

## Съпоставително езикознание

2013 (XXXVIII), № 2–3

### Съдържание

Красимира АЛЕКСОВА (София) – Съвременни гледни точки за евиденциалността и за преизказването в българския език // 5

Иван КУЦАРОВ (Пловдив) – Преизказването // 17

**Summary/Abstract:** The article offers an overview of the research into the complex of the Bulgarian perfectoid forms (renarrative, conclusive, admirative, dubitative) with a special emphasis on renarration. It traces the history of the problem (especially its earlier stages) and the competition of ideas aiming at the explanation of the linguistic facts. The origin of each approach is pointed out as well as its subsequent development. This presentation is naturally influenced by the author's own position on the problems discussed, without claiming to offer the ultimate solution. Problems of terminology are also focused on. One of the reasons to include a relatively rich bibliography is to draw the attention of researchers at home and abroad to the numerous publications referred to.

Руселина НИЦОЛОВА (София) – Перфект и свързанна с ним граматическа категория евиденциалности в българском языке // 50

**Summary/Abstract:** The article focuses on the issue of which semantic properties of the perfect in the indicative in Bulgarian enhance its further grammaticalization into a novel grammatical subsystem – evidentiality. A brief review is presented of the semantic load of the different types of evidential – conclusive, renarrative and dubitative, which can be deduced from the presuppositions of statements. Such presuppositions are preserved intact in the affirmative and negative forms of the statements, while in interrogatives the presuppositions are chosen by speaker in accordance with the presumed listener's cognitive state in relation to the source of information and not with the speaker's own. The place of the perfect in the temporal system of Bulgarian is discussed in a wider Reichenbachian framework. Also debated is the issue of the movement of the reference interval of the perfect in the past or in the future in relation to the pragmatic phenomenon of empathy or point of view. The basic semantic variability of the perfect in Bulgarian is described, including resultative perfect with its variant perfect of statement without an auxiliary in the 3rd p., the existential, the inferential perfect, and the perfect of hot news. The types of perfect that have given rise to the respective evidential are also specified.

Красимира АЛЕКСОВА (София) – Българският адмиратив в типологическата класификация на езиците, притежаващи евиденциална глаголна категория // 68

**Summary/Abstract:** The main purpose of the present paper is to pinpoint the place of the Bulgarian admirative in the typological classification of languages with evidentiality systems which have admirative use. The semantics of the admirative, a surprising conclusion about an unexpected fact ('D, but I did not expect D'), invites the hypothesis that the Bulgarian admirative is one of the expressive uses of the conclusive (inferential) evidential but not a transposition of the renarrative evidential. The recognition of two types of evidentiality systems attested worldwide: i. evidentiality systems with two subcategories (non-first hand : firsthand information; non-eyewitness : eyewitness etc.) and ii. evidentiality systems with many subsystems which grammatically encode more details about the information source (three, four or more subcategories), proves the hypothesis that the admirative is related with the inferential evidential but not with the reported (or hearsay) one.

Zlatka GUENTCHÉVA-DECLÉS (Paris) – Médiativité ou 'evidentiality'? Alternance de référentiels temporels dans la narration en bulgare // 83

**Summary/Abstract:** This article deals with the much debated questions on the semantics of Modern Bulgarian verbal forms of the type чел/четял referred to as

“reported”, “renarrated”, “mediative” or “evidential”, and чел е /четял е referred to as “conclusive”, or “inferential”. Without going into the controversy concerning the place of these perfect-like forms in the grammatical system of the contemporary Bulgarian language, our intention is to show that the presence or the omission of the third person auxiliary is a phenomenon associated with the establishment of a point-of-view relation between the speaker (enunciator) and the message he presents. The first part of the paper deals with some theoretical and epistemological issues („опосредственоост” and „evidentiality”) and introduces the basic operational concepts. Using the framework of the Theory of enunciation (Theorie de l’enonciation), whose key parameters are the enunciator (Ego) and his spatio-temporal coordinates hic and nunc, we show that the notion “temporal frame of reference” also plays a crucial role for the localization of the verbalized situations according to the enunciator’s stance towards them. In the second part of the paper, special attention is paid to the alternation between different „temporal frames of reference”. We show that this alternation is a narrative strategy which opposes situations presented by the enunciator as non-actualized, e.g., in mythical, historical or fictional times (the forms чел/четял) and situations presented by the speaker as resulting from abductive reasoning (the forms чел е / четял е).

