UC Berkeley
Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society

Title
Denotative and Connotative Meaning of the 'Preterite' and 'Perfect' in Bulgarian and English

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/26g9602m

Journal
Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 4(4)

ISSN
2377-1666

Author
Chvany, Catherine

Publication Date
1978

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

bls Berkeley Linguistics Society

Denotative and Connotative Meaning of the 'Preterite' and 'Perfect' in Bulgarian and English
Author(s): Catherine Chvany
Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1978), pp. 31-42

Please see "How to cite" in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via eLanguage, the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

DENOTATIVE AND CONNOTATIVE MEANING OF THE 'PRETERITE' AND 'PERFECT' IN BULGARIAN AND ENGLISH

Catherine V. Chvany
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This paper is part of a larger study whose goal is to refine and constrain the 'syntactic feature' of transformational-generative grammar with the help of the Prague School concept of hierarchies and oppositions among grammatical signs. I assume a generative framework in which syntactic features are spelled out as inflectional and other grammatical morphemes. From the Prague School I adopt (and adapt) the concept of 'grammatical sign' and the assumption that a 'marked' (here, plus-valued) grammatical sign has a single constant (denotative) meaning, as well as contextually determined (connotative) meanings. The primary focus will be on the Bulgarian data, with some contrastive material from English.

In practice, even 'autonomous syntax' has used semantic labels borrowed from traditional grammar--'±plural' and '±past', for instance, rather than '±S' or '±D', to specify the respective English morphemes. So far, however, such approximate translations of the meanings of the features (or of the morphemes that spell them) have been no more than mnemonics, multiplying ad hoc with scant attention to accurate and economical accounts of their semantic properties. At the same time, Prague school oriented studies of 'markedness' or of 'grammatical oppositions' have too often taken an atomistic or isolationist approach to morphology and have suffered from inexplicitness about the several kinds of oppositions that may coexist within a language system.

I will show that an 'autonomous syntax' account of Bulgarian verb forms requires four sets of features. Three of them specify the presence vs. the absence of suffixes, and will be represented as '±E', '±H', '±L', in an approximation of their phonological forms, or <u>signantia</u>; the last set of features is represented as '±Ø', specifying the absence vs. the presence of the third person copula-auxiliary with forms in -L-. The constant general meanings or <u>signata</u> of the plus-valued features are those of aspectual, temporal and modal categories found in most other Indo-European languages. The many, often contradictory or overlapping meanings reported in the literature on the Bulgarian tenses and moods can be accounted for in terms of these meanings and the contextual connotations of the minus-valued features. There is no need to resort to the homonymous categories of traditional Bulgarian grammar, nor is there need to invent for Bulgarian a set of syntactic features such as '±reported' or '±evidential', or '±witnessed', to name a few that have been proposed. These meanings are not constant properties of the Bulgarian verb forms but are derivable from their far more ordinary properties. But, before presenting the reader with the entire inventory of Bulgarian forms and their traditional names, I must outline what <u>is</u> unusual about the Bulgarian system.

CHART OF NARRATIVE POSITIONS IN BULGARIAN. SUBSTITUTION LISTS BASED ON Mutafčiev (1964:40; 131-8).

(The names in single quotes are traditional translations of the terminology in traditional grammars[1])

Probably unnecessary 'archicategory','± Evidential':	VISUALIZING PLANE *(plan na naglednostta)* [-Evidential] ('DIRECT')	REMINISCING PLANE *(plan na spomena)* [+Evidential] [2]	
		prjako 'DIRECT NARRATION'	*preizkazno* 'reported' 'INDIRECT NARRATION'
Plot-advancing events:	*PIŠE, NAPISVA* ** 'present'	*(NA)PISA** 'aorist'	*(NA)PISAL Ø* 'reported aorist'
Descriptions, states, concurrent processes:		*PIŠEŠE* 'imperfect'	*PIŠEL Ø* 'reported imperfect' (=reported present)
Flashbacks:	*(NA)PISAL E* 'perfect, indefinite past' *PIŠEL E* [3] 'imperfect indefinite'	*BEŠE (NA)PISAL* 'pluperfect'	*BIL Ø (NA)PISAL* 'reported pluperfect'

*The perfective stem is *NAPISA+*, the imperfective is *PISA+*. Both aspects may combine with any of the suffixes, though the imperfective is far more compatible with the forms with the suffix -E-, which denotes 'continuative with respect to an orientation point'. The aorist, without that aspect feature, is far more compatible with the perfective aspect than the imperfective. On the reminiscing plane, most plot-advancing events would be in the perfective aorist, though imperfective aorists also occur; digressions are normally in the imperfective imperfect; perfective imperfects are used (rarely) for repeated completions coordinated with another event, e.g., 'the dog would bark once (P-imfct) every time something else happened'. ** *NAPISVA* is the present of the secondary derived imperfective.

