Any language is capable of specifying the source of the information communicated by the speaker. The most obvious means are lexical and syntactic. In English, for example, in order to indicate that the source of information is a report, i.e. someone else’s words, the speaker can use subordination to such specific clauses as *I heard that, So-and-so said that*, adverbial qualifiers such as *allegedly, reported* as well as less specific adverbs, i.e., those which may be used to indicate that the source of information is a report but which do not specify the nature of the source, e.g., *apparently*, and other lexical devices. Some languages also have particles, frequently originally derived from reduced forms of verbs of reporting, which can indicate that the statement is a quotation or is based on second-hand information, e.g. Russian *de* and *mol*, Bulgarian *kaj*, Georgian *o-, tkva*, and *metki*. The use of particles, especially enclitic particles such as the Georgian, leads to consideration of the possibility of the morphological specification of the source of information as a report or somehow second-hand or indirect. Such, for example, is said to be the function of the Haida verbal suffix *agAn*, e.g. *Ua la l’nagegalagAn ‘he married her* (Swanton 1911: 248). According to Sapir (1922: 158-159, 200-201), Takelma has a special conjunction, which he calls *inferential*, used primarily for reported events, e.g., *dómk’wak* ‘it killed him’ as opposed to the ordinary aorist form *tómik’wa*. When the source of information is specified morphologically rather than lexically or syntactically, i.e., if there is an inflectional means of specifying the source of information which is not merely a use of some broader category as is the case in the German use of the subjective in indirect speech, then the language can be said to possess a grammatical category expressing this meaning. In this connection, Jakobson (1957: 4-5) used the term *evidential* to describe verbal categories which connect the speech event with both the narrated event and a narrated speech event serving as the source of information about the narrated event.
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and he used Bulgarian as an example of a language possessing such a category.¹

Almost all descriptions of the Bulgarian verb written in the last four decades have assumed the existence of a special series of reported forms which are used to indicate that the speaker has learned of the information from some other source and which are opposed to other forms that are either unmarked or marked for some other category.² Bulgarian linguists consider these forms to be "a very original and rare characteristic" (Andrzejčin 1952: 43) differentiating Bulgarian from the other Slavic languages (BAN 1978: 20) and constituting a significant part of the reason for their considering the verbal system "the pride of our language" (Kazandžiev 1943: 13). The idea that some forms of the Bulgarian verb indicate that the action was learned of from an indirect source of information was first expressed in the 1860s (Pârvev 1975: 278-279). It was not until 1938, however, that Andrzejčin, basing himself on Trifonov (1905), established the model which, despite subsequent ramification and discussion (particularly with regard to modal classification and the status of the imperfect participle) nevertheless contains the basic set of assumptions used in virtually all subsequent studies of the Bulgarian verb (see in particular Andrzejčin 1938: 57, cf. also Pârvev 1975: 224-226). In this article I wish to examine one of those basic assumptions, viz., that there is a special set of reported paradigms entirely homonymous with the past indefinite except in the third person, where the only distinguishing feature is the omission of the auxiliary in the former, i.e., that the omission of the auxiliary in those verbal paradigms formed by the present tense of *sâm* 'be' and the *l*-participle is a signal of the special grammatical category of reportedness and justifies the distinction between a reported paradigm and a nonreported paradigm.³ As Stankiewicz (1967: 1898) has observed, "Morphological oppositions, as well as words and morphemes of a language, are, most often, differentiated not through single features but through combinations of intersecting features." Aronson (1967: 93) has shown that the distinction reported/nonreported is neutralized in the first two persons of the past indefinite and can thus be said to exist only in the third person, i.e., this supposedly far-reaching distinction is based entirely on a single feature. If it can be shown that auxiliary omission is not a predictable signal or requirement of reported speech, as is the intention of this article, i.e., if this single feature can be shown to occur in free variation rather than in a genuinely distinctive capacity, then reportedness cannot be said to exist at all as a separate grammatical category distinct from the past indefinite.⁴

