［論文］

Aspect and the –*l* participle forms in Bulgarian

Eleonora YOVKOVA-SHII

1. Introduction

As is well known, Bulgarian possesses verbal forms composed of the –*l* participle, historically derived from the present perfect. These forms, called 'renarrative', 'non-witnessed', and 'evidential', have functions in three domains, i.e. temporal (Past Indefinite), aspectual (Perfect) and modal (Evidential, Epistemic, Admirative) and vary in accordance with the type of the participle (Aorist participle, Imperfect participle) and the omission or preservation of the auxiliary in the third person. The variety of the forms and their functions presents problems with classification, description of basic semantic features and the usage conditions of these forms. Most studies on the –*l* participle (Andrejčin 1944[1978], Stojanov 1964[1993], Penčev 1967, Gerdžikov 1977, 1984, Friedman 1982, 1999, 2000, Nicolova 2007, 2008) focus exactly on such problems. The –*l* participle forms are typically discussed from the point of view of the relation of their functions and meanings to modality. Recently, some studies (Koev 2011, 2016, Smirnova 2013) analyzed these forms in regard to how their distribution depends on the temporal relations specified in the context. Except for some remarks in a few studies (Guentchéva & Desclés 1982, Izvorski 1997), these forms, however, have not been explored in regard to their grammatical or semantic aspectual features. The interdependency of aspect and modality in general have received relatively less attention in lingusitics in comparison to tense and aspect or tense and modality. In this paper we will focus on the problem of aspect and show how aspectual features affect the distribution of the functions of the –*l* participle forms in discourse. Fleischman (1992:519) points out that 'verb forms marked for imperfective aspect, particularly but not exclusively where combined with past tense, express a spectrum of meanings and functions subsumable under the modal heading of irrealis[1]'. Israeli (1996: 16) gives examples from Russian to discuss formalizing the context of the presupposition of expectation in terms of the shared knowledge of a pragmatic contract between the discourse participants and argues that if there is a contract, the speaker uses the perfective verb as in *Vy pročitali Vojnu i mir?* 'Did you read *War and peace?*', but if there is no contract, or the speaker thinks that the contract has been broken, s/he uses the imperfective verb as in *Vy čitali*

Vojnu i mir? 'Have you [ever] read *War and peace?*'.

We will argue that the modal functions/meanings of the *–l* participle in Bulgarian are imperfectively marked. We will show that the Imperfect type of the participle and also the semantic atelicity of the verb impose conditions on the distribution of the functions of the *–l* participle in regard to modality.

In some previous works (Yovkova-Shii 2003, 2004, 2011) we argued that forms with the Imperfect participle are more highly modal than forms with the Aorist participle since the forms with the Aorist participle as in (1)-(3) can express modal (evidential) functions preserving at the same time their non-modal (prototypical) functions, while the forms with the Imperfect participle as in (4)-(6) have only modal functions, some of them being evidential (inference from hearsay, hearsay) and others non-evidential (admirativity, disbelief, etc.), as shown below. The forms with the Aorist participle are polysemous but the polysemy can be removed on a contextual (pragmatic) level or, in some cases, by some syntactic features (the type of the agent of the sentence, the type of the sentence)[2].

(1) *Az **săm čela** tazi kniga.* (indefinite past, experiential perfect)
   I have read this book.

(2) *Ivan **e došal**.* (perfect of result/current relevance, inference from result, surprise)
   Ivan has come (and he is now here).

(3) *Vlakăt **e pristignal***. (perfect of result/current relevance, inference from result, surprise)
   The train has arrived (and it is now here).

(4) *Toj **e piel** mnogo*. (inference from hearsay)
   He drinks/had drunk/was drinking a lot.

(5) ***Imalo** edno vreme edna baba i edin djado*. (hearsay)
   Once upon a time there lived an old woman and an old man.

(6) *Dăšterja Vi **svirela** mnogo xubavo na piano!* (surprize)
   Your daughter plays piano so well!

