, A. (ed.). *SALT VII*. Ithaca, 1997, 222–239.

Jakobson 1971; J a k o b s o n, R. Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. – *Selected Writings, Vol. II*. The Hague, 1971, 130–147

Klein 1995: K l e i n, W. A time-relational analysis of Russian aspect. – *Language* 71/4, 1995, 669–695.

Lee 2001: L e e, D. Genres, registers, text types, domains and styles: clarifying the concepts and navigating a path through the BNC jungle. – *Language Learning & Technology* 5/3.3, 37–72.

Levin-Steinmann 1999: L e v i n - S t e i n m a n n, A. Der bulgarische Renarrativ und der Mythos von der selbständigen Kategorie. Tošović, B. (ed.). – In: *Die grammatischen Korrelationen*. Graz, 1999, 151–164

Levin-Steinmann 2004: L e v i n - S t e i n m a n n, A. *Die Legende vom bulgarischen Renarrativ*. München, 2004.

Lindstedt 1994. L i n d s t e d t, J. On the development of the South Slavonic perfect. – In: *Three papers on the perfect (EUROTYP Working Papers, VI)* (5), 1994, 32–53

Lindstedt 2000: L i n d s t e d t, J. The perfect – aspectual, temporal and evidential. Dahl, Ö. (ed.). – In: *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin–New York, 2000, 365–383

Marovska 2005: M a r o v s k a, V. *Novobǎlgarskijat perfekt*. Sofija, 2005.

Momǎk i tri samodivi (http://slovo.bg/showwork.php3?AuID=16&WorkID=436&Level=1, 6.11.2012)

Mutafčiev 1964: M u t a f č i e v, R. *Segašno istoričesko vreme v sǎvremennija bǎlgarski ezik*. Sofija, 1964.

Nicolova 1993: N i c o l o v a, R. Kognitivni sǎstojanija na govoreštija, epistemična modalnost i temporalnost. – *Sǎpostavitelno ezikoznanie* 28/3–4, 137–144.

Nicolova 2008: N i c o l o v a, R. *Bǎlgarska gramatika. Morfologija*. Sofija, 2008.

Padučeva 1996: P a d u č e v a, E. V. *Semantičeskie issledovanija*. Moskva, 1996.

Plungjan 2001: P l u n g j a n, V. A. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. – *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 2001, 349–357

Roth 1979: R o t h, J. *Die indirekten Erlebnisformen im Bulgarischen. Eine Untersuchung zu ihrem Gebrauch in der Umgangssprache*. München, 1979.

Schmid 2008: S c h m i d, W. *Elemente der Narratologie*. Berlin, New York, 2008.

Sonnenhauser 2011: S o n n e n h a u s e r, B. 'Renarrativ' und indirekte Rede im Bulgarischen. – *Die Welt der Slaven* 56/1, 2011, 131–154

Sonnenhauser 2012: S o n n e n h a u s e r, B. Auxiliar-Variation und Textstruktur im Bulgarischen. – *Die Welt der Slaven* 57/2, 2012, 351–379

Šurbanova 2002: Š u r b a n o v a, O. *Vkus na Mocart*. 2002. (http://slovo.bg/showwork.php3?AuID=322&WorkID=11676&Level=2, 20.10.12)

Wiemer, Kampf: W i e m e r, B., V. K a m p f. To appear. On conditions instantiating tip effects of epistemic and evidential meanings in Bulgarian. – *Slovene*.

Zambova 2000: Z a m b o v a, A. *Manipulativni ezikovi strategii v pečata*. Sofija, 2000.

Евиденциалност и гледна точка в българския език

Барбара Зоненхаузер (Мюнхен)

Статията разглежда евиденциалността в български, като се фокусира върху разликата между еловите прости форми със или без спомагателен глагол в 3-то лице. Появата или изпускането на спомагателния глагол се разглеждат като решаващи за евиденциалната семантика на тези форми, тъй като те кодират гледната точка за представяне на събитието. Това може да бъде гледната точка на „разказвач" или „не-разказвач". Спецификацията „не-разказвач" се задейства от контекстуални фактори и фактори като разпознаването на жанра и на типа текст. Като се отчита взаимодействието на семантични и дискурсивни фактори, може да се опише обхватът на интерпретациите на еловите форми, както и техните текстообразуващи и наративни функции.

e-mail:basonne@lmu.de