It is interesting to note that during the first four decades of this century, a number of linguists either had no conception of the omission of the auxiliary as significant or considered it a signal of something other than reported speech. Thus, for example, Romanski (1926) in his review of Weigand (1925) states that the perfect *toj e umval* 'he [has] died' is used when the speaker has heard or learned of the death from someone else. Elsewhere in the same article, Romanski cites auxiliariless forms as part of the same paradigmatic set. Beševliev (1928: 175) in his commentary on Weigand (1925), in which he cites uses of the Ancient Greek imperfect with the particle *dra*, includes or omits the auxiliary in his Bulgarian translations without comment but with the implicit assumption that a single paradigm - the perfect - is involved. Conev (1911: 13 reprinted 1937: 104) did consider the omission of the auxiliary to be significant, but his explanation was distinctly different from Andrzejčin's. To illustrate his conception of the difference, Conev cites the following two sentences:

1a. *Rekata pridōšla*

1b. *Rekata e pridōšla*

The river has risen.

According to Conev, (1a) is used for a report or at the sight of the swollen river, i.e., as a reported or as a purely resultative perfect, while (1b) is used

² Deržavin, in his preface to Andrzejčin (1949: 5), describes the system of reported tenses proposed in that work as "artificial" and "not corresponding fully to the linguistic facts." He refers to Andrjejčin's examples of "incorrect" usage (e.g., 1944: 296 [§319]), in which confirmative forms occur where reported forms should be used and vice versa, as demonstrating that "the author himself indicates this obliquely." Popželjavko (1962: 89) expresses a view similar to that expressed at the end of this paper, viz., that there is a single past indefinite with auxiliary deletion in some cases. A major difference between our view and Popželjavko's, other than the fact that Popželjavko bases himself primarily on examples taken from poetry and folklore, lies in the significance he assigns to auxiliary deletion, which resembles Conev's (see example [1]).
for a deduction, e.g., on the basis of the noise made by the river, or if the report is doubted, i.e., the form without the auxiliary carries, according to Conev, a greater degree of conviction of the truth of the statement. Thus, although Bulgarian grammarians were already aware of the possibility of omission of the auxiliary in the nineteenth century (see Pârv 1975: 215), and although they were aware that the meaning of reportedness was somehow associated with the past indefinite, it was only in 1938 that these two phenomena were systematically connected by Andrejkîn and used to justify the establishment of separate, almost totally homonymous, paradigms. This immediately raises a question: if this distinction is as obviously clear-cut and far-reaching as it has been assumed to be during the past forty years, why was it not noticed before? Why could linguists ignore the fact that the auxiliary might or might not be used? Why could Conev even cite the auxiliaryless form as being a pure resultative perfect? We shall return to this question, but the next step is an examination of those cases which have been recognized as problematical by Andrejkîn and those who have followed him.

In his dissertation (1938: 45) and his Bulgarian grammar (1944: 237[§259]), Andrejkîn did acknowledge the existence of nonreported auxiliaryless forms. Consider the following examples:

2. Šâbrali se bjaxa ot devet sela xora da prazdnuat denja na Rosenski most. Doveli orljak malgućani da go videli. Naduli gajdi dvamata čobana ot Balkana, deto letuvaxa u nas ... (Andrejkîn 1938: 45; 1944: 242 [§262]).

People had gathered from nine villages to celebrate the day on Rosen ski bridge. The people from Malguč brought a flock for them to see. The two shepherds from the Balkan mountains who were spending the summer with us blew on bagpipes.

3. I sred tova utivanc na čoveškija šum, izvedenaž toko čušeč, če viknale nejde otsreša veselata i skokliva: Ogrevali mesečinka ... (ibid.) And in the midst of this quieting of the human noise, all of a sudden you hear that they are singing somewhere over yonder the gay and lively “The Moon Has Risen” ...


Why it's not gold! It's not gold at all.

5. Taka šoto po edno vreme vidjax, če družinata mi otminala i se izgubila napred (ibid.).

It was thus that I suddenly saw that my company had gone on and disappeared up ahead.

Other authors have also indicated their awareness that these usages occur, as in the following additional examples:


Her cheeks flushed, she didn’t dare turn around. And on top of it all – the regional secretary. He sat and listened!


