Mirativity in Korean and Bulgarian

So Yong Kim, Krasimira Aleksova

I. Introduction

The present paper studies from a typological point of view the grammatical means for encoding a speaker's surprise at an unexpected real fact in Korean and Bulgarian. In the first section we examine the semantics of the phenomenon and present briefly a few approaches to it. The nest part is an attempt at a typological classification of languages on the grounds of the grammatical status of mirative forms employed by the respective language(s). The main aim is to discover and demonstrate the places of Bulgarian and Korean in such a typological classification and specify the similarities and differences in the grammatical means for expressing the speaker's astonishment. The third part focuses on the morphological patterns and types of marking specific for Bulgarian and Korean. It contains an overview of the grammatical system of the languages and some particular mirative uses.

II. The semantics of mirativ forms

The mirative is used to express the assessment of the knowledge background of the speaker – a fact little known to the speaker turns out to be truthful and the conclusion about the mismatch between the foreseen, expected, supposed and the real fact encites the astonishment of the speaker. The surprise expressed by the mirative forms is caused by the discrepancy between what is expected and what thing really are (see Guéncheva 1990) and as such encodes the transition of the speaker from a state of non-knowledge into a state of knowledge (see Nitsolova 1993).

By using mirative forms the speaker expresses an assertion, an inference, a conclusion which are surprising even for himself. The speaker asserts the reality of an unexpected fact or a fact that does not correspond to the speaker's idea of the logical coherence between states and acts and the process that bring them about. The asserted

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003 Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

2

fact is real and truthful; it challenges and refutes the preliminary expectations and assumptions of the speaker.

The semantics of mirative forms can be presented in the following manner: "It turns out the X is probable, although I thought the opposite and this surprises me." Or to put it differently, "It turns out that A (A = a real act or state) is true, which I did not expect and that surprises me". The definition Melčuk provides for the content of mirative semantics is similar: "I expected this vs. I did not expect that" (Mel'čuk 1998:197). R. Nitsolova conceives of the mirative as an opposition between a previous cognitive state of non-knowledge and a present cognitive state of knowledge – *"I already know that p (p designates a proposition – Kr. Aleksova) but the truthfulness of p is unexpected for me and this surprises me*, i.e. the assertion is accompanied by an attitudinal commitment and an emotional reaction." (Nitsolova 1993:141). As the mirative is used to assess the knowledge of the speaker – a fact unexpected for the speaker turns out to be true and the mismatch between the expectations of the speaker and the real state of affairs incites the surprise, we consider the mirative as belonging to the realm of epistemic modality.

In some studies of the mirative in languages round the world, the non-preparedness of the mind of the speaker to absorb the information that is being taken in is cited as the most basic semantic feature of the mirative (Aksu-Koç, Slobin 1986; Slobin, Aksu 1982), or new knowledge (as opposed to old knowledge), that has not yet been integrated in the picture of the world, which dwells in the speaker's mind (see DeLancey 1997, 2001), or opposition is created between expected-unexpected, assimilated – non-assimilated knowledge (Slobin, Aksu 1982:198; see also the review in S. DeLancey 1997:36). DeLancey defines the mirativity from a cognitive standpoint as a universal semantic category which has significant areas of overlap with the categories of evidentiality and modality (DeLancey 1997).

In our view, the most important task linguists face (as G. Lazard insists – Lazard 1999:105-106, Lazard 2001:360-367) is to clarify how different languages distribute these semantic categorical space into relevant features via significant correlation of signifiers and signifieds. We will emphasize that first we have to describe the features themselves – what are these relevant, commutable features (i.e. the features that meet the

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

3

commutability test and are related to the other plane), along which the articulation is carried out and second we have to define the typological similarities between the separate languages on the basis of the likenesses in the specificity of the way the category is articulated and the means for its expression.

III. Typological aspect

Within the scope of our observations, the mirative, due to its grammatical make-up constitutes either part of the uses of evidentials (or in Lazard's terminology – the meditative), or a separate verb category (disregarding how controversial this question is in contemporary debates), or it is realized by a modal usage of perfective forms in different languages. We distinguish between the following cases on grounds of the grammatical status of mirativity in different languages. These cases are essential for the present argument, since they outline the similarities and differences in the means for grammatical expression of the semantics of mirativity in Bulgarian and Korean.