### Barbara SONNENHAUSER (Münich) – ‘Evidentiality’ and point of view in Bulgarian // 110

**Summary/Abstract:** The present paper is concerned with ‘evidentiality’ in Bulgarian, focusing on the difference between the simple ‘I-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 I-forms can be accounted for, as well as their text structuring and narrative functions.

### Uli SAUERLAND (Harvard–Berlin), Mathias SCHENNER (Berlin) – On embedding and evidentiality in Bulgarian // 131

**Summary/Abstract:** The interpretation of evidentials in Bulgarian has to our knowledge only been investigated for unembedded occurrences just like in a number of other languages. In this paper, we show that evidentials can be embedded in the complement of a range of propositional attitude verbs in Bulgarian. We show that evidentials behave differently from modals when embedded in Bulgarian, and develop a presuppositional account of evidentials. We argue that embedded occurrences provide important evidence for distinguishing different theories of evidentiality.

### Björn WIEMER (Mainz), Veronika KAMPF (Mainz) – Gesten und Mimik als semiotische Substitute für Sprechakte oder umgekehrt? Zur speziellen Verwendung einiger Reformulierungsmarker im Bulgarischen // 153

**Summary/Abstract:** The article aims to give an overview of lexical units used in contemporary Bulgarian for making reference to non-verbal actions with a semiotical interpretation, cf. Russ. „xenomarkers” like deskat’ and mol or Engl. „new quotatives”, e.g. like. Similarly to the reportive markers these units have their scope over the whole proposition, but instead of facts they concern the (re)interpretation of texts (discourse fragments), including fictive ones, merely presumed or attributed consciously to somebody by the speaker. The units in question have expanded into this functional domain mainly from the domain of reformulation; compare, for instance, demek, sankim, sireč, edin vid, v smisäl, v stil or marginally from the domain of „dialogical quotation” (Arutjunova), e.g. vidite li, vižte me.

### Сергей С. СКОРВИД (Москва) – О некоторых морфосинтаксических средствах передачи сообщения с чужих слов в славянских языках центральноевропейского ареала в сравнении с немецким // 192

**Summary/Abstract:** The author of the paper analyses morphosyntactic means of expressing hearsay in several languages belonging to the Central European area. This includes constructions with the modal verb *sollen* in German, as well as, on the one hand, its functional equivalents with primarily possessive meaning in Czech, Slovak, Polish, Upper and Lower Sorbian, and, on the other hand, constructions of the incentive particle with the forms of the subjunctive mood in Slovene. It is shown that those constructions, despite their different origins, display essential correspondence in their usage; this may be regarded as one of the characteristic features of the Central European language affinity.

### Anastasia SMIRNOVA (Medford) – The meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials // 205

**Summary/Abstract:** This paper discusses the meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials. I argue that evidential forms in these languages have a rich semantic content: they encode the source of information, epistemic modality, and temporality. Ultimately, I show that the meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials is not reducible to the meaning of perfect forms, from which the evidential forms are historically derived, and argue that evidentiality in Bulgarian and Turkish should be recognized as an independent category in its own right.

### Максим М. МАКАРЦЕВ (Москва) – Съобщенията за Русия в българския печат от втората половина на XX век (към въпроса за използването на евиденциалността) // 224

**Summary/Abstract:** The article is dedicated to changes in strategies of using unwitnessed evidentials in Bulgarian Communist Party official newspaper "Rabotničsko delo" (renamed as "Duma" on March, 4th, 1990). The main idea is that the socio-political changes deeply influenced the usage of unwitnessed evidential forms. While before the Soviet perestrojka and "the changes" in Bulgaria the Soviet sources were referred to as objective par excellence and the forms used in the news based on them almost exclusively were witnessed evidentials, in 1988- 1990 intervention of unwitnessed evidentials (both with and without auxiliary) into them becomes obvious. The breaking point in this process is August 1991 when unwitnessed evidentials become default forms in the news from the USSR, though not for a long time.