I rub my eyes. I look – it has dawned. I jump up ...

8. “Kâđe si bil?” – “Na dolnata kârça. Tam čorbadžata se sâbrali. I Vâčan beše tam (ibid.).

“Where have you been?” – “At the lower inn. The rich folk have gathered there. Vâčan was there too.”

9. – Baj Ganjo se vârnal ot Evropa! ... az go vidjax, govorix s nego ... (Demina 1959: 326).

– Baj Ganjo has returned from Europe! ... I saw him, I spoke with him ...

These examples have one major characteristic in common, viz., the auxiliary is omitted in a context which clearly does not involve a report as the source of information. The explanations which have been offered are of several types, which can be grouped into two broad classes labeled stative-descriptive and emotive-contrastive. These classes are not mutually exclusive, however, and occasionally they overlap. The bare essentials of these explanations can be paraphrased in the following manner: the auxiliary is omitted from the perfect when it is used to state a fact, particularly a description of a state or a set of circumstances, as in (2) and (3), and when it is used to convey emotion, surprise, contrast, vividness and the like, as in (4), (6), and (9). Examples such as (5), (7), and (8) are said to fit into both types of explanation. Stative descriptive examples are sometimes explained as attributive-like uses of the participle with the omission of the predicative copula as occurs in the present tense in sentences such as the following:

(10) I toj mnogo malâk, sâbira samo dvesta ton (Dejanova 1970:847)

And it’s a small one at that, it only holds two hundred tons.

On the other hand, emotive-contrastive examples have been treated as adm irative usages similar to example (4). Aside from the fact that such examples produce total homonymy between the perfect and reported paradigms, a fact which will be returned to later, the explanations appear to be inadequate.
The attributive use of the participle must be distinguished from its predicative function as part of a compound tense, since the attributive participle must agree with the noun it modifies and can be made definite while the predicative participle agrees with the subject of the clause, cannot otherwise be inflected, and can occur with certain subordinating and coordinating conjunctions as well as the intransitive marker se. Thus, for example, if otminala and se izgubila have an attributive look to them, their subordination to če and the use of se with izgubila make it clear that they are predicative. Similar arguments apply to (3), (7), and (8). In an example such as (6), the conjunction i makes it clear that both forms are predicates. In (2), the da construction indicates that doveli is functioning predicatively, while the transitivity of naduli and the verb-object-subject word order make this construction quite different from that of (10).

The emotive-contrastive, or admirative, explanation involves two different phenomena. The phenomenon of admirative usage, as exemplified by (4), is characterized by the apparent present-tense meaning of the verb, and, as I have argued elsewhere (Friedman 1979: 341-342; Friedman Forthcoming), it is limited to expressions of state involving bil 'be', imal 'have' and their semantic functional equivalents. True admirative usage, which has its equivalents in Albanian, Turkish, and other languages (see Friedman 1979), is a use of the perfect to refer to a state which has existed in the past and continues into the present but has come to the speaker's unsuspecting attention only at the moment of speech. The meaning is present, but the reference, or 'agreement' is past (i.e., the form is referring to the present realization but is agreeing with the fact that the state is acknowledged to have already been existing in the past), and such usage is unacceptable with verbs denoting actions taking place in the presence of the speaker. In examples such as (6), (7), and (9), the action described has taken place in the past and is over and done with. To be sure, a state relevant to the present has resulted, such was the original meaning of the perfect from which the Bulgarian past indefinite is descended. But in (6) and (9) the speaker was aware of the action before uttering the statement, and in (7), despite the fact that the resultant state comes to the speaker's attention only at the moment of speech, the action is already completed leaving only the results for the speaker to view:

(11) Ami az pomnja majka mu, bre, tja mi e splitala kosite na plitki, ucela me e pesni da peja ... (Stankov 1967: 341).

Well, but I remember his mother, man, she used to braid my hair in braids, she taught me songs to sing ...

(12) Polučil sa razprostranenie ... i prilagatelnii imena s nastavkata -im -em (kojto nadjoga e služela za obrazuvane na segašni stradalnii pričastija ...). Adjectives with the suffix -im-em (which at one time used to serve for the formation of the present passive participle) also have acquired distribution ...