<div align="right">(Examples from Yovkova-Shii, 2003)</div>

The forms with the Aorist participle and the Imperfect participle are typically

distinguished in the existing literature. However, the distinction is usually made from the point of view of the correlation of the –*l* participle to the tense forms, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1   The correlation of tense and –*l* participle forms of *piša* 'write'

Tense, 3rd person		–l participle, masculine
Present	*piše*	*pišel (e)*
Past Imperfect	*pišeše*	*pišel (e)*
Aorist	*pisa*	*pisal (e)*
Present Perfect	*pisal*	*bil (e) pisal*
Past Perfect	*beše pisal*	*bil (e) pisal*
Future	*šte piše*	*štjal (e) da piše*
Future in the Past	*šteše da piše*	*štjal (e) da piše*
Future Perfect	*šte e pisal*	*štjal (e) da e pisal*
Future Perfect in the Past	*šteše da e pisal*	*štjal (e) da e pisal*

As Gerdžikov (1977) points out, on the level of the participle, which is higher in the tense-modality hierarchy the forms concide in pairs (except for the Aorist) and the number of possible forms decreases due to the principle of compensation, which observes that as language forms change category, some of their complexity is neutralized. Later in our analysis on the Aorist and Imperfect participle we will come back to this topic and argue that the homophonous forms are neutarlized in regard to temporality but preserve the aspectual features marked in the tenses. Thus, *pišel (e)* loses the distinction of Present/Past Imperfect but preserves 'imperfectivity' marked in both tenses.

The paper is organized in the following way. **Section 2** makes a brief outline of aspect in Bulgarian. In **section 3** we discuss the problem of defining the basic semantic features of the –*l* participle constructions. **Section 4** is the main part of this paper and focuses on the interdependency of aspect and distribution of the functions of the –*l* participle forms. **Section 5** is the conclusion.

2. Aspect in Bulgarian

Before proceeding with the analysis of the participle forms, we will briefly go over the specific features of aspect in Bulgarian.

Bulgarian possesses morphological properties for expressing aspect that are prototypical of the Slavic family, in particular a distinction between perfective and

imperfective verbs. Each verb in Bulgarian is either imperfective or perfective and the verbal pairing is common for most of the verbs. The unprefixed/unsuffixed verbs like *piša* 'write' are usually imperfective (primary imperfective) and do not have a pair. By adding a suffix they can be turned into perfective verbs (*napiša*, *podpiša*, etc.). The derived perfective verbs, by further suffixation, can be turned into secondary imperfective verbs (*napisvam*, *podpisvam*, etc.). Bulgarian has the most productive imperfectivizing system among the Slavic languages because from practically every perfective verb it is possible to derive an imperfective form. Imperfectivization is mostly inflectional and the result is 'true aspectual pairs' which differ only in aspect (Maslov 1963, 1981), i.e. telic forms become semantically atelic (*napiša* vs. *napisvam*).

Prefixivization, on the other hand, due to the incredibly rich semantics of the verbal prefixes, is a more complicated matter than suffixation. Traditionally, the prefixation is usually considered to be derivational, adding new lexical properties to the meaning of the imperfective verb. The original imperfective verb in such pairs is thought to be a simplex imperfective standing outside of the perfective/imperfective opposition (Maslov 1963, Aronson 1985). The fact that the perfective correlate in every such opposition is able to form a pair by the means of a second imperfectivization (cf. *piša-napiša-napisvam*) has been stated as evidence that pairs like *piša-napiša* are not true aspectual pairs and it has been argued (Isačenko 1960, Maslov 1963) that prefixation always contributes lexico-semantic content. However, prefixes do not exclusively mark telicity and, as some recent studies on prefixation in the Slavic languages have shown (Smith 1991[1997], Gehrke 2005, Gvozdanović 2012), there are two types of prefixes, namely, internal and external. The internal prefixes, as in <u>*na*</u>*piša* 'write to the end', <u>*pod*</u>*piša* 'sign', affect the argument structure and induce telicity. On the other hand, the external prefixes as in <u>*po*</u>*spja* 'sleep a little bit', <u>*za*</u>*spja* 'fall asleep' bear on the event as a whole and do not necessarily induce telicity. Gvozdanović (2012: 783) has stated that the essential difference between internal and external prefixes is found in their scope, thus internal prefixes scope over the verb with the capacity to produce lexically distinct new verbs with new argument schemata, while external prefixes scope over the verb with its existing argument schema and do not derive a new lexical item. Again, Gvozdanović (ibid.) argues that the distinction between internal and external prefixes is a matter of combination of the prefix meaning and the meaning of the verb phrase in accordance with the compositionality principle (Verkuyl 1972, 2012).