1. Mirative forms as uses of a separate subcategory.

1.1. Mirative forms as uses of some of the forms of the evidential subcategory.

1.1.1. When the evidential has a higher degree of semantic generality (languages in Southeastern Europe and West Asia – the so-called Balkan and West Asian typological areal) (see Guéncheva 1993, Lazard 1999, Nitsolova 2002).

1.1.1.1. When the semantic space of the evidential is partitioned into four subcategories (for example the Bulgarian language).

1.1.1.2. When the evidential constitutes a two-member category (for example Turkic languages).

1.1.2. When the evidential forms denote greater specificity concerning the manner of acquisition of the information and this is represented in the greater morphologization of the respective means of expression (predominantly Native American languages – see Aikhenvald 2001: §3.5, Anderson 1986, Barnes 1984).

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

4

1.2. The mirative as a modal use of perfect forms (for example some of the Iranian languages – see Lazard 2000 and the five studies of Iranian languages in Johanson, Utas 2000).

2. Mirativity as a separate category (for example some Tibeto-Birman languages – see Turnandre 1996, в Nakh-Dagestanian languages – see Tatevosov 2001, some Barbacoan Indian languages DeLancey 1997, 2001, in some other Indian languages and in Korean – see Aikhenvald 2001).

According to the presented classification Bulgarian belongs to the first type of languages where mirativity is a specific use of one of the members of the evidential category, more specifically the subtype with a four-fold portioning of the evidentals opposition (subtype 1.1.1.1.). Korean, on the other hand, belons to the third type of languages, where mirativity represents a separate category, not subordinate to evidentials but interrelated with the honorifics system.

In the remaining part of the paper we will discuss the formal means for the expression of the semantics of the mirative in the two languages.

IV. Mirativity in Korean

In Korean, there is a modal suffix (-gun) which expresses surprise and new information and independent of evidential suffixes.

(1) bi-ga o-neun-gun.

rain come-Pr[1]-gun

'It's raining' or 'It rains'

In the example (1) a sense of admiration is conveyed. Besides, 'to be raining' is new information and it's surprising to the speaker. Here, the speaker didn't expect that it

---

[1] We have used the following simbols: Acc – Accusative, Adm – Admirative, Ao – Aorist, Dec – Declarative, F - Female, Fut - Future, FutPast – Future in the Past, Imf – Imperfect, Imper – Imperative, Ind – Indicative, Infer – Inferential, Inter – Interjection, Loc – Locativ, M - Male, N – Neuter, p – person, Part – Particle, Past – Past Tense, Pl - Plural, Pp – Past Perfect, Pr - Present, Prf – Perfect, quest – Question, Refl- Reflexive, Sg – Singular, Voc – Vocative.

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

5

would rain, but in reality it's raining. The irrelevance between proposed (it wouldn't rain) and real situation (it's raining) causes surprise, expressed with an admirative form 'gun'.

The suffix 'gun' is a contracted form of '-guna'. In comparison with '-gun', the form '-guna' cannot be combined with a terminal verb ending '-yo'. This verb ending '-yo' is used for a higher level of speech[2]. It's used to express respect to the hearer. Thus, 'guna' doesn't have any polite form, while '-gun' can be used with '-yo'. The combined form '-gunyo' is appropriate in an informal conversation.

S. DeLancey presents another suffix for "new knowledge" '-ne' which has a similar meaning of '-gun'. These two suffixes '-gun' and '-ne' contrast paradigmatically with an "integrated knowledge" suffix '-ji' and a simple declarative suffix '-eo' which is the unmarked member of the set. In Korean, there are also evidential forms, marking hearsay and inferential categories, which occur in different position class. In principle they are compatible with any of these suffixes(-eo/-ji/-gun/-ne) (DeLancey 1999:45-47).

When suffix '-ne' is used like a mirative form, there is no specific deference between '-ne' and '-gun'. In some cases, the meaning of the suffix '-ne' is different from '-gun'.

(2) bi-ga o-ne.

rain come-ne

'It's raining' or 'It rains'

The mirative '-ne' suggests that the contrary fact is real. It refutes and rejects a preliminary expectation of the speaker. It generates a surprise and an admiration of the speaker.