...
(13) V po-osnovnite si linii obačte tozi razvoj se e dviješel po specifičen pát, caracteren samo za bulgarskih ezik i obusloveno... glavno ot prodolžitelno obštuvane sas stari i novi ezići, koito sa se govoreti na balkanski jezku poluoslobo (Mirčev 1964: 4).

In its more basic outlines, however, this development followed a specific path far more characteristic of the Bulgarian language and conditioned... chiefly by continuous contact with the ancient and modern languages which were spoken on the Balkan peninsula.

It is clear from examples (11) - (13) and similar material that statements such as Andrejčin’s and Maslov’s represent an artificial codification. Even Andrejčin himself uses the auxiliary with the imperfect participle for non-reported facts, e.g., (12). We must thus agree with Stankov (1967) that examples such as (11) - (13) represent an imperfect paradigm which parallels the aorist unmarked past (the so-called perfect).

Of greater importance are examples such as the following, in which the auxiliary occurs in a reported context:

(14) Ne sam čul vuk da e izjel teolo na jakaja krava, skoro otelena, - kaza Erofin. - Tuj ne sam čul, ala sam čuval, če smok e smučel mljakoto im (Demina 1959: 323n.36).

“I haven’t heard of a wolf’s eating the calf of a cow that has recently calved,” said Erofin. “I haven’t heard that, but I have heard that a snake sucked (sucks) their milk.”

(15) Ivan kaza, če si e kupil nova stixozbirka (Stankov 1969: 89).
Ivan said that he bought himself a new collection of poetry.

(16) Gledaj, gledaj kakav čovek e bil toja, deto e napisal taja knižka! (Stojanov 1964: 382).

Look, look at what kind of person this is who wrote this book!

(17) A kogato sinat slabši, če si e nameril kvartira i šte se pribira neštata, dojde i pripadak (Andrejčin 1938: 44).

And when the son announced that he had found himself an apartment and would collect his things, then the fit came.

(18) ... srestnaxme edna babička, nosi dva guliša ... kupix gi - kaza ... Momčeto mi e bolno, uplaši se, če šteša da go pretrepe kon, ta mi kazaxa da vze na sreče ot guliš dokato e ože živ, i da mu go dam da gulišne. Ej bože, kata počerenjenja onzi hadži Petar, kata kipna ... - Ti - kaza - kakva si, ne li ti e sram ... Daj sam gulišite ... Babata raztrepera, dade gi. - A kato ti e bilo bolno deteto - kaza hadži Petar, nà ti pari da go ceriš (Demina 1959: 322n.36).

... we met a little old lady carrying two pigeons... I bought them—she says... My boy is sick, he got frightened because he was almost trampled by a horse, so they told me to take the heart of a pigeon while it was still alive and give it to him to swallow. Oh Lord, how that Hadži Petar flushed, how he seethed... — You — he says — what are you, aren’t you ashamed... Give the pigeons here... The old woman began to tremble and gave them up. — And since your child is sick (i.e. since you said your child was sick) — said Hadži Petar — here’s money for you to heal him.

This brings us to the question of the degree of facultativity in marking reported speech, as well as returning us to the question of the auxiliary. Most Bulgarian grammarians contend that the reported is required if the source of information is second-hand (cf. Roth 1979: 149-150). However, they generally also concur that in actual subordination to a verb of reporting, the perfect is often used, e.g., (15) and (17); the reported is not required (Popov 1963: 336-337), and its use under such circumstances is essentially quotative, i.e., a precise rendition of what was said (Demina 1959: 347). Thus it would appear that the specification of a second-hand source by morphological means need not occur if there is lexical specification (but see BAN 1978: 20).7 Such an explanation could also account for (14), if we accept the norm which permits the auxiliary with the imperfect participle. According to Stojanov, it is clear from the context in which it occurs that (16) is present in meaning and hence an admirable with the auxiliary. If, as has been argued, (Demina 1959: 325-328, Stankov 1969: 176-178) the admirable is a special use of the perfect, then this example does not present any problems, although it is inconsistent with other adverbs in that the auxiliary is retained. If, however, as has also been argued (Andrejčin 1938: 68, 1944: 311[§335]; Maslov 1956: 250-253; Stojanov 1964: 381, Darden 1977) the admirable is a use of the reported, then this example presents a problem. Example (18) is problematic to any description of the Bulgarian verb which bases the distinction between perfect and reported paradigms on the absence of the auxiliary, since Hadži Petar’s e bilo bolno is clearly based on the old woman’s report of e bolno.

