

## **The interpretation on the event and verbal morphology. The example of Bulgarian language and the evidential paradigms.**

Bulgarian language has developed an evidential system based on four members (indicative, reportative, dubitative and conclusive) through which cognitive states of the speaker are grammaticalized. The conclusive, also defined as presumptive modality, is used to transfer non-witnessed (non-confirmative) information, presupposition or information obtained from third person. The most frequent uses of these forms are in past tenses in the third person. But it's also possible to find forms in the first person singular, when the speaker wants to emphasize a physical, but unconscious, participation in the event.

Subjectivity is the distinctive sign that belongs to all forms of conclusive. When the speaker conveys the information he generates a conclusion, a presupposition, a conjecture, an assumption accepted by all, etc. through both direct or indirect evidence (respectively marked [+subjectivity] [+witness], [+subjectivity] [-witness]).

It would appear that the evidential forms are not directly related to the veracity of the statement but rather to the source of information. The meaning of conclusive forms is not only identified by the subjective presupposition. It depends also on relationship between the subject and the information concerned to the event which is formulated as well by the point of view on the situation and the source of information.

The evidential forms have evolved from non-witnessed use of indicative perfect with an enlargement of semantic signs which are typical for perfect, forming a scheme of oppositions: subjectivity vs. foreign source, personal experience vs. common experience, direct information vs. indirect information, etc.)

The formation of new morphological paradigms (sometimes very complicated and not all in use) is imposed by the need of verbal system to cover all possible combination from different temporal point of view. Anyway it's not possible to define a tense-level rule for the right uses of these forms, but only situational rules characterized by some adverbial markers too.

Such a model like the Bulgarian, can give us a very interesting example for how historically and synchronically evolves a verbal system and how the structure of grammar is deeply related to the mental operations the native speaker applies on the event.

## **Bibliography**

ALEKSOVA K. 2003 - Алексова Красимира 2003, *Адмиративът в съвременния български език*, София: СЕМА РШ, 2003.

ALEKSOVA K. 2003 - Алексова Красимира 2003, “Удостоверителен перфект или умозаключителен аорист – от теоретичните основи към преподаването на чужденци”, в: *Публикации от Юбилейната научнопрактическа сесия “40 години ИЧС”*, издание на CD-ROM Disk, София: 2003, 60-66.

ALEKSOVA K. 2004 - Алексова Красимира 2004, “Отново за отношението индикативен перфект – конклузивен аорист (някои теоретични аспекти с оглед на обучението по български език за чужденци)”, в: *Третата международна конференция на тема: “Езикът – средство за образование, наука професионална реализация”*, Варна: юни 2004.

ANDREJČIN L. 1976 - Андрейчин Любомир Д. 1976, “Начини на изказване”, в: Пашов Петър, Ницолова Руселина, *Помагало по българска морфология. Глагол*, София: Наука и Изкуство, 1976: 336-347.

ANDREJČIN L. 1977 - Андрейчин Любомир Д. 1977, *Граматика на българския език*, София, 1977.

ARONSON H. 1977 “Interrelationship between aspect and mood in bulgarian”, *Folia Slavica*, Columbus (Ohio): Slavica Publishers, Inc., 1, 1-2 (1977): 9-32.

BYBEE J., PERKINS R., PAGLIUCA W. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

BACHE C., BASBØLL H., LINDBERG C., edited by, *Tense, Aspect and Action, Empirical and Theoretical Contributions to Language Typology*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994 [= *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology* 12].

GERDŽIKOV G. 1976 - Герджиков Георги 1976, *Една специфична глаголна категория в съвременния български език* (Категорията “ангажираност на говорещия с изказването за действието”). – ГСУ, ФСФ, т. 69, кн. 2, стр. 5-68.

GERDŽIKOV G. 1976 - Герджиков Георги 1976, „Българските глаголни времена като система”, в: Пашов Петър, Ницолова Руселина, *Помагало по българска морфология глагол*, София: Наука и Изкуство, 1976: 224-229.

GERDŽIKOV G. 2000 - Герджиков Георги 2000, „Категорията “време” като хиперкатегория”, в: Български език и литература, 2000, кн. 1, с.3-16.

JOHANSON L. 2000 “Viewpoint operators in European languages”, в: Dahl Östen, (edited by), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000, [= Empirical Approaches to Language Typology]: 27-188.

LINDSTEDT J. 2000 „The perfect – aspectual, temporal and evidential”, в: Dahl Östen, (edited by), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000, [= Empirical Approaches to Language Typology]: 365-384.

NICOLOVA R. 2008 - Ницолова Руселина 2008, Българска граматика – морфология, София: университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски”.

FRIEDMAN V. A. 2000 „Confirmative/nonconfirmative in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian with additional observations on Turkish, Romani, Georgian, and Lak”, в: Johanson Lars, Uta Bo, (edited by), *Evidentials, Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000: 329-366 [= Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24].