Fig. (1)

While most Indo-European languages have two narrative positions--they can tell a story in the past or in the so-called historical present--Bulgarian has three. A story may be told in two possible 'planes', the 'visualizing plane' *(plan na naglednostta)*, or the 'reminiscing plane' *(plan na spomena)*; within the latter, the story may be told as a first-hand account, using the 'direct' or 'witnessed' mode, or else it can be told in the 'reported' mode. This is illustrated in Fig. (1), where I give substitution lists illustrated with forms of the verbs *napisa+/pisa+* 'write' in 3rd person. Notice that the forms *(na)pisal e* and *pisel e*, which are used on the 'visualizing plane' for anterior events, differ from the 'reported' forms in the third column only in having the 3rd person auxiliary while the 'reported' forms have Ø. This maximal contrast is found only in 3rd person; as shown in Fig. (2) below, there is no contrast in first and second person, where the auxiliary is obligatory. In spite of this, traditional Bulgarian grammars insist on separate, partly homonymous, paradigms, which they claim differ in both tense and mood.[4] In general, the interrelations between the 'perfect' forms (with 3rd person auxiliary) and the 'reported' forms (without 3rd person auxiliary) have not been explored in detail, nor has the occurrence (and cooccurrence) of the H and L morphemes in the conditional forms, see Fig.(2) below. Discussions of Bulgarian verbal categories have concentrated more on the contrasts illustrated in Fig. (1), where a Bulgarian speaker is forced to choose one of the options in the same or similar contextual frames.

In an 'autonomous syntax' account, however, the forms may be specified in terms of the four above-mentioned features, and the choices are between the + and - values of [±E,±H,±L,±Ø],cf. below:

Fig. (2) OCCURRING FORMS & 'traditional names' V STEM(S): *(NA)PISA+*		AUX ±Ø 3rd	ORDER OF SUFFIXES 1 E	2 H/L	3 PvN GʌN
INDICATIVE	*-PIŠE,-PIŠA 1,3* 'present'		+	- -	+ -
	-PIŠEH, PIŠEŠE 1,2-3 'imperfect'		+	+ -	+ -
	-PISAH,-PISA 1,2-3 'aorist'		-	+ -	+ -
	-PISAL sǎm/si/e 1,2,3 'perf.indef.'	-Ø	-	- +	+ +
	-PIŠEL sǎm/si/e 1,2,3 'impf.indef.'	-Ø	+	- +	+ +
	-PISAL bjah/beše 1,2-3 'plupfct'	be+	(5)	+ +	+ +
MODAL	*-PISAL bih/bi 1,2-3* 'conditional'	bi+	-	+ +	+ +
	-PISAL sǎm/si/Ø 'reported aorist'	+Ø	-	- +	(+) +
	-PIŠEL sǎm/si/Ø 'reptd pres.impft'	+Ø	+	- +	(+) +
	-PISAL bil sǎm/si/Ø 'reptd plupfct'	+Ø	-	- ++	(+) ++ *(redupl. L&GʌN)*
(+)='no PvN in 3rd, since no AUX'					

In Fig. (2) I have included all singular forms, in order to show the suffixes more overtly than they appear in some of the 3rd person forms in Fig. (1). I have somewhat simplified the phonological forms of the suffixes, based on Scatton (1976). I omit from discussion some other periphrastic modals, including the future of both perfective and imperfective stems, in which the forms in Fig. (2) appear as complements of the modal auxiliary *šte* 'want'.