The opposition perfective/imperfective coexists with 'modes of action' (Aktionsart[3]) which pertain to the lexicon. The two areas are often mixed up. Dahl (1985) maintains the idea that the Slavic aspect is Aktionsart and thus a lexical category. Andersson (1972) persists on the grammatical character of the Slavic aspect. Dickey (2000) argues that aspect in Slavic is slightly dependent on the situation type. It is necessary to make a clear distinction: on

the one hand, the category aspect is treated as a verbal category, similar to tense, gender, and person, i.e. a grammatical category. As such, it has its own terminology. On the other hand, Aktionsart, is used for the description of languages, which might or might not have a grammatical aspectual category. Obviously, Aktionsart and its terminology can be applied universally, though the types of verbs in this classification do not enter paradigmatic relations. The basic property of the Bulgarian aspectual system is definitely the interaction of lexical and grammatical semantics. The idiosyncrasy of the system consists in the fusion of aspectual and lexical meanings. Traditionally this interaction associates perfectivity with telicity and imperfectivity with atelicity (Chung and Timberlake 1985)[4], however, it has been shown (Padučeva 1996, Ignatova 2008) that morphologically perfective verbs can express both telicity and atelicity. Also, as Verkuyl (2012: 574) states, the verb cannot be considered the only factor in providing aspectual information but 'the quantification information of the arguments of the verb plays a role in the construction of the complex aspectual information', and terminativity (boundedness, telicity) is a marked aspectual compositional property of a sentence. According to the compositional principle, lexical aspect is not a matter of verbs alone, but a matter of a compositional effect of verbs and their arguments. By adding an argument to the predicate an activity can be transformed into an accomplishment. Number and definiteness or specificity of the arguments are decisive for boundedness (telicity). For example, in relation to the compositional principle, the imperfective verb *vărvjah* 'I walked' in Bulgarian, by adding the location phrase *do universiteta* 'to the university', e.g. *vărvjah do universiteta* 'I walked to the university', turns into a telic one.

In Bulgarian, in addition to the aspectual opposition of perfective/impefrective, there exists another opposition expressed only in past, i.e. the Aorist/Imperfect opposition. There has been a considerable debate in the literature as to whether the Aorist/Imperfect opposition should be considered a temporal distinction (Stankov 1967[1976], Andrejčin 1944[1978], Bunina 1970) or an aspectual distinction (Comrie 1976, Maslov 1981, Lindstedt 1985). In some recent studies (Rivero and Arregui 2010) this opposition has been reffered to as *viewpoint aspect*, expressing semantic (im)perfectivity. In Bulgarian, the combination of the grammatical aspectual forms with the Aorist/Imperfect opposition results in a combination of four grammatical items as shown in Table 2.

Table 2   The Aorist/Imperfect paradigm of *kaža/kazvam* 'say'

Present, 3rd person	Aorist, 3rd person	Imperfect, 3rd person
kaže (perfective)	*kaza*	*kažeše*
kazva (imperfective)	*kazvaše*	*kazvaše*[5]

For primary unprefixed imperfective verbs the combination becomes more complicated, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3   The Aorist/Imperfect paradigm of *piša/napiša/napisvam* 'write'

Present, 3rd person	Aorist, 3rd person	Imperfect, 3rd person
piše (imperfective)	*pisa*	*pišeše*
napiše (perfective)	*napisa*	*napišeše*
napisva (imperfective)	*napisva*	*napisvaše*

According to Comrie (1976: 31-32), the perfective Imperfect 'describes an iterative situation and superimposes upon imperfectivity', while the imperfective Aorist 'gives explicit reference to the internal complexity' and in it the perfectivity dominates. Aronson (1981: 198-199) claims that it is the perfective/imperfective opposition which is superordinated. Comrie's claim, i.e. that the Aorist/Imperfect feature should be considered higher in the hierarchy, seems more acceptable if we consider Gvozdanović's following argument. Gvozdanović (2012: 792) argues that the morphological richness of verbs results in complex layering of aspect where each higher layer is grounded on the lower layer but autonomous of it and each higher layer may impose conditions on the interpretation of the lower layer. This indication can be displayed as follows:

[viewpoint aspect [situation/grammatical aspect [lexical aspect]]].