---

[2] Table 1: Terminal ending in the formal speech level

	Declarative	Interrogative	Imperative	Propositive
High Form	-(eu)pnida	-(eu)pnikka	-(eu)sipsio	-(eu)psida
Neutral Form	-ne	-na	-ge	-se
Low Form	-neun/nda	-ni	-a(eo, yeo)la	-ja

Table 2: Terminal ending in the informal speech level

	Declarative	Interrogative	Imperative	Propositive
High Form	-a(eo, yeo)yo	-a(eo, yeo)yo	-a(eo, yeo)yo	-a(eo, yeo)yo
Low Form	-a(eo, yeo)	-a(eo, yeo)	-a(eo, yeo)	-a(eo, yeo)

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

6

(3) Sumi-ga beolsseo daehaksaeng-i-ne.

Sumi   already   student -is-ne

(Sumi is already a student!)

In the example (3) the suffix '-ne' suggests that the speaker doesn't expect, completely, that Sumi became a student, however the expectation of the speaker for Sumi not to be a student is soon realized contrary to the actual. As compared to '-gun' the suffix '-ne' has another meaning 'a distrust of the speaker'. This sentence (3) can be interpreted like this – 'I can't believe Sumi is already a student'.

The use of the verb ending '-ne' is completely different from two upper suffixes '-ne'. When it is used as the neutral form of the formal speech level, it can be used only in a declarative sentence. By the neutral form, the speaker, who is higher in status than the hearer, expresses a certain moderate level of respect to the hearer. The use of this form is appropriate especially when the hearer himself, or herself, is the person of "age". The neutral form may also be used between older persons.

(4) Sumi jip-e   ga-ss-ne.

Sumi house-Loc go-Past-Dec

'Sumi went at home!'

The non-mirative '-ne' (4) shows that the speaker is higher in status than the hearer. It isn't admirable or surprising to the speaker. The simple declarative form '-ne' can't be used with '-yo'[3], while the mirative suffix '-ne' can be used with it.

In principle, the mirative 'gun' can be used instead of the informal intimate or impolite form '-a(-eo, -yeo). Additionally, '-gun' expresses surprise and admiration of a speaker. The mirative '-gun' is lower (more impolite) than the terminal ending '-ne' in the speech level. While the honorific form '-ne' is appropriate in a formal conversation or in an official setting, 'gun' is used in an informal situation, and both of them convey intimacy and warmth. The honorific form '-ne' expresses a certain moderate level of respect to the hearer, but the mirative '-gun' is an impolite form and doesn't express any

---

[3] The terminative verb ending '-yo' expresses respect to the hearer in a informal situation.

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

7

respect to him. Thus, the mirative suffixes '-gun' and '-ne' belong to the distinct category from 'honorification', but this category is connected with it.

The mirative suffixes '-gun' and '-ne' are used irrelevantly to a change in the grammatical person and they don't change according to the tense[4].

(5) nae-ga michyeo -ss-kun.

I   am crazy-Past-kun

(I am crazy!)

nae-ka michyeo -ss-ne.

I   am crazy-Past-ne

(I am crazy!)

(6) chak bo-si[5]-neun-gun-yo.

book read- Pr -gun-yo

(You are reading a book!)

chak bo-si-ne-yo.

book read- ne-yo

(You are reading a book!)

(7) nalssi   joh-gun-yo.

weather cold-gun-yo

(It is cold!)

 nalssi   joh-ne-yo.

weather cold-ne-yo

(It is cold!)

In Korean, there are distinct evidential forms '-nabo-', '-gess-' and '-de', marking hearsay and inference. These forms suggest that the speaker draws an inference from some facts, which are based on indirect or direct evidence.

(8) Sumi-ga jip-e   dolaya-ss-nabo-gun.

Sumi   house-Loc come back-Past-Infer-gun

---

[4] In Korean, there are four types of the tense. They are the present, past, pluperfect and future tense.

[5] The form 'si' is a honorific suffix.

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

8

(Sumi came back to home!)

(9) Sumi-ga jip-e   dolaya-ss-gess-gun.

Sumi   house-Loc come back-Past-gess-gun

(I suppose that Sumi came back to home.)

(10) Sumi jip-e   dolaya-ss-taen[6]-te.

Sumi   house-Loc   there is no-taen[7]-te

(Sumi came back to home.)

The sentence (9) could be said on the base of an indirect and uncertain evidence. (9) could be a conjecture from hearsay or uncertain and indirect evidence and the speaker expresses a kind of unreliability. As compared with (9), '-nabo-' suggests that the speaker infers from available certain evidence (e.g. having looked around the house and founding Sumi's belongings). In contrast with (8), (9), (10) suggests that the conclusion was arrived only after search, and the speaker is a witness of the fact. He has an certain evidence (e.g. having met Sumi at home).