As you can see in Fig. (2), the verb stem may be joined to suffixes of three order classes. The first one, which I will describe only briefly here, is E, which is common to all forms made from the so-called 'present-imperfect stem', i.e., the 'present' *PIŠE*, the 'imperfect' *PIŠEH, PIŠEŠE*, and the *PIŠEL* forms with and without 3rd person copula-auxiliary. The meaning of this suffix (and of the feature [+E]), is an aspectual one, denoting 'CR' or 'continuative with respect to a reference point'.[5] Forms without E (with the feature [-E]) merely connote 'non-continuative' or 'punctual' as well as independence from a reference point, as the aorist usually does, but these are non-constant meanings of forms without E, which may disappear in context: the 'perfect' *PISAL E* can be contextually related to the present or to another event, for instance; and forms without E can be used for continuous processes, as in *Toj dălgo pisa*. [aorist] 'He wrote a long time.' (Vs. *Toj dălgo pišeše* [imperfect] 'He was writing a long time (while...)')

It is important to distinguish two kinds of binary opposition: the features [±E] are in privative opposition, as are the forms with and without the suffix E, but that is only on the level of signans. On the semantic (or signatum) level, the oppositions are of a different kind. To borrow Jakobson's definition, the marked form 'makes a statement of A' while the unmarked form 'makes no statement of A', is non-committal as to the meaning 'A', rather than have the meaning 'non-A'(1957, [1971]). When contrasted, the meanings may be 'A' vs. 'non-A', but the 'non-A' meaning of the unmarked member of the opposition can be amended or removed by a context incompatible with 'non-A'. The marked form, on the other hand, with the denotative meaning 'A', will be grammatically and/or semantically incompatible with contexts that denote 'non-A'. Janakiev (1962b) used the term subordinative for the semantic oppositions that co-exist with the privative oppositions in grammatical signs.

The distinction between privative and subordinative oppositions and between denotative and connotative meaning is particularly important in the discussion of the interplay of the suffixes of the second order class, H and L. The suffixes H and L are mutually exclusive, but they are not incompatible: in the pluperfect *BJAH (NA)PISAL*, L appears on the verb stem while H is carried by the copula-auxiliary. There are two privative oppositions, [±H] and [±L] --while [+H] and [+L] are in equipollent opposition. I'll return to these matters after mentioning the terminal suffixes.

The third order class of suffixes carry the subject-verb agreement features of person and/or number (PvN) on the 'present', 'imperfect' and 'aorist'; the L-forms exhibit a different set of

agreement features: gender or number, but not both (GʌN). In the L-forms, the PvN suffixes are carried by the auxiliary, except in the 3rd person 'indirect' forms, which have Ø auxiliary.

The suffix H expresses marked tense, a 'shifter' in Jakobson's (and Jespersen's) term, a strongly deictic sign which relates the process denoted by the verb stem to the moment of speech. The opposition [±H] corresponds to the English [±D], traditionally the *'nunc-tunc'* 'now-then' opposition. While the most frequent use of the marked preterites is to express an event anterior to the speech event (or 'past'), that cannot be the constant general meaning of H, for the H-preterite can be used in contrary-to-fact conditions and may even refer to future events, as will be shown below. Moreover, H also appears on the auxiliary of the conditional mood. The denotative meaning of the Bulgarian (and English) preterite forms might be generalized as 'distanced in time or reality from the speech event' or 'not (real) now'. But, along with this common denotative meaning, the forms of the two languages have widely divergent connotations: the English preterite has been described as 'remote' (Joos 1964, among others) and, unlike the Bulgarian H, cannot be used to refer to imminent events. The Bulgarian H-forms, on the other hand, are often said to refer to 'close','witnessed', 'vouched-for', 'real', 'definite' events. How is that to be reconciled with 'distancing in time or reality'?

The answer lies in the oppositions available in the respective systems: the English preterite is often (but not always) felt to present events as 'remote' because it is chosen over the 'present perfect,' which relates an anterior event to a reference point at the moment of speech (Reichenbach 1947:297). The Bulgarian form, on the other hand, is opposed not only to the 'present', but also to the doubly remote so-called 'reported' or 'indirect' forms shown in Fig. (1), the L-forms with Ø in 3rd person. The H-forms thus connote nearness in those contexts where a choice exists. The concept of connotations due to membership in oppositions explains why it is the H-form that is used expressively for imminent (future) events: *Umrjah!* lit.: 'I died' (rather than the perfect *Umrjal sǎm!*), but it is the English perfect that glosses them, as in 'I've had it!' or 'I'm done for!'