We will take into consideration this argument when we discuss the distinction of the functions of the Aorist and the Imperfect participle.

3.   The –l participle forms: functions and meaning

All the verbs in Bulgarian have –*l* participle forms. If we take as an example the verbs in Table 3, their participle forms are shown in Table 4.

Table 4   The participle forms of *piša/napiša/napisvam* 'write'

	Aorist participle	Imperfect participle
imperfective	*pisal (e)* *(napisval (e))*	*pišel (e)* *napisval (e)*
perfective	*napisal (e)*	*napišel (e)*

As we mentioned, the –*l* participle forms can express non-modal as well as modal meanings. A problem arises when one tries to define the modal feature expressed by the –*l* participle forms.

There are two views concerning the definition of the basic semantic feature (or, function) of the the so called evidential forms in the languages of the world. According to the first one (Jakobson 1957[1971], Anderson 1986, Aikhenvald 2004), the core meaning/function is defined as marking the source of the information. However, markers of evidentiality can also show the speaker's subjective assessment of the validity of the information or the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition and thus, according to the second point of view (Lyons 1977, Chafe 1986, Willet 1988), the evidential forms are subsumed under the label of epistemic modality. For the Bulgarian –*l* participle forms (called in some studies evidentials), the first point of view, that the core meaning/function marks the source of the information, finds support, for example, in Nicolova (2007), while the latter point of view, that they express the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition or attitude of the speaker toward the source of the information, has been supported by Gerdžikov (1977, 1984) and Friedman (1986).

Since we have already discussed these problems and have made our position clear in other work (Yovkova-Shii 2003, 2004), we will not deal with these problems further here, but just mention that we consider that the –*l* participle constructions have a tripartite meaning, i.e. that besides their non-modal functions (temporal/aspectual) they can encode modality in the form of source of information and speaker attitudes toward the information. Based on this, we prefer to define the modal meaning of the –*l* participle forms in a broader sense as marking the 'source and certainty of the speaker's knowledge'.

4. Aspect and the –*l* participle forms

Many studies in Bulgarian (see for example Gerdžikov 1977, Bojadžiev et al. 1999, Nicolova 2008) view the relationship between the Perfect form and its –*l* participle forms to be as shown in Table 5 and argue that there exist two homophonous forms with different functions, one, the indicative Perfect and the other, the conclusive Aorist. In this study, however, we will consider forms such as *pisal e* as polysemous expressing the non-modal (perfect) and modal (inferential) meanings contextually or pragmatically.

Table 5   The Perfect and its conclusive and renarrative forms of *piša* 'write'

indicative	conclusive		renarrative	
Perfect	Aorist	Imperfect	Aorist	Imperfect
pisal e	*pisal e*	*pišel e*	*pisal*	*pišel*

For the purposes of our study, we will not deal with all the forms given in Table 1 but will instead focus on the combinations given in Table 4, i.e. perfective Aorist, imperfective Aorist, perfective Imperfect and imperfective Imperfect.

In regard to factivity, utterances can be classified as factive, non-factive (epistemic) and contra-factive (unreal). A factive utterance commits the speaker to the truth of the proposition, a non-factive utterance commits the speaker to neither the truth nor falsity of the proposition, a contra-factive utterance commits the speaker to the falsity of the propsoition (unreal conditions).

The forms with the Aorist –*l* participle can occur both in factive and non-factive utterances while the forms with the Imperfect –*l* participle occur in non-factive or contra-factive utterances. The analysis below will illustrate this claim.

4.1. The Imperfect –*l* participle forms

We will start our analysis with the Imperfect –*l* participle forms because these forms invariably express modality.

The perfective Imperfect participle form can not be used as a predicate of the main clause and occurs only in subordinate clauses for contra-factual (conditional, unrealized) events as in (7) where the telic event of 'writing the letter' is represented as non-real.