In our view, if the mirative *("Something turns out to be highly probable, although I thought it was not.")* really exists as a separate category, encoding exclusively surprise that arises from the refutation of natural expectations of the speaker about the activity expressed in the proposition, as is the case in the above-mentioned languages, it would constitute a separate category that would characterize the knowledge of the speaker concerning the activity relating to its degree of probability – i.e. it would belong to the probability verbal mode in the terms of Gerdzhikov's model to which we stick here (see Gerdzhikov 1984). It is not by mere chance that Mel'čuk individuates it into a separate grameme of the category "reactivity" – "mental reaction of the speaker to the fact Fn from the standpoint of its probability". According to the same author, reactivity is related to the scale of the opposition "I expected that vs. I didn't expect that" (Mel'čuk 1998:197). In such a case mirativity should be characterized as a modal, epistemic in nature category, because it is used to assess the speaker's knowledge – a fact that in his view is highly improbable turns out to be true and that causes the surprise.

---

[6] The suffix 'taen' is used, when the past action is reminiscent.

[7] '-teon' is a reminiscent suffix and it is used only for the past action.

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

9

V. Mirativity in Bulgarian

There are several major interpretations of the grammatical status of mirativity forms in Bulgarian: a) it constitutes a second, independent, non-re-narrative meaning of re-narrative forms (Andreichin 1944/1978, Maslov 1956, 1982), b) it represents transposed uses of re-narrative forms in the field of the indicative (Kutzarov 1994, Nitsolova 2000), c) it represents contextually restricted uses of re-narrative forms that express disbelief (Darden 1977, Freedman 1982), d) it represents emotionally loaded, expressive uses of the forms of the conclusive subcategory of Bulgarian evidential system (Gerdzhikov 1984, Aleksova 2001, 2002), e) it represents uses of the perfect forms (Ivanchev 1973/1976, Guéncheva 1990), f) it is a separate paradigm within the field of the indicative, whose forms are homonymous with re-narrative forms (Dyomina 1959, Stankov 1969).

The author of this part of the paper, (Kr. Aleksova), is of the opinion that mirativity in Bulgarian constitutes emotionally-loaded, expressive conclusion about the mismatch between what is expected and what really is. If this be the case, mirativity could be defined as one of the uses of the conclusive forms (inferential forms), forms that are necessarily emotionally loaded. It should always be remembered that not every stylistically marked use of conclusive forms is an instance of mirativity, since the conclusive mood has also other expressive uses. What is more, not every single surprise or astonishment should be interpreted as instances of mirative use, but only those which result from the establishment, inference of conclusion about the mismatch between what is expected and what really is; the ones arising from the refutation of the speaker's expectations existing prior to the respective communicative event.

Most tenses in Bulgarian have mirative uses – we did not find in our corpus of literary texts and authentic speech cases only of the use of conclusive perfect forms and future in the past tense forms. Table one presents the temporal paradigm of mirative uses in Bulgarian. It reflects the neutralization of the opposition between absolute tenses

(anchored to the moment of speech) and relative tenses (anchored to a given past moment), which leads to significant coincidental identity of forms.

Tense in the indicative (3 p. Sg.)	Mirative uses of the conclusive mood (3 p. Sg.)
Present – пише Imperfect – пишеше	Пишел (е)
Aorist – писа	Писал (е)
Perfect – писал е Plusquam perfectum – беше писал	Писал (е) бил
Future – ще пише Future in the past – щеше да пише	Щял (е) да пише
Future Perfect– ще е писал Future Perfect in the Past – щеше да е писал	???Щял (е) да е писал (such mirative forms were not found)

Table 3: The Temporal Paradigm of Mirative Uses of the Conclusive in Bulgarian

One of the controversial questions in the literature on Bulgarian is the temporal sphere which tolerates the spread of mirative uses − some authors restrict its use to the perfect only (for example Guéncheva 1990), others to present and aorist (for example Dyomina 1959) or present tense and perfect (Nitsolova 2002), present, imperfect and aorist (for example Maslov 1956) and others. Mirativity uses are most rarely admitted in future tenses (Andreichin 1938/1976, Gerdzhikov 1984). The material the author has excerpted contains mirative uses for the seven out of the nine tenses in Bulgarian. Most frequent are mirative uses of present and imperfect form, next in frequency come aorist forms, followed by perfect and past perfect form, with future forms displaying the lowest frequency rate. Before we illustrate out claims with examples from literary texts and authentic speech excerpts, we will focus on another important problem related to the plane of expression.