Klagstadt (1963), following some early grammars, attempted to set up a 'definite'-'non-definite' opposition in the H vs. L forms. But this opposition cannot be the basic one involved, since H and L co-occur in the 'pluperfect' and 'conditional', which would then be both 'definite' and 'non-definite'. The 'perfect' *(ńa)pisal sǎm/si/e* is traditionally the 'indefinite past', yet a contrastive grammar points out that it is 'far more definite than the English present perfect', since it allows time adverbials to pinpoint the past event (Atanasova et al., 1963:125). 'Indefiniteness' is a contextually removable connotation of the 'perfect', which may also be explained in terms of the opposition of the L-forms with the deictic H-forms. Deictic forms are often referred to as 'definite' because, like the definite article, they elicit questions if used inappropriately. Just as a sentence *The student was here* elicits *What student?* in the

absence of identifying context, a sentence *Hodih u Cveta* 'I went to Cveta's' or *Pišeh* 'I was writing' elicit questions like *Koga?* 'When?' (In the last example, this property is strengthened by the addition of 'orientation to a reference point' common to E, the 'continuative' aspect, and to the English progressive.) Both definiteness and indefiniteness are derivable, the first from the deictic nature of the tense forms with H (and the English D), and indefiniteness from opposition with deictic-definite forms.

If the forms with H denote 'distancing' from the moment of speech (usually 'past', less often 'irreal'), then the forms without H would be expected to connote 'non-distanced', 'present' or 'real'. This is true of the 'present' tense forms, but not of the L-forms without H, since the meaning of [+L] removes some of the expected connotations of [-H]. And H, in turn, affects the expected connotations of the forms without L.

The opposition [±L] is very similar to the opposition [±H], but L does not point to the moment of speech; it is not a shifter. The meaning of L is 'tactic', indicating a relation to another event, not necessarily the speech event. It is what is sometimes called a 'relative tense'. The L-form is used in modals, and does not always denote anteriority; here too, the constant meaning is one of 'distancing', but the reference point of L does not shift from one speech act to another (as with the more strongly deictic [+H]), hence a 'perfect' does not elicit a When-question, though it does not preclude it either. It is this property that accounts for the 'indefinite' connotation of the 'perfect' in contrast with the 'definite' deictic H-preterites. It is perhaps this lack of pointing to the speech context that led Aronson (1967) to call the 'perfect' the 'unmarked past'. Lack of focus on the time of the event is accompanied sometimes by stronger focus on its result, particularly in combination with the present tense copula-auxiliary.

I have mentioned the connotation of closeness of the H-forms which allow expressive reference to imminent disasters. This is due to the opposition of H-forms to doubly distanced forms, marked both [+L] and [+Ø]. The nature of this modal 'distancing' has been one of the more controversial areas of Bulgarian grammar.

As shown in Fig. (1), a Bulgarian must choose between telling a story in the 'present', in the 'direct' preterites, or in the 'indirect' mood. In traditional grammar the latter is called *preizkazno naklonenie* 'renarrated mood'; the feature [+Ø] is a shifter, a sign referring to the speaker, who speaks 'as a distant person' (*kato daleč̆no lice* Trifonov 1905), withdrawing from responsibility for the statement.[6] The 'indirect' forms do not necessarily express doubt about the truth of the statement; the term 'dubitative' has sometimes been suggested, but it is clearly wrong. If the source is presented as reliable, then the use of the 'indirect' form may signal commendable objectivity, perhaps a touch of pedantry.[7] Balan (1958) called it *Modus commentativus*, but its actual meaning is closer to 'no comment'. For pragmatic reasons, 'no comment' is often interpreted as a pejorative comment, but linguistically, one can be quite neutral in 'passing something on without comment'.

The basic denotative meaning of the feature [+Ø], which specifies the absence of the 3rd person auxiliary *e* (3rd sg) and *sa* (3rd pl) is also one of distancing, this time of the speaker from the event. The forms of the 'reported' group are thus doubly distanced, for [L+] expresses distancing with respect to another event (usually, but not always 'anteriority'), and the modal distancing expressed by [+Ø] is superposed on it. It is in contrast with these doubly distanced forms that the narrative H-forms of 'direct narration' acquire their connotations of real, close, witnessed events. That these meanings are mere connotations of H is clear from the fact that H appears also in the conditional, and that even the narrative H-forms are used in contrary-to-fact conditions, in historical accounts of fairly recent but clearly unwitnessed events, etc. There is no need for a syntactic feature pair [±witnessed].