(7) *Părvoto, koeto trjabvalo da storjat ošte šom **napišel** pismoto, a toj šjal da go napiše ošte săštata sutrin, bilo da podxvanat obrabotvaneto na zemjata.* (BulNC)

The first thing they had to do when he wrote the letter, which he should write tomorrow morning, was to begin with the cultivation of the soil.

The event of 'writing the letter' in (7) is represented as possible but non-real because (7) cannot imply *Toj e napisal pismoto* 'He has written the letter'. The imperfectivity of the Imperfect, i.e. the higher level in the aspectual hierarchy of the form, imposes constrains on the telicity of the verb phrase although the compositional structure of the phrase including the participle expresses completion.

The imperfective Imperfect –*l* participle forms correspond to both the Past Imperfect

tense and the Present tense. In previous studies (Yovkova-Shii 2003, 2004, 2011, 2013) we have argued that in their usage for present events as in (8), i.e. witnessed or direct evidence information, these forms express 'surprise', while in their usage for past events as in (9) they express unattested facts which we define as 'inference from hearsay'. In (8) the event time and the time when the speaker acquires the evidence concide, while in (9) the event time precedes the time of the evidence acquisition.

(8) *Dăšterja Vi* **svirela** *mnogo xubavo na piano!* (Yovkova-Shii, 2003)
　　 Your daughter plays piano very well!

(9) *Prez 1867 god. Statelov učitelstva v Sevlievo, a ottam idva v Kazanlăk. Osven učitelskata si rabota Statelov* **e pišel** *statii văv v. "Pravo", "Vek", sp. "Učilište" i dr.* (BulNC)
　　 In 1867 Statelov is a teacher at Sevlievo and then comes to Kazanlăk. Besides his teaching activity, he was writing articles for "Pravo", "Vek", "Učilište" etc.

　　Both the Present and the Past Imperfect do not signal any completion of the event and acquisition of a goal, and thus are marked for imperfectivity. It is this feature of imperfectivity (semantic atelicity) which is preserved in the Imperfect participle, corresponding to both tenses.

　　The prefixed imperfective participles preserve the semantic feature of 'repetition/ habituality' in the past (cf. *vseki den toj e napisval po edno pismo* 'every day he wrote/he was writing a letter'). It is not possible to formally distinguish the imperfective Imperfect from the imperfective Aorist for verbs of the third congugation type. However, as shown below, the distinction can be made on a contexual level. (10) is an imperfective Imperfect, while (11), when used with a first person agent, is an imperfective Aorist, expressing perfect experience.

(10) *V denja na văzpominanieto Bog* **napisval** *prisădata, ala* **postavjal** *pečatite edva deset dni po-kăsno.* (BulNC)
　　 In the day of reminiscence, God was writing the verdict but was signing ten days later.

(11) *Poneže* "*barabanistite*" *imaxa i trupa, obikaljaxa Bălgarija, az često păti* **săm napisval** *tzeli broeve.* (BulNC)
　　 Since the "drummers" had a group and were going around Bulgaria, I was very often writing a series of articles.

The –*l* participle form in (11), which substitutes the factive predicate *napisvax*, is used in this example euphemistically. Similar usages are found in utterances for unconcious events (dreams, reminiscences) with a first person agent (for details see Yovkova-Shii 2004).

4.2. The Aorist –*l* participle forms

The following example illustrates the coocurrence of the Imperfect –*l* participle (*e pišel*) and the Aorist –*l* participle (*e napisal*).

(12) *Flober **e pišel** s usilie, no kakvoto **e napisal**, e vse xubavo*. (BulNC)

  Flober was writing with dificulty, but all that he wrote is nice.

The form *e pišel* is an imperfective Imperfect participle and the form *e napisal* is a perfective Aorist participle. The first part of the sentence displays that the speaker cannot commit him/herself to the truth of the proposition, while the second part of the sentence displays a strong commitment on the part of the speaker to the truth of the proposition (i.e., <u>az znam</u> *kakvo e napisal* 'I know what he has written'). This distinction in meaning is made by the type of the participle.