In mirative uses of the conclusive, the auxiliary verb 'be' in the 3rd person singular and plural can easily be dropped out due to the highly emotional-expressive character of such uses.

The difference in the two separate cases lies in the degree of expressivity, where the forms with a preserved auxiliary verb 'be' in the 3rd person singular and plural imply a statement for the refutation of expectations, which is often not emotionally tinted. We

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

11

should emphasize the fact that the forms with a dropped-out 'be' form are the more common case. The dropping out of auxiliary verb 'be' in the 3rd person singular and plural is a phenomena typical of various emotionally loaded grammatical constructions, generally containing the 'be' auxiliary verb: uses of the perfect, complex subject complement, passive structures. The following two examples of mirative forms differ only in the dropping out of auxiliary verb 'be' in the 3rd person singular:

(11) //лèле:/ т'à **се е билà завр'àла**   тука// товà е

    Inter   she put 3p.Sg.F.Prf.Pefl.**Adm**   here   this   be-3p.Sg.Pr.Ind

  лѝчната   ми   кàрта//

  identity-the.F.Sg.   my   card-F.Sg

(Wow, it has been put here (I have not noticed that). It is my identity card.)

(12) Значи, ето   за какво   **бил дошъл**   Макар! (M. Sholohov)
    So   this is   what-N.Sg   arrive-3p.Sg.Prf.Adm   Makar for
    (Kutzarov 1984:70)
   That is why Makar has come! (I just relised it!)

      It is the dropping out of the auxiliary verb form of 'be' that gives reasons to some scholars to consider that what we see is a use of the non-evidential forms or for transposed usages of non-evidential forms to the neglect of the existence of mirative forms with a preserved 'be' auxiliary form in 3rd person:

    Present tense

(13) Ух , то   **било**   наш   Дончо, пък   аз жъна

    Inter it be3p.Sg.N.Imper.Pr.**Adm**   our   Doncho and me, I reap1pSg.Pr.Ind

и   си мисля: кой   ли   гръмоли   по пътя?
and think1p.Sg.Pr.Ind.Refl who Part.quest clatter3Sg.Pr.Ind on road-theM.Sg

(A. Karalijchev)
(Oh (surprise)! It proved to be our Doncho, but I am reaping and I am thinking who is clattering on the roade!)

    Imperfect

(14) Това е   чудо   божие.   Бедна   измъчена
    This is3p.Sg.Pr.Ind miracleN.Sg God'sN.Sg   poor/wretched F.Sg jadedF.Sg

щерко,   той бил   достоен за твоята   любов…
dautherF.Sg.Voc   he   be3p.Sg.M.Pr.Adm   be worthy of your-theF.Sg loveF.Sg

Как   **съм бил**   жесток   към   вас… (I. Vazov)
How   be1p.Sg.M.Imf.**Adm**   cruel-M.Sg to you-2p..Pl.Acc

(This is a God's blessing, my poor, jaded daughter; he well deserved your love… How

cruel I have been to you…)

     Aorist

(15) Я,   небето   съвсем **се изяснило**   и   греело
    Inter sky-theN.Sg totally clear up3p.Sg.N.Ao.Ref.**Adm** and shine3p.Sg.N.Pr.Adm

слънце,   а   аз мислех,   че   още вали… (Stojanov 1964/1980:408)
sunF.Sg   but I think1p.Sg.Imf.Ind   that still rain3p.Sg.Imp.Pr.Ind

(Ah, the whole sky has cleared and I was thinking it was still raining!)

    Perfect

(16) Боже,   на какво   място   **съм била хвърлила**
    God-M.Sg.Voc at what-N.Sg   place-N.Sg throw-1p.Sg.F.Prf.**Adm**

сърцето   си. (Ив. Вазов)
heard-the.N.Sg   my-Refl.Poss.Pronoun

(Good God! (surprise, astonishment) What a place have I thrown my heart into!)