### Мария КИТОВА-ВАСИЛЕВА (София) – Граматични средства за изразяване на несвидетелски съждения в съвременния испански език // 238

**Summary/Abstract:** The study aims at proving that some Indo-European languages that do not realize the category evidentialis / testimonialis are capable of developing morphological devices specialized at expressing problematic (probable or possible) judgments that can parallelly express 'untestimony' as well. These structures pertain to the verbal system of the Spanish language. They are presented: a) by several lines of paraphrases formed by modal verbs of obligation + simple or perfect infinitive and b) by the four future tenses of the indicative. The latter function as 'biparticipants': they fall in different paradigms and take different positions in the verb system. The structures realize themselves in the so called "relative reliability" – a modal logical-evaluation subcategory, different from mood – an intermediate zone set in the middle of the virtual modal axes, around whose two poles the forms of the two basic 239 Spanish moods are set: the mood of the objective reality (indicative) and the mood of the subjectively perceived reality or unreality (subjunctive). The probable and possible structures enter the frames of two functional semantic fields, where the forms of the two subjective epistemic statuses are placed, characterized by a complex double nucleus and gradual (overflowing) nature – a single subjective probable epistemic status as well as the double subjective possible epistemic status.

### Victor A. FRIEDMAN (Chicago) – The use of *li* as a marker of evidential strategy in Romani // 253

**Summary/Abstract:** The use of the Slavic interrogative particle *li* in the Kriva Palanka Arli dialect of Romani to mark dubitativity in declarative sentences suggests that the use of *li* as a general evidential strategy in the Sliven dialect of Romani observed by Kostov and by Iгла also has its origins in the semantic reinterpretation of the interrogative particle. This conclusion is supported by the use of the Turkish interrogative particle *mi* in the Barutči Arli Romani dialect of Skopje in exactly the same context as the Kriva Palanka Arli Romani use of *li*. It is also supported

typologically by the expressive use of *li* in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian/Montenegrin and the use of the interrogative negative optative to express surprise in Turkic languages. This in turn suggests a connection between interrogation and evidentiality that can arise in contact situations.

### Eleonora YOVKOVA-SHII (Tokyo) – Evidentiality in Bulgarian and Japanese // 262

**Summary/Abstract:** This paper deals with the problem of evidentiality in Bulgarian and Japanese. Bulgarian and Japanese are typologically different languages but both possess means to express evidentiality. The paper examines the evidential systems of the two languages within the framework of the following conceptual problems: 1) the definition of the semantic domain of evidentiality, 2) the classification of the evidential values, 3) the grammatical status of evidentiality, i.e. is evidentiality a genuine grammatical category or not, 4) the relationship of evidentiality and modality, 5) the relationship of evidentiality and some other semantic categories like (ad)mirativity.

## Содержание

### Красимира АЛЕКСОВА (София) – Современные взгляды об эвиденциальности и пересказывании в болгарском языке // 5

### Иван КУЦАРОВ (Пловдив) – Пересказывание // 17

**Summary/Abstract:** The article offers an overview of the research into the complex of the Bulgarian perfectoid forms (renarrative, conclusive, admirative, dubitative) with a special emphasis on renarration. It traces the history of the problem (especially its earlier stages) and the competition of ideas aiming at the explanation of the linguistic facts. The origin of each approach is pointed out as well as its subsequent development. This presentation is naturally influenced by the author's own position on the problems discussed, without claiming to offer the ultimate solution. Problems of terminology are also focused on. One of the reasons to include a relatively rich bibliography is to draw the attention of researchers at home and abroad to the numerous publications referred to.