As mentioned in the introduction, the Aorist –*l* participle forms can be used in non-modal contexts. The non-modal usage of this forms is found in perfect expressions. Several types of perfect (universal perfect, perfect of result, experiential perfect, perfect of recent past) have been distingusihed (Comrie 1976, Izvorski 1997). The –*l* participle forms typically express experiential perfect with a first person agent as in (11), and perfect of result with a second or third person agent in statements. Here we will focus on utterances with a third person agent and will not deal with the experiential perfect.

Both perfective and imperfective verbs combine with the Aorist participle. As pointed out (Iatridou et al. 2001), the perfect of result is possible only with telic predicates. The Aorist participle form with a telic predicate, however, can be ambiguous between perfect of result and inference based on the current relevance of the completed event (see (2), (3)).

When the verb is atelic, either imperfective as *pila* 'drank' in (13) or perfective as *postojal* 'stayed for a while' in (14), the modal nuances strengthen and the form typically expresses inference or uncertainty of the speaker[6].

(13) *Tja **e pila** vinoto* (*no ne znam dali go e izpila tzjaloto*). (Iatridou 2001:173)

  She drank the wine (but I don't know if she has drunk it).

(14) *Verojatno **e postojal** v stajata izvestno vreme sled ubijstvoto*.(BulNC)

　　Apparently, after the murder he stayed for a while in the room.

5.　Conclusion

In the introduction we mentioned that a relationship has been pointed between high modality and imperfectivity. As the above analysis for Bulgarian displayed, the distribution of the functions of the –*l* participle forms is interdependent with the aspectuality of the participle. The modal/non-modal functions of the –*l* participle are primarily distinguished on the basis of the Imperfect/Aorist opposition which, if we take into consideration the idea of layering of aspect, is superordinated in the aspectual hierarchy and imposes conditions on the (im)perfectivity of the participle. Further, within the forms of the Aorist participle, the semantic telicity of the verb also imposes conditions on the distribution of the functions into non-modal and modal. Guentchéva and Desclés (1982: 55) have described the contribution of the Imperfect and Aorist forms in terms of the specification of a process as open (excluding initial and final boundary) or closed (including initial and final boundary). In our opinion, it is the semantic feature of unboundedness through which forms including 'imperfectivity' in their meaning express an action as an open-ended process that strengthens the degree of modality of –*l* participle forms.

　　It is a natural fact for forms that have non-modal (factive) meanings to be more commonly used in discourse than more highly modal forms. This fact is supported by the contents of the Bulgarian National Corpus (BulNC). If we take as an example the forms in Table 4 and look at the examples listed for them in the BulNC, the results are as follows: *napisal (e)* [4529 examples], *pisal (e)* [3163 examples], *pišel (e)* [385 examples], *napisval (e)* [6 examples], *napišel (e)* [3 examples]. The form with the perfective Imperfect, due to its specificity of expressing non-real events, has the most limited usage in the corpus.

Notes

[1]　What Fleischman includes in the domain of 'irrealis' are not only unreal or conditional events but also events requiring epistemic verification.

[2]　For example, questions with a second person agent (*Čel li si tazi kniga?* Have you ever read this book?) can express only 'experience'.

[3]　The term *Aktionsart* is in fact ambiguous and, as Comrie (1976: 7) points out, it has been used in two different ways, the first one representing the lexicalization of the relevant semantic distinctions

(which is close to Vendler's notion of aspect), and the second, used by most Slavists for the lexicalization by means of derivational morphology.

[4] Chung and Timberlake argue that lexical aspect refers to situation type, and morphological aspect refers to perfective/imperfective opposition although situation type and derivational aspect are to some degree interdependant.

[5] The Aorist and Imperfect first person forms of the imperfective verbs of third conjugation (third person singular's ending –a) have the same form. They can be distinguished by the stress (*ka'zvax* Aorist, *kava'x* Imperfect) but this is not very common. As Fielder (1993: 48-49) points out, for educated speakers in Sofija there is no stress difference and there is no way to verify whether the choice is the Aorist or the Imperfect.

[6] Iatridou et al. (2001) argue that a perfect participle based on an imperfective stem can have 'universal perfect' reading as in *Marija vinagi e običala Ivan* (Maria has always loved Ivan).