Before attempting to draw any conclusions on the basis of the foregoing material, let us consider the actual speech of educated Bulgarians. It is quite clear from the data presented by Roth (1979) and from my own fieldwork,
both of which involved native speakers from all over Bulgaria, that the auxiliary is not at all consistently omitted in reported speech or retained in nonreported speech in the spoken language. Thus for example, an engineer from Touloux, in relating a story to me about an acquaintance’s grandfather, consistently used the past indefinite but freely switched back and forth between auxiliaryless constructions and those with the auxiliary in much the same manner as the chemist from Burgas quoted in the following example from Roth (1979: 177) in which the speaker is relating an experience of his father’s which he only knew of from his father’s report:

(19) vednâž e pâtuval ot Burgas nadolu kâm granicata — selo Fakija — i pâtuval toj — signal e veçerta do njakakvo selo s rejs i sled tova trâbvalo da premine.

and once he traveled from Burgas down toward the border — the village of Fakija — and so he traveled — in the evening he got to some village with bus service and then he was supposed to go on.

Consider also the following example in which the reported is used for the personal opinion of the speaker, who then switches to the perfect upon continuing that part of the narrative based on a report (vs. Andrejčin 1944: 291-293[313]):

(20) Razkazvava e za kolégite si — v sâšnost za edin ot tjax — po vâzrasten bil — njakakâv star ergen sâvsem — njakâda nad četirijet, četirijet i pet godini — če bil interesen kato čovek — bil v sâšnost — e vladeel mnogo ot tehnîčeskite poxvasti na spektroskopija — i vâjobite e bil v nejna pomost — toj bil kako tehnik dâlig godini tam pri tezi — (Roth 1979: 179).

She used to talk about her colleagues — about one of them actually — he was older — an old bachelor — somewhere around forty, forty-five — that he was interesting as a person — and he really was — he had a lot of technical skill in spectroscopy — and he was very helpful to her in general — he had been there as a technician with them for many years —

Similarly, in my conversations with colleagues in Sofia, I found that they used sentences such as the following when relating events based on their own personal experiences and not on reports:

8 See Kabasanov (1966: 52-53) where he states that school children in Western Bulgaria have trouble learning how to use the reported forms because they do not exist in their dialects, but compare Roth (1979: 124-126) where she shows that there is no correlation between consistent use of the auxiliary and place of origin of the speaker.

(21) Bilo na tova vreme . . .
It was at that time . . .

(22) Dosega ne bilo takiva domove.
There haven’t been such houses until now.

They also accepted admirative usage with the auxiliary of the type illustrated by example (16). It is also interesting to note that while normativists cite sentences of the type used in example (15) without the auxiliary as examples of reported speech (e.g., BAN 1978: 20), most of the educated speakers I spoke with preferred the sentence with the auxiliary, and some even rejected such auxiliaryless sentences, i.e., in subordination to verbs of reporting, as sounding substandard or ungrammatical.

Let us now consider the implications of all the foregoing material. As was indicated at the outset, the intent of this paper is to re-examine the claim that omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the past indefinite produces a separate set of paradigms marked for reportedness and justifies the positing of two otherwise totally homonymous paradigmatic sets, viz., the perfect and the reported. If such were actually the case, then examples such as those we have been considering should not occur. First of all, it is suspicious that there was so much uncertainty regarding reportedness and the omission of the auxiliary during the first four decades of this century. Secondly, examples such as (2) - (10), with auxiliaryless predicative participles, cannot be justified as having any kind of reported meaning. Thirdly, examples such as (11) - (13) show that the imperfect participle is not limited to the auxiliaryless reported paradigm, so that we are dealing with a situation of total homonymy between the perfect and reported except in the third person. Fourthly, examples such as (14) - (18) show that the auxiliary can be used in reported speech. Finally, examples (19) - (22) show that in the speech of educated native speakers of literary Bulgarian, the auxiliary can occur in reported speech, be omitted in nonreported speech, and both without apparent motivation (cf. Roth 1979: 126-129, 150-153).