As for such features as [±reported] or [±evidential], they too are unnecessary. The 'reported' forms are not limited to reported speech, though that is their most frequent use (their *Hauptbedeutung*, not the constant general meaning or *Grundbedeutung*). The meaning is 'distancing of the speaker from the narrated event' not necessarily from 'the narrated speech event' as Jakobson suggested (1971:135)--though a frequent way of accomplishing this distancing is by reporting the event through another speaker. For example, the modal 'indirect' (née 'reported') forms can be used for witnessed events that are regarded as surprising. This is the so-called 'admirative' use.[8] For example, the sentence (3a) in Fig. (3) is ambiguous between the senses (3b) and (3c):

Fig. (3)

(3a) *Tja bila hubavica* (Examples from Romanski 1926:145)
she is/was [reported pres/impfct](a)beauty
is ambiguous between (3b) and (3c)
(3b) *Kazvat, čuvam, če e hubavica*
they-say,I-hear, that (she) is (a) beauty
(3c) *Neočakvah, očudvam se, kato uznavam, če e hubavica*
I-not-expect, marvel, as I-learn, that (she) is a beauty

'They say/ I hear, she's a beauty.'
'I didn't expect it/I marvel as I learn that she's a beauty.'

Other examples cited in the literature include *Ah, to valjalo!* 'Hey, it's raining!' clearly referring to witnessed, unreported processes. The Bulgarian speaker can use the modal form that allows him to distance himself from the event, not only to disclaim responsibility, but to express the equivalent of English 'Don't tell me!' or 'I can't believe my eyes!' The meaning of the [+Ø] feature is a simple marked mood, whose extension to reported speech is similar to the use of the subjunctive in French and German in the same contexts. But Bulgarian differs in allowing it to be used freely in main clauses, and in having a full set of forms so that an entire narrative can be laid in this mode.

I have claimed that the Ø-form is marked, while the actual segment is found in the unmarked form. One argument for this is that affirmation, one of the meanings of the copular verb, is normal (unmarked) for declarative sentences--there is no logical difference between a statement and affirmation of the statement. Weakened affirmation (expressed by the absence of the copula) is more unusual, perhaps not found in all languages as an obligatory category, hence more marked. A second argument involves neutralization. We have seen that the contrast [±Ø] is suppressed in the (marked) 1st and 2nd persons, appearing only in the unmarked 3rd. This is analogous to the suppression of gender markings in the (marked) plural. The neutralization is in favor of the form with auxiliary, by analogy with phonology (e.g., the unvoicing of final consonants in Bulgarian and Russian), in favor of the unmarked member. The distribution of contrasts is not accidental. A third possible argument for the unmarked status of *pisal e* and *pišel e* comes from the historical development of the new forms. Here we have another analogy with phonology, this time the 'filling of a gap' with an unmarked form. This is seen in Fig. (4). The 'perfect' with and without 3rd person auxiliary is descended from Common Slavic; the *pišel* forms (with the continuative aspect morpheme E) appeared in Modern Bulgarian in the order shown as 1., 2.

Fig. (4)

Unmarked 'perfect'	*(NA)PISAL E*		<--- *2.PIŠEL E* (fills gap)
Marked, now 'modal'	*(NA)PISAL Ø*	*1.PIŠEL Ø*	

Compare with the analogous situation in phonology (after Andersen 1966):

Fig. (5)

Russian			Ukrainian dialect		
š	č	[-voice] U	[+tense] M	š	č
ž		[+voice] M	[-tense] U	ž	<-- ǯ
Gap in marked series stays. Unmarked unvoiced C remains unpaired.			Gap in unmarked series filled: marked unpaired consonant does not remain unpaired.		

The four sets of syntactic features needed to generate the Bulgarian verb forms represent quite ordinary categories found in many other languages: a continuative aspect, a shifter-tense and a relative tense, and a distanced mood. There is no need to add to the inventory of substantive universals such oppositions as [±witnessed] or [±reported]. What is unusual about Bulgarian is the distribution of the features and their interrelations.