Bibliography

Aikhenvald, A. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford:Oxford University Press

Andrejčin, L. 1944 [1978]. *Osnovna bălgarska gramatika*. Sofija: Hemus.

Anderson, L. 1986. Evidentials, paths of change and mental maps: Typologically regular asymmetries. In W. Chafe and J. Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality: the Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 273-312.

Andersson, S. G. 1972. *Aktionalität im Deutschen: Eine Untersuchung unter Vergleich mit dem Rssichen Aspektsystem*. Stockholm: Uppsala University.

Aronson, H. 1981. Towards a typology of aspect in the languages of the Balkan peninsula. *Folia Slavica* 4.2-3, 198-204.

Aronson, H. 1985. Form, function and the 'perefective' in Bulgarian. In M. Flier and A. Timberlake (eds.) *Scope of Slavic Aspect*. UCLA Slavic Studies, 274-285.

Bojadžiev, T. et al. 1999. *Săremenen bălgarski ezik. Fonetika. Leksikologija. Slovoobrazuvane. Morfologija. Sintaksis*. Sofija: P. Beron.

Bunina, I. K. 1970. *Istorija glagol'nyx vremen v bolgarskom jazyke*. Moskva: Nauka.

Chafe, W. 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In W. Chafe and J. Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality: the Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 261-272.

Chung, S. and A. Timberlake 1985. Tense, aspect and mood. In T. Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 202-258.

Comrie, B. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Ö. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dickey, S. M. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic Aspect*. CSLI Publications. Stanford.

Fielder, G. E. 1993. *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Verbal Categories in Bulgarian*. The Edwin Mellen Press: Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter.

Fleischman, S. 1992. Imprfective and irrealis. In J. Bybee and S. Fleishman (eds.) *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 519-552.

Friedman, V. 1982. Reportedness in Bulgarian: category or stylistic variant. *International Journal of SlavicLinguistics and Poetics* 25-26, 149-163.

Friedman, V. 1986. Evidentiality in the Balkans: Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Albanian. In W. Chafe and J. Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality: The linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood. N.J.: Ablex, 168-187.

Friedman, V. 1999. Evidentiality in the Balkan languages. In U. Hinrichs (ed.) *Handbuch der Siudosteuropa-Linguistik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 519-544.

Friedman, V. 2000. Confirmative/nonconfirmative in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian with additional observations on Turkish, Romani, Georgian, and Lak. In L. Johanson and B. Utas (eds.) *Evidentials in Turkic, Iranian, and Neighbouring Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 329-366.

Gehrke, B. 2005. The prepositional aspect of Slavic prefixes and the goal-source asymmetry. In Proceedings of the ESSLLI workshop on Formal Semantics and Cross-Linguistic Data.

Gerdžikov, G. 1977. Edna spetzifična glagolna kategorija v săvremennija bălgarski knižoven ezik. *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet* 69-2, 9-68.

Gerdžikov, G. 1984. *Preizkazvaneto na glagolnoto dejstvie v bălgarsija ezik*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.

Guentchéva, Z. and J.-P. Desclés. 1982. A la recherché d'une valeur fondamentale du parfait bulgare. *Săpostavitelno ezikoznanie*. 7/1-2, 44-56.

Gvozdanović, J. 2012. Perfective and imperfective aspect. In R. Binnick (ed.) *The Oxford Textbook of Tense and Aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 781-802.

Iatridou, S. et al. 2001. Observations about the form and meaning of the perfect. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: MIT Press, 189-238.

Ignatova, A. 2008. *A Functional Approach to Bulgarian Verbal Aspect and Reduplication of Clitics within the Framework of Role and Relevance Grammar*. Ph.D. thesis.

Isačenko, A. 1960. *Grammatičeskij stroj russkogo jazyka v sopostavlenii s slovackim. Morfologija* 2. Bratislava: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk.

Israeli, A. 1996. Pragmatic contract and verbs of communication: the choice of aspect. Paper presented at the Gorgetown University round table on language and lingusitics.

Izvorski, R. 1997. The present perfect as an epistemic modal. SALT 7, 222-239.

Jakobson, R. 1957 [1971]. Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. *Selected Writings* 2. The Hague: de Gruyter, 131-147.

Koev, T. 2011. Evidentiality and temporal distance learning. SALT 21,115-134.