### Руселина НИЦОЛОВА (София) – Перфект и связанная с ним грамматическая категория эвиденциальности в болгарском языке // 50

**Summary/Abstract:** The article focuses on the issue of which semantic properties of the perfect in the indicative in Bulgarian enhance its further grammaticalization into a novel grammatical subsystem – evidentiality. A brief review is presented of the semantic load of the different types of evidential – conclusive, renarrative and dubitative, which can be deduced from the presuppositions of statements. Such presuppositions are preserved intact in the affirmative and negative forms of the statements, while in interrogatives the presuppositions are chosen by speaker in accordance with the presumed listener's cognitive state in relation to the source of information and not with the speaker's own. The place of the perfect in the temporal system of Bulgarian is discussed in a wider Reichenbachian framework. Also debated is the issue of the movement of the reference interval of the perfect in the past or in the future in relation to the pragmatic phenomenon of empathy or point of view. The basic semantic variability of the perfect in Bulgarian is described, including resultative perfect with its variant perfect of statement without an auxiliary in the 3rd p., the existential, the inferential perfect, and the perfect of hot news. The types of perfect that have given rise to the respective evidential are also specified.

### Красимира АЛЕКСОВА (София) – Болгарский адмиратив в типологической классификации языков, обладающих эвиденциальной глагольной категорией // 68

**Summary/Abstract:** The main purpose of the present paper is to pinpoint the place of the Bulgarian admirative in the typological classification of languages with evidentiality systems which have admirative use. The semantics of the admirative, a surprising conclusion about an unexpected fact ('D, but I did not expect D'), invites the hypothesis that the Bulgarian admirative is one of the expressive uses of the conclusive (inferential) evidential but not a transposition of the renarrative

evidential. The recognition of two types of evidentiality systems attested worldwide: i. evidentiality systems with two subcategories (non-first hand : firsthand information; non-eyewitness : eyewitness etc.) and ii. evidentiality systems with many subsystems which grammatically encode more details about the information source (three, four or more subcategories), proves the hypothesis that the admirative is related with the inferential evidential but not with the reported (or hearsay) one.

### Zlatka GUENTCHÉVA-DECLÉS (Paris) – Médiativité ou ‘evidentiality’? Alternance de référentiels temporels dans la narration en bulgare // 83

**Summary/Abstract:** This article deals with the much debated questions on the semantics of Modern Bulgarian verbal forms of the type *чел/четял* referred to as “reported”, “renarrated”, “mediative” or “evidential”, and *чел е /четял е* referred to as “conclusive” , or “inferential”. Without going into the controversy concerning the place of these perfect-like forms in the grammatical system of the contemporary Bulgarian language, our intention is to show that the presence or the omission of the third person auxiliary is a phenomenon associated with the establishment of a point-of-view relation between the speaker (enunciator) and the message he presents. The first part of the paper deals with some theoretical and epistemological issues („опосредственоост” and „evidentiality”) and introduces the basic operational concepts. Using the framework of the Theory of enunciation (Theorie de l’enonciation), whose key parameters are the enunciator (Ego) and his spatio-temporal coordinates *hic* and *nunc*, we show that the notion “temporal frame of reference” also plays a crucial role for the localization of the verbalized situations according to the enunciator’s stance towards them. In the second part of the paper, special attention is paid to the alternation between different „temporal frames of reference”. We show that this alternation is a narrative strategy which opposes situations presented by the enunciator as non-actualized, e.g., in mythical, historical or fictional times (the forms *чел/четял*) and situations presented by the speaker as resulting from abductive reasoning (the forms *чел е / четял е*).

### Barbara SONNENHAUSER (Münich) – ‘Evidentiality’ and point of view in Bulgarian // 110

**Summary/Abstract:** 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.

### Uli SAUERLAND (Harvard–Berlin), Mathias Schenner (Berlin) – On embedding and evidentiality in Bulgarian // 131

**Summary/Abstract:** The interpretation of evidentials in Bulgarian has to our knowledge only been investigated for unembedded occurrences just like in a number of other languages. In this paper, we show that evidentials can be embedded in the complement of a range of propositional attitude verbs in Bulgarian. We show that evidentials behave differently from modals when embedded in Bulgarian, and develop a presuppositional account of evidentials. We argue that embedded occurrences provide important evidence for distinguishing different theories of evidentiality.