The narrative positions in Fig. (1) are reproduced below in terms of their features. As you can see in Fig. (6), the narration in the present (the 'visualizing' plane) makes no statement of distancing. Only the relative tense is available for flashbacks. The 'reminiscing' plane allows a wider choice of aspect and tense features, permitting a far greater differentiating of events and variety in the narrative tempo.[9] The 'direct' and 'indirect' narrative positions may be viewed as a substitution of one kind and degree of distancing for another.

Fig. (6)

	'Visualizing'	'Reminiscing'	
	(Direct)	Direct	Indirect
STORY			
aspect: ±P	-Perfective	±Perfective	±Perfective
±E	+Continuative	±Continuative	±Continuative
tense: ±H +shifter	-Distanced	+Distanced	-Distanced
±L -shifter	-Distanced	-Distanced	+Distanced
mood: ±Ø +shifter	-Distanced	-Distanced	+Distanced
FLASHBACKS			
aspects:	±P ±E	±P	±P
tenses:	-H +L	+H +L	-H +L+L
mood:	-Ø	-Ø	+Ø

Notes

[1] The classifications and terms are taken from Andrejčin (1944) and its several successors, e.g., Andrejčin et al. (1957), (1962). The English terms are from Lord (1962), a textbook based on the Andrejčin descriptions. Lord uses the more accurate terms 'direct' and 'indirect' for the contrast that is often called 'witnessed' vs. 'reported'.

[2] The term 'evidential' was introduced by Jakobson (1957[1971: 135]) for a category that relates a narrated event, a speech event, and a narrated speech event. Jakobson's tentative suggestion was accompanied by a pair of examples: "To our question, what happened to the steamer Evdokija, a Bulgarian first answered *Zaminala* 'It is claimed to have sailed', and then added, *Zamina* 'I bear witness, it sailed.'" Since these terms were used in the context of a discussion of marked-unmarked oppositions, it has been widely assumed that the Bulgarian 'reported' and 'witnessed' ('indirect' and 'direct') forms were in privative/subordinative opposition. The term 'evidential' has passed into the oral tradition in informal allusions to the Bulgarian 'reported' mood, and so has 'non-evidential'. Mutafčiev (1964) has pointed out that the 'visualizing plane' is outside the opposition; it might thus seem that a category [±Evidential] should be distributed as shown in Fig. (2), with the 'visualizing plane' making "no statement of 'Evidential'". However, such a feature is not needed for specifying the morphology, nor

is it necessary for accounting for the meaning. Moreover, it will be shown that the 'indirect' forms do not always refer to narrated speech events, hence they do not really illustrate the 'Evidential' as Jakobson tentatively described it.

[3] The existence of the relatively new form *pišel e* has been a matter of controversy. The older grammars (Mladenov and Vasilev 1939:305-6) list two kinds of 'perfect': *pisal (e)* and *pišel (e)*. But though the newer official grammars list separate paradigms for *pisal sǎm/si/e/sme/ste/sa* 'indefinite past (perfect) indicative', and *pisal sǎm/si/Ø/sme/ste/Ø* 'aorist tense, reported mood', *pišel e* is mentioned only in passing as a variant of the 'reported present-imperfect' used for 'personal assertions (Andrejčin 1944:278; Maslov 1959:250); it is not mentioned at all in the 1957 and 1962 grammars for pedagogical institutes. (There may be understandable reluctance to set up yet another paradigm with homonymous forms.) The existence of *pišel e* as a form that bears the same relation to the 'perfect' as the imperfect bears to the aorist has been fully documented by Kančev (1960), also by Janakiev (1962a) and Aronson (1977), who calls it the 'non-witnessed, non-reported imperfect' --these authors give examples where the auxiliary could not have been omitted, for instance in the complements of factives (e.g., after *Znam položitelno, če* ... 'I know positively that ...', in cases where a speaker draws a conclusion on the basis of circumstantial evidence, etc.).