(17) Бре,   каква   е   таз   работа!,
    Intr what-F.Sg be-3p.Sg.Pr.Ind this-N.Sg what it all was-F.Sg

Ставам,   поглеждам   нагоре, аз **съм бил легнал**
 get up-1p.Sg.Pr.Ind look-1p.Sg.Pr.Ind up   I   lie down-1p.Sg.M.Prf.**Adm**

под   Радославов! Той слизал   да ме   души!
under Radoslavov! He descend-3p.Sg.M.Ao.Adm to me-Acc choke-3p.Sg.Pr.Ind

(Y. Yovkov)

(Oh! What was all aboute! (What did it happen!) I got up and looked up – I had lied

under the portrait of Radoslavov (I have just realised it!) He had come down from the

portrait to suffocate me!)

    Plusquam perfectum

(18) /à/ снòщти се   склòузна   експлòрър/ илѝгъл фỳнкшън/
 Inter last night Refl.Pronoun close-3p.Sg.Ao.Ind   explore-the illegal   function

и   à_си трѝгнах/   а: тѝ предѝ твà
and I leave-1p.Sg.Ao.Refl.Ind Inter you before this

си го   **бѝла свалѝла/**   кàк   бе/   йѐ/   брàво// дай
  it-Acc   download-3p.Sg.Pp.**Adm** how Part Inter bravo give-2p.S.Imper

го//   (Aleksova's corpus of spoken Bulgarian)
it-Acc

(Wow! The programme Explorer closed last night! Illegal function! And I went away. Oh I see, you had already downloaded it (surprise)! Oh really! Give it to me!)

    Future tense

(19) (The speaker sees a picture in the newspaper of a delegation to go abroad and recognizes among the people an acquaintance of his whose name is not mentioned in the paper.)

//йà   глѐдай/   и   тòй **шт'àл да пътỳва**/   некадѐрник/
Inter look-2p.Sg.Imper and he   travel-3p.Sg.M.Fut.**Adm** good-for-nothing, duffer

в делегàцийа   мòл'ъ ти се/   с   правѝтелствената//
with delegation-F.Sg can you imagine with   governmental-the.F.Sg

(Aleksova's corpus of spoken Bulgarian)

(Well, well, look here, he is also traveling with the governmental delegation, isn't he, the good-for-nothing duffer!)

    Future in the past

(20) (An indignant mother is recounting her sudden discovery of the fact that her son had turned the cellar into a party place, covered in rugs; some of them showing signs of having been on fir.)

Боже,   викам,   аз **съм щяла да хврѐкна**   у въздуха значи,
God-M.Sg.Voc say-1p.Sg.Pr.Ind I   be blown-1p.Sg.F.FutPast.**Adm** in air-the

къщата   цялата   **да я запали (=щял да я запали)**
house-the whole-theF.Sg   set on fire-3p.Sg.F.FutPast.**Adm**

(Nikolova's corpus of spoken Bulgarian)

(Oh my God, I say, so, I had been about to be blown up and the whole house would have been set on fire.)

    Mirative uses in Bulgarian are allowed for all three persons. The peculiarities of their use in the 1st person, sg. are not the result of an intraparadigm recombination of distinctive features, but are entirely pragmatically driven. The surprising inference, which the speaker makes about himself, arises when the speaker has forgotten a particular

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

14

fact, has not registered its existence, has not noticed it and discovers the real state of affairs in the mere communicative event, for example:

(21) (Part of a telephone conversation.)

//ò/	чàкай	да спрѐ	котлòнъ	(след няколко секунди)
Inter	hait-2p.Imper	to stop-1p.Sg.Pr.Ind	hot-plate-the.M.Sg	(in a few minutes)

… ò:/	**билà съм**	го	**спр'àла**/	(Aleksova's corpus of spoken Bulgarian)
Inter		it-Acc	stop-1p.Sg.F.Perf.**Adm**	

(Oh, let me switch off the cooker. (in a few second) Ah, I had really switched it off.)

VI. Conclusions

After discussing the typologically relevant correlations between mediativity (evidentiality) and mirativity, G. Lazard points out that the existence of a separate mirativity category is a rare event, that mirativity far less often has at its disposal separate grammatical means for expression, that it rarely exist independently of inference-making strategies and the forms of the evidentiality category (Lazard 1999:106). S. Tatevosov verifies these claims with his observations of several Nakh-Dagestanian languages (Tatevosov 2001:454-455). The studies we performed are fully compliant with these contentions. The case is that both in languages with an evidentiality, characterized with high degree of semantic generality, as well as in languages with particularized morphological expression of the source/channel of information, the mirative represents a specific use of the mediated modes (in other terminological paradigms – of evidentials, of the meditative category). The Bulgarian language belongs to the type of languages in which mirativity is a specific use of one of the members of the evidential category, but Korean represents the least common case - where mirativity is a separate category, not subordinate to evidentials.