### Björn WIEMER (Mainz), Veronika KAMPF (Mainz) – Gesten und Mimik als semiotische Substitute für Sprechakte oder umgekehrt? Zur speziellen Verwendung einiger Reformulierungsmarker im Bulgarischen // 153

**Summary/Abstract:** The article aims to give an overview of lexical units used in contemporary Bulgarian for making reference to non-verbal actions with a semiotical interpretation, cf. Russ. „xenomarkers” like *deskat’* and *mol* or Engl. „new quotatives”, e.g. like. Similarly to the reportive markers these units have their

scope over the whole proposition, but instead of facts they concern the (re)interpretation of texts (discourse fragments), including fictive ones, merely presumed or attributed consciously to somebody by the speaker. The units in question have expanded into this functional domain mainly from the domain of reformulation; compare, for instance, demek, sankim, sireč, edin vid, v smisāl, v stil or marginally from the domain of „dialogical quotation“ (Arutjunova), e.g. vidite li, vižte me.

### Сергей С. СКОРВИД (Москва) – О некоторых морфосинтаксических средствах передачи сообщения с чужих слов в славянских языках центральноевропейского ареала в сравнении с немецким // 192

**Summary/Abstract:** The author of the paper analyses morphosyntactic means of expressing hearsay in several languages belonging to the Central European area. This includes constructions with the modal verb *sollen* in German, as well as, on the one hand, its functional equivalents with primarily possessive meaning in Czech, Slovak, Polish, Upper and Lower Sorbian, and, on the other hand, constructions of the incentive particle with the forms of the subjunctive mood in Slovene. It is shown that those constructions, despite their different origins, display essential correspondence in their usage; this may be regarded as one of the characteristic features of the Central European language affinity.

### Anastasia SMIRNOVA (Medford) – The meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials // 205

**Summary/Abstract:** This paper discusses the meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials. I argue that evidential forms in these languages have a rich semantic content: they encode the source of information, epistemic modality, and temporality. Ultimately, I show that the meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials is not reducible to the meaning of perfect forms, from which the evidential forms are historically derived, and argue that evidentiality in Bulgarian and Turkish should be recognized as an independent category in its own right.

### Максим М. МАКАРЦЕВ (Москва) – Сообщения о России в болгарской прессе второй половины XX века (к вопросу об использовании эвиденциальности) // 224

**Summary/Abstract:** The article is dedicated to changes in strategies of using unwitnessed evidentials in Bulgarian Communist Party official newspaper “*Rabotničsko delo*” (renamed as “*Duma*” on March, 4th, 1990). The main idea is that the socio-political changes deeply influenced the usage of unwitnessed evidential forms. While before the Soviet perestrojka and “the changes” in Bulgaria the Soviet sources were referred to as objective par excellence and the forms used in the news based on them almost exclusively were witnessed evidentials, in 1988–1990 intervention of unwitnessed evidentials (both with and without auxiliary) into them becomes obvious. The breaking point in this process is August 1991 when unwitnessed evidentials become default forms in the news from the USSR, though not for a long time.

### Мария КИТОВА-ВАСИЛЕВА (София) – Грамматические средства выражающие несвидетельствованность в современном испанском языке // 238

**Summary/Abstract:** The study aims at proving that some Indo-European languages that do not realize the category evidentialis / testimonialis are capable of developing morphological devices specialized at expressing problematic (probable or possible) judgments that can parallelly express ‘untestimony’ as well. These structures pertain to the verbal system of the Spanish language. They are presented: a) by several lines of paraphrases formed by modal verbs of obligation + simple or perfect infinitive and b) by the four future tenses of the indicative. The latter function as ‘biparticipants’: they fall in different paradigms and take different positions in the verb system. The structures realize themselves in the so called “relative reliability” – a modal logical-evaluation subcategory, different from mood – an intermediate zone set in the middle of the virtual modal axes, around whose two poles the forms of the two basic Spanish moods are set: the mood of the objective reality (indicative) and the mood of the subjectively perceived reality or unreality (subjunctive). The probable and possible structures enter the frames of two functional semantic fields, where the forms of the two subjective epistemic statuses are placed, characterized by

a complex double nucleus and gradual (overflowing) nature – a single subjective probable epistemic status as well as the double subjective possible epistemic status.