[4] See the examples in Note 3 above. Andrejčin (1944) defends his classification, saying that the difference is obvious from the context, i.e., he recognizes that the distinction in 1st and 2nd persons is purely contextual. But his later grammars for teachers do not mention this and simply give the separate paradigms. In a polemical article, Popželjazkov says that this system represents "torture, terrible violence to the spirit of students, not only in the schools, but in higher education as well, and even for the teachers who, as in the story of 'The Emperor's New Clothes' are forced to insist on distinctions they themselves cannot perceive, for they could not back them up with clear specific examples... which is true of the 1st and 2nd persons of the 'reported' mood as well as other homonymous forms that are assigned to different tenses (1962:90, translation mine)."

An alternative classification is given in Aronson (1967:94), the one systematic attempt I know of to relate the L-forms to each other in a Prague framework. The H-forms are called 'non-confirmative', and the 'reported-non-reported' distinction within this category appears only in the 3rd person. This analysis is closer to the actual facts of Bulgarian, but it assumes a privative opposition between H-forms and L-forms. It also fails to account for other forms with H or L or both.

[5] The question mark in Fig. (2) indicates uncertainty about the status of E in the auxiliary. It may be carried by the forms *bjah be(še)*, historically the imperfect of the copula. It is also possible that E is part of the lexical meaning of the copular stem. There is a very large class of verbs (such as the derived imper-

fectives like *napisvam* 'write (down), be writing down'), which have only one L-form *napisval (e)*, which is semantically closer to the imperfect series than to the aorist-perfect series but does not have the suffix E. It may be that E is part of the lexical meaning of these verbs, or that E has fallen together in this class with the imperfectivizing morpheme AJ.

Janakiev (1962b) isolated a continuative aspect in the 'present' (or 'non-past') of both aspects (perfective non-pasts can be used expressively for 'generic-iterative statements') Janakiev argues convincingly that this marked 'continuative' feature is what prevents the Bulgarian perfective non-past from being used as a punctual future (as the corresponding form is in Russian). A similar aspectual feature was isolated in the imperfect, distinguishing it from the aorist, by Maslov (1959:256) and by Aronson (1967:86). Dejanova (1970) and Stankov (1969) emphasize the 'orientation to a moment (=reference point)' in E-forms.

[6] Aronson (1977) suggests a terminological reform, in which the definitions of 'mood' and 'status' are interchanged. He argues convincingly that the Bulgarian 'reported' (our 'indirect') forms express 'status'. Since the definition of his 'status' is the same as our 'mood', I keep the latter term here because it translates the traditional Bulgarian term.

[7] The 19th century writer Ljuben Karavelov used the 'indirect' forms to tell the most fantastic stories as if they were accurate historical reports, with comical effect. Andrejčin (1949/50:128 writes: 'Karavelov cherche à suggerer à ses lecteurs qu'il relate des faits authentiques; et c'est pourquoi, probablement, il use de la narration d'autrui.'

[8] 'Admirative' is the name of a category in Albanian (an inverted perfect) that is translated into Bulgarian with the 'indirect' forms. Demina (1959) insists on yet another set of homonymous paradigms for the 'admirative' in Bulgarian as distinct from the 'reported'--since the events are clearly witnessed, not reported. Maslov (1959), reluctant to accept fully homonymous paradigms (in addition to the partly homonymous ones he does accept), settles for 'grammatical polysemy'. Darden (1977) points out that the admirative use is a normal expressive extension of the 'reported' ('indirect') forms. Friedman (1977) gives translation data from Albanian and several other languages, pointing out that the admirative use of the indirect forms is essentially limited in Bulgarian to stative verbs like 'be', 'have', and weather verbs. The similarity of this use of the Bulgarian verb forms to certain uses of the imperfect of the same verbs in Ancient Greek was noted by Beševliev (1928). There is clearly no need for such a category (or set of features) in Bulgarian.

[9] The interplay of the 'visualizing' and 'reminiscing' narrative positions in the structure of a literary text is discussed in Chvany (to appear). An application of an analysis of Old Russian in the same framework to the poetics of the Igor' Tale is Chvany (1977).

References

Andersen, Henning. 1966. Tenues and Mediae in the Slavic Languages: A Historical Investigation. Harvard University Doctoral dissertation. Ms.

Andrejčin, L. 1944. Osnovna bălgarska gramatika. Sofia.

Andrejčin, L., K. Popov, M. Ivanov. 1957. Săvremenen bălgarski ezik. Sofia.

Andrejčin, L., N. Kostov, E. Nikolov. Bălgarski ezik za institutite za načalni učiteli. Sofia.