Koev, T. 2016. Evidentiality, learning events and spatiotemporal distance: the view from Bulgarian. *Journal of Semantics*,1-41.

Lindstedt, Y. 1985. *On the Semantics of Tense and Aspect in Bulgarian*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

Lyons, J.1977. *Semantics 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maslov, J. 1963. *Morfologija glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke*. Moskva-Leningrad.

Maslov, J. 1981. *Grammatika bolgarskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Vysšaja škola.

Nicolova, R. 2007. Modalizovannaja evidentzial'naja sistema bolgarskogo jazyka. In V. Xrakovskij (ed.): *Evidentzial'nost' v jazykax Evropy i Azii. Sbornik statej pamjati Natalii Andreevny Koznecovoj*. Sankt Peterburg: Nauka, 105-197.

Nicolova, R. 2008. *Bălgarska gramatika. Morfologija*. Sofija: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski".

Padučeva, E. 1996. *Semantičeskie issledovanija*. Moskva: Škola jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Pенčev, Y. 1967. Kam văprosa za vremenata v săvremennija bălgarski ezik. *Bălgarski ezi*k 17, 131-143.

Rivero, M. L. and A. Arregui. 2010. Variation in Slavic imperfectives. Proceedings of the 2010 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association.

Smirnova, A. 2013. Evidentiality in Bulgarian: temporality, epistemic modality, and information source. *Journal of semantics* 30, 479-532.

Smith, C. S. 1991 [1997]. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Stankov, V. 1967[1976]. Kategorii na indikativa v săvremennija bălgarski ezik. Reprinted in P. Pašov, R. Nicolova (comps.) *Pomagalo po bălgarska morfologija. Glagol*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo, 360-374.

Stojanov, S. 1964 [1993]. *Gramatika na bălgarskija knižoven ezik*. Sofija: Nauka i izkustvo.

Verkuyl, H. 1972. *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Verkuyl, H. 2012. Compositionality. In (ed.) R. Binnick. *The Oxford Textbook of Tense and Aspect*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 563-585.

Willet, T. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12-1, 51-97.

Yovkova-Shii, E. 2003. *Burugariago no –l Bunshi no Goyooronteki Kenkyuu: Iwayuru Evidential Toiuu Kategorii Nikanrenshite*. Ph.D. thesis. Tokyo University.

Yovkova-Shii, E. 2004. Evidentiality and admirativity: semantic-functional aspects of the Bulgarian –l participle. *Gengo Kenkyu* 126, 1-38.

Yovkova-Shii, E. 2011. Grammaticalization and the Bulgarian –l participle: semantic-functional shift from tense-aspect to modality. In M. Nomachi, A. Danylenko, P. Piper (eds.). *Grammticalization and Lexicalization in Slavic Languages*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 86-103.

Yovkova-Shii, E. 2013. Evidentiality in Bulgarian and Japanese. *Săpostavitelno ezikoznanie* 2-3, 262-278.

Bulgarian National Corpus (BulNC) *http://search.dcl.bas.bg/*

Aspect and the *-l* participle forms in Bulgarian

Елеонора Йовкова-Шии

В тази статия се разглежда въпросът за взаимовръзката между аспектуалните особености на еловото причастие и дистрибуцията на функциите на причастието в българския език, проблем, който почти не е третиран в съществуващата литература. Еловото причастие може да бъде аористно или имперфектно, а глаголът, на който е основано причастието може да е от свършен или несвършен вид. В статията се разглеждат четирите възможни комбинации на причастието, а именно, аористно причастие на глаголи от свършен вид, аористно причастие на глаголи от несвършен вид, имперфектно причастие на глаголи от свършен вид, имперфектно причастие на глаголи от несвършен вид, като се взимат предвид и лексико-аспектуалните особености на глагола, и се анализират функциите на причастията. Формите с елово причастие имат модална и немодална употреба. Анализът показва, че засилването на модалността е в пряка зависимост от засилването на семантичната черта "несвършеност" в значението на причастието. Формите с имперфектно причастие имат само модални функции, докато формите с аористно причастие, в зависимост от лексико-аспектуалните особености на глагола, могат да функционират както модално така и немодално.