### Victor A. FRIEDMAN (Chicago) – The use of *li* as a marker of evidential strategy in Romani // 253

**Summary/Abstract:** The use of the Slavic interrogative particle *li* in the Kriva Palanka Arli dialect of Romani to mark dubitativity in declarative sentences suggests that the use of *li* as a general evidential strategy in the Sliven dialect of Romani observed by Kostov and by Iгла also has its origins in the semantic reinterpretation of the interrogative particle. This conclusion is supported by the use of the Turkish interrogative particle *mi* in the Barutči Arli Romani dialect of Skopje in exactly the same context as the Kriva Palanka Arli Romani use of *li*. It is also supported typologically by the expressive use of *li* in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian/Montenegrin and the use of the interrogative negative optative to express surprise in Turkic languages. This in turn suggests a connection between interrogation and evidentiality that can arise in contact situations.

### Eleonora YOVKOVA-SHII (Tokyo) – Evidentiality in Bulgarian and Japanese // 262

**Summary/Abstract:** This paper deals with the problem of evidentiality in Bulgarian and Japanese. Bulgarian and Japanese are typologically different languages but both possess means to express evidentiality. The paper examines the evidential systems of the two languages within the framework of the following conceptual problems: 1) the definition of the semantic domain of evidentiality, 2) the classification of the evidential values, 3) the grammatical status of evidentiality, i.e. is evidentiality a genuine grammatical category or not, 4) the relationship of evidentiality and modality, 5) the relationship of evidentiality and some other semantic categories like

## Contents

### Krasimira ALEKSOVA (Sofia) – Contemporary views on evidentiality and renarration in Bulgarian // 5

### Ivan KUTSAROV (Plovdiv) – Evidentiality // 17

**Summary/Abstract:** The article offers an overview of the research into the complex of the Bulgarian perfectoid forms (renarrative, conclusive, admirative, dubitative) with a special emphasis on renarration. It traces the history of the problem (especially its earlier stages) and the competition of ideas aiming at the explanation of the linguistic facts. The origin of each approach is pointed out as well as its subsequent development. This presentation is naturally influenced by the author's own position on the problems discussed, without claiming to offer the ultimate solution. Problems of terminology are also focused on. One of the reasons to include a relatively rich bibliography is to draw the attention of researchers at home and abroad to the numerous publications referred to.

### Ruselina NITSOLOVA (Sofia) – The perfect and evidentiality in Bulgarian // 50

**Summary/Abstract:** The article focuses on the issue of which semantic properties of the perfect in the indicative in Bulgarian enhance its further grammaticalization into a novel grammatical subsystem – evidentiality. A brief review is presented of the semantic load of the different types of evidential – conclusive, renarrative and dubitative, which can be deduced from the presuppositions of statements. Such presuppositions are preserved intact in the affirmative and negative forms of the statements, while in interrogatives the presuppositions are chosen by speaker in accordance with the presumed listener's cognitive state in relation to the source of information and not with the speaker's own. The place of the perfect in the temporal system of Bulgarian is discussed in a wider Reichenbachian framework. Also debated is the issue of the movement of the reference interval of the perfect in the past or in the future in relation to the pragmatic phenomenon of empathy or point of view. The basic semantic variability of the perfect in Bulgarian is described, including resultative perfect with its variant perfect of statement without an auxiliary in the 3rd p., the existential, the inferential perfect, and the perfect of hot news. The types of perfect that have given rise to the respective evidential are also specified.

## Krasimira ALEKSOVA (Sofia) – The Bulgarian admirative in the typology of languages with grammaticalized evidentiality // 68

**Summary/Abstract:** The main purpose of the present paper is to pinpoint the place of the Bulgarian admirative in the typological classification of languages with evidentiality systems which have admirative use. The semantics of the admirative, a surprising conclusion about an unexpected fact ('D, but I did not expect D'), invites the hypothesis that the Bulgarian admirative is one of the expressive uses of the conclusive (inferential) evidential but not a transposition of the renarrative evidential. The recognition of two types of evidentiality systems attested worldwide: i. evidentiality systems with two subcategories (non-first hand : firsthand information; non-eyewitness : eyewitness etc.) and ii. evidentiality systems with many subsystems which grammatically encode more details about the information source (three, four or more subcategories), proves the hypothesis that the admirative is related with the inferential evidential but not with the reported (or hearsay) one.