I would suggest, rather, the following: omission of the auxiliary in the third person of the unmarked past (i.e., the past indefinite) is a stylistic device or possibility. At its most formalized, i.e., at the normative level, it could be treated as a rule of deletion; at its least formalized, i.e., in actual

9 It should be noted that the use of the imperfect for apparently present tense situations can be accounted for as a type of tense agreement with the ontological pastness of the reported speech event (or a deleted verb of reporting) similar to that found in Macedonian (see Friedman 1977: 69-72). Cf. also English tense agreement, e.g., Where was the yard sale? ( = Where did the sign say the yard sale was/is?).
speech, there is virtually free variation. I would suggest that the situation in literary Bulgarian as it is actually used by educated natives in speaking and writing, i.e., a variant of literary Bulgarian which might be called educated Bulgarian, as opposed to normative or academy Bulgarian (cf. Scarton 1978: In.5, and also Naylor 1979 on the need for grammatical descriptions of spoken forms of literary languages) is the following: the past indefinite, by virtue of its unmarkedness with respect to the confirmative past definite, has the same range of meanings as the literary Macedonian past indefinite, viz., perfect, simple past, and reported. In educated Bulgarian, however, unlike literary Macedonian, the auxiliary can occur in the third person. 10 It appears to occur most frequently when the past indefinite is functioning as the simple past, less so when it is a perfect, and least of all when it is conveying reported information. The idea that reportedness constitutes a grammatical category independent from the past indefinite is an artificial distinction created by normative grammarians on the basis of a stylistic variation (cf. Roth 1979: 153). Thus, for example, on the basis of her material, Roth (1979: 153) states that it is virtually impossible to distinguish the reported from the perfect in their use in any context in the spoken and written literary language. In this regard, it is also significant that in the data based on Roth’s (1979: 120-128, 151-152) questionnaire there was no correlation between the rate of auxiliary omission and the age, sex, or native region of the speaker, but the rate of auxiliary omission did increase with an increase in the level of education, i.e., the more schooling the informants had, the more likely they were to supply the “correct” answers in contexts where, according to the codified form, the auxiliary is supposed to be omitted. In the narratives of educated informants, however, even this correlation broke down. Although Roth (1979: 159) wishes to avoid the obvious conclusion suggested by her data, as well as by the rest of the data given here, by

10 In literary Macedonian, there is a single past indefinite which never has the auxiliary in the third person and which is unmarked with respect to the confirmative past definite (Friedman 1977: 21-82). By virtue of this fact and its historical origins and developments, the literary Macedonian past indefinite can have reported, perfect, and simple preterite meanings, according to the context, although reported is the chief contextual variant meaning due to the contrast with the marked confirmative (Friedman 1977: 113). As the unmarked past, it has no single basic meaning other than pastness. In the Kumanovo dialect, the same basic situation holds true, but the third person auxiliary does occur sporadically in the past indefinite (Vidoeski 1962: 218, 234). Grickat (1954) has written on the omission of the auxiliary in all three persons of the unmarked past in Serbo-Croatian. The educated Bulgarian phenomenon shows strong resemblances to the Kumanovo dialect and, insofar as context, but not person, is concerned (cf. Koneski 1965: 148), also to the Serbo-Croatian situation. It should be noted that it has never been suggested that Serbo-Croatian possesses a separate auxiliaryless paradigm.

claiming the sample to be “too limited” and thus continuing to speak of a “Category of Indirect Narration,” the overwhelming amount of evidence shows that reportedness is a contextual variant meaning of the past indefinite, one which is likely to be accompanied by omission of the auxiliary in the practice of at least some speakers, but nevertheless one which does not constitute a separate category or paradigmatic set as distinct from the past indefinite. 11
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