Andrejčin, L. 1949/50. Ezik i stil na L. Karavelov. Summary in Fr.: La langue et le style de L. Karavelov. Godišnik na sofijskija universitet. Ist.-filol. fak. XLVI:4.

Aronson, Howard L. 1967. The grammatical categories of the indicative in the contemporary Bulgarian literary language. To Honor Roman Jakobson. The Hague: Mouton. 82-98.

Aronson, Howard L. 1977. Interrelationships between aspect and mood in Bulgarian. Folia Slavica I:1. 9-32.

Atanasova, T., N. Radulova, M. Rankova, R. Rusev. 1963. Anglijska gramatika v sravnenie s bălgarski ezik. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo (Reviewed by C. V. Chvany. SEEJ XII:1.116. 1968.)

Balan, A. Teodorov-, 1958. Nova bălgarska gramatika za vsjakogo. sv. 3. Glagol. Sofia.

Beševliev, V. Kăm văprosa za t. n. 'admirativ' v bălgarski ezik. Makedonski Pregled IV:1. 174-7. 1928.

Chvany, Catherine V. 1977. The role of tense and aspect in the narration of the 'Igor' Tale'. Symposium on the Structure of the Narrative Text. NYU. November 18-20, 1977. To appear in Proceedings, ed. by Andrej Kodjak et al.

Chvany, Catherine V. to appear. Grammatical categories in the narration of 'Zemja' by Elin Pelin. Folia Slavica II.

Darden, Bill J. 1977. On the admirative in Bulgarian. Folia Slavica I:1.59-63.

Dejanova, Marija. 1970. Istorija na složnite minali vremena v bălgarski. Sofia:BAN.

Demina, E. I. 1959. Pereskazyvatel'nye formy v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke. Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka. S. Bernštejn, ed. Moscow:ANSSSR. 313-78.

Friedman, Victor. 1977. The Admirative in Balkan Slavic, Albanian and Turkish. Paper read at OSU Symposium-Conference on SE Europe. April 6-9, 1977. Columbus.

Jakobson, Roman. 1957. Reprinted 1971. Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. In Selected Writings II. The Hague: Mouton. 130-147.

Janakiev, M. 1962a. Bălgarskite glagolni formi, v koito se săobštava za minali săbitija i načinite za preveždaneto na ruskoto 'prošedšee vremja'. Bălgarski ezik i literatura. 2.3-10.

Janakiev, M. 1962b. Za gramemite, naričani v bălgarskata gramatika 'segašno vreme' i 'bădešte vreme'. BAN, Izv. na inst. za bălgarski ezik VIII. 419-32.

Joos, Martin. 1964. The English Verb--Form and Meanings. Milwaukee: University of Winsconsin Press.

Klagstadt, Harold L., Jr. 1963. The opposition Definite/Non-definite in South Slavic verb morphology. Indiana Slavic Studies III. 35-41.

Kančev, Ivan. 1960. Beležki vărxu njakoi složni glagolni vremena. BE X. 223-30.

Lord, Albert B. 1962. Beginning Bulgarian. The Hague: Mouton.

Maslov, Ju. S. 1959. Glagol'nyj vid v sovremennom bolgarskom jazyke. Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka. S. Bernštejn, ed. Moscow: ANSSSR. 157-312.

Mladenov, Stefan, i St. Vasilev. 1939. Gramatika na bălgarski ezik. Sofia.

Mutafčiev, Radoslav. 1964. Segašno istoričesko vreme v săvremennija bălgarski ezik. Sofia.

Popželjazkov, T. 1962. Po văprosa za preizkaznoto naklonenie. BE XII. 84-90.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. Elements of Symbolic Logic. New York: Macmillan.

Romanski, Stojan. 1926. Review of articles on the admirative by Weigand. Makedonski Pregled II:3. 143-5.

Scatton, Ernest A. 1976. Bulgarian Phonology. Slavica: Columbus.

Stankov, V. 1969. Bălgarskite glagolni vremena. Sofia:Nauka i izkustvo.

Trifonov, Ju. 1905. Sintaktični beležki za săedinenieto na minalo dejstvitelno pričastie s glagola săm v novobălgarskija ezik. Periodičesko spisanie na balgarskoto knižovno družestvo v Sofija. LXVI. 155-92.