## Zlatka GUENTCHÉVA-DECLÉS (Paris) – Médiativité ou 'evidentiality'? Alternance de référentiels temporels dans la narration en bulgare // 83

**Summary/Abstract:** This article deals with the much debated questions on the semantics of Modern Bulgarian verbal forms of the type чел/четял referred to as "reported", "renarrated", "mediative" or "evidential", and чел е /четял е referred to as "conclusive", or "inferential". Without going into the controversy concerning the place of these perfect-like forms in the grammatical system of the contemporary Bulgarian language, our intention is to show that the presence or the omission of the third person auxiliary is a phenomenon associated with the establishment of a point-of-view relation between the speaker (enunciator) and the message he presents. The first part of the paper deals with some theoretical and epistemological issues („опосредственаост" and „evidentiality") and introduces the basic operational concepts. Using the framework of the Theory of enunciation (Theorie de l'enonciation), whose key parameters are the enunciator (Ego) and his spatio-temporal coordinates hic and nunc, we show that the notion "temporal frame of reference" also plays a crucial role for the localization of the verbalized situations according to the enunciator's stance towards them. In the second part of the paper, special attention is paid to the alternation between different „temporal frames of reference". We show that this alternation is a narrative strategy which opposes situations presented by the enunciator as non-actualized, e.g., in mythical, historical or fictional times (the forms чел/четял) and situations presented by the speaker as resulting from abductive reasoning (the forms чел е / четял е).

## Barbara SONNENHAUSER (Münich) – 'Evidentiality' and point of view in Bulgarian // 110

**Summary/Abstract:** 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.

## Uli SAUERLAND (Harvard-Berlin), Mathias Schenner (Berlin) – On embedding and evidentiality in Bulgarian // 131

**Summary/Abstract:** The interpretation of evidentials in Bulgarian has to our knowledge only been investigated for unembedded occurrences just like in a number of other languages. In this paper, we show that evidentials can be embedded in the complement of a range of propositional attitude verbs in Bulgarian. We show that evidentials behave differently from modals when embedded in Bulgarian, and develop a presuppositional account of evidentials. We argue that embedded occurrences provide important evidence for distinguishing different theories of evidentiality.

### Björn WIEMER (Mainz), Veronika KAMPF (Mainz) – Gesten und Mimik als semiotische Substitute für Sprechakte oder umgekehrt? Zur speziellen Verwendung einiger Reformulierungsmarker im Bulgarischen // 153

**Summary/Abstract:** The article aims to give an overview of lexical units used in contemporary Bulgarian for making reference to non-verbal actions with a semiotical interpretation, cf. Russ. „xenomarkers“ like *deskat'* and *mol* or Engl. „new quotatives“, e.g. *like*. Similarly to the reportive markers these units have their scope over the whole proposition, but instead of facts they concern the (re)interpretation of texts (discourse fragments), including fictive ones, merely presumed or attributed consciously to somebody by the speaker. The units in question have expanded into this functional domain mainly from the domain of reformulation; compare, for instance, *demek*, *sankim*, *sireč*, *edin vid*, *v smisäl*, *v stil* or marginally from the domain of „dialogical quotation“ (Arutjunova), e.g. *vidite li*, *vižte me*.

### Sergey S. SKORVID (Moskou) – On some morphosyntactic means for renarration in Slavic languages from the central European areal in comparison with German // 192

**Summary/Abstract:** The author of the paper analyses morphosyntactic means of expressing hearsay in several languages belonging to the Central European area. This includes constructions with the modal verb *sollen* in German, as well as, on the one hand, its functional equivalents with primarily possessive meaning in Czech, Slovak, Polish, Upper and Lower Sorbian, and, on the other hand, constructions of the incentive particle with the forms of the subjunctive mood in Slovene. It is shown that those constructions, despite their different origins, display essential correspondence in their usage; this may be regarded as one of the characteristic features of the Central European language affinity.

### Anastasia SMIRNOVA (Medford) – The meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials // 205

**Summary/Abstract:** This paper discusses the meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials. I argue that evidential forms in these languages have a rich semantic content: they encode the source of information, epistemic modality, and temporality. Ultimately, I show that the meaning of the Bulgarian and Turkish evidentials is not reducible to the meaning of perfect forms, from which the evidential forms are historically derived, and argue that evidentiality in Bulgarian and Turkish should be recognized as an independent category in its own right.

### Maxim M. MAKARCEV (Moskou) – Reports on Russia in the Bulgarian press in the second half of the XX c. Towards the problem of the use of evidentials. // 224

**Summary/Abstract:** The article is dedicated to changes in strategies of using unwitnessed evidentials in Bulgarian Communist Party official newspaper „Rabotničsko delo“ (renamed as „Duma“ on March, 4th, 1990). The main idea is that the socio-political changes deeply influenced the usage of unwitnessed evidential forms. While before the Soviet perestrojka and „the changes“ in Bulgaria the Soviet sources were referred to as objective par excellence and the forms used in the news based on them almost exclusively were witnessed evidentials, in 1988- 1990 intervention of unwitnessed evidentials (both with and without auxiliary) into them becomes obvious. The breaking point in this process is August 1991 when unwitnessed evidentials become default forms in the news from the USSR, though not for a long time.

### Maria KITOVA-VASILEVA (Sofia) – Grammatical means for the expression of nonwitness information in presentday Spanish // 238

**Summary/Abstract:** The study aims at proving that some Indo-European languages that do not realize the category evidentialis / testimonialis are capable of developing morphological devices specialized at expressing problematic (probable or possible) judgments that can parallelly express 'untestimony' as well. These structures pertain to the verbal system of the Spanish language. They are presented: a) by several lines of paraphrases formed by modal verbs of obligation + simple or perfect infinitive and b) by the four future tenses of the indicative. The latter function as 'biparticipants': they fall in different paradigms and take different positions in the

verb system. The structures realize themselves in the so called "relative reliability" - a modal logical-evaluation subcategory, different from mood - an intermediate zone set in the middle of the virtual modal axes, around whose two poles the forms of the two basic 239 Spanish moods are set: the mood of the objective reality (indicative) and the mood of the subjectively perceived reality or unreality (subjunctive). The probable and possible structures enter the frames of two functional semantic fields, where the forms of the two subjective epistemic statuses are placed, characterized by a complex double nucleus and gradual (overflowing) nature - a single subjective probable epistemic status as well as the double subjective possible epistemic status.

### Victor A. FRIEDMAN (Chicago) - The use of *li* as a marker of evidential strategy in Romani // 253

**Summary/Abstract:** The use of the Slavic interrogative particle *li* in the Kriva Palanka Arli dialect of Romani to mark dubitativity in declarative sentences suggests that the use of *li* as a general evidential strategy in the Sliven dialect of Romani observed by Kostov and by Iгла also has its origins in the semantic reinterpretation of the interrogative particle. This conclusion is supported by the use of the Turkish interrogative particle *mi* in the Barutči Arli Romani dialect of Skopje in exactly the same context as the Kriva Palanka Arli Romani use of *li*. It is also supported typologically by the expressive use of *li* in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian/Montenegrin and the use of the interrogative negative optative to express surprise in Turkic languages. This in turn suggests a connection between interrogation and evidentiality that can arise in contact situations.

### Eleonora YOVKOVA-SHII (Tokyo) - Evidentiality in Bulgarian and Japanese // 262

**Summary/Abstract:** This paper deals with the problem of evidentiality in Bulgarian and Japanese. Bulgarian and Japanese are typologically different languages but both possess means to express evidentiality. The paper examines the evidential systems of the two languages within the framework of the following conceptual problems: 1) the definition of the semantic domain of evidentiality, 2) the classification of the evidential values, 3) the grammatical status of evidentiality, i.e. is evidentiality a genuine grammatical category or not, 4) the relationship of evidentiality and modality, 5) the relationship of evidentiality and some other semantic categories like.