References

Aikhenvald, A. (2001). Position Paper for International Workshop "Evidentiality", 6-th – 11-th August 2001, Melbourne, La Trobe University, RCLT – http://www.latrobe.edu.au/rclt/

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

15

Aksu-Koç, Ayhan, Slobin, Dan (1986). A Psychological Account to the Development and Use of Evidentials in Turkish. – In: Chafe, W. and J. Nichols, eds., Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology. Advances in Discourse Processes, vol. XX, Norwood – Ney Jersey, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1986, pp. 159-167.

Aleksova, Kr. (2001). Znachenie i gramaticheska săshtnost na bălgarskija admirativ. (Meaning and Grammatical Status ot Bulgarian Admirativ.) – In: Obucheniero po bălgarski ezik v nachaloto na XXI vek. (Teaching Bulgarian in the Beginning of the XXI Sentury.) Smoljan: Plovdivski universitet "Paisij Hilendarski", Klon Smoljan, pp. 27-33.

Aleksova, Kr. (2001). Kăm tipologicheskata harakteristika na bylgarskija admirativ. (Oh the Typological Characteristic of the Admirativ in Bulgarian.) – In: Ezikyt: istorija i săvremennost. (The Language: History and Contemporary State.) Shoumen: Universitetsko isdatelstvo "Episkop Konstantin Preslavski", 2002, pp. 97-111.

Anderson, Lloyd (1986). Evidentials, Path of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically Regulare Asymmetries. – In: Chafe, W. and J. Nichols, eds., Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology. Advances in Discourse Processes, vol. XX, Norwood – Ney Jersey, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1986, pp. 273-312.

Andreichin, L. (1944). Osnovna bulgarska gramatika. (Basic Bulgarian Grammar.) Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1944.

Barnes, J. (1984). Evidential in the Tuyuca Verb. – In: International Journal of American Linguistics 50, 1984, pp. 255-271.

Darten, B. (1977). On the Admirativ in Bulgarian. – In: Folia Slavica, vol. 1, N1, 1977, pp. 59-64.

DeLancey, S. (1997). Mirativity: The Grammatical Marking of Unexpected Information. – In: Linguistic Typology 1, 1997, pp. 33-52.

DeLancey, S. (2001). The Mirative and Evidentiality. – In: Journal of Pragmatics 33, 2001, pp.369-382.

Dyomina, E. (1959). Pereskazyvatel'nye formy v sovremennom bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke. (Re-narrative Forms in Contemporary Standart Bulgarin Language.) – In: Voprosy grammatiki bolgarskogo literaturnogo jazyka. (Issues in Bulgarian Grammar.) Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1959, c.326-343.

Friedman, V. (1982). Admirativity in Bulgarian Compared with Albanian and Turkish. – In: Bulgaria: Past and Present. Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Sofia, 1982, pp. 63-68.

Gerdjikov, G. (1984). Preiskazvaneto na glagolnoto dejstvie v bălgarskija ezik. (Re-narration of Verbal Action in Bulgarian Language.) Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1984.

Guenchéva, Zl. (1990). Valeur inférentielle et valeur "admirative" en bulgare. – In: Contrastive Linguistics, XV, 1990, N4-5, p. 47-52.

Guéncheva, Zl. (1993). La catégorie du médiatif en Bulgare dans une perspective typologique. – In: Revue des Études slaves, Paris, LXV/1, 1993, p. 57-72.

Hae, Ung (1995). 20seki urimalui hyeongtaeron (Korean morphology in 20 century). Seoul:Saem Munhwasa Press.

Ivanchev, Sv. (1973/1976). Problemi na razvitieto i funkcioniraneto na modalnite kategorii v bălgarskija ezik. (Some Problemes of Development and Functioning of Modal Categories in Bulgarian.) – In: Pomagalo po bălgarska morfologija. Glagol. (Handbook of Bulgarian Morphology. Verb.) Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1973/1976, pp. 348-360.

Johanson, L., Utas, Bo. (2000). Evidentials: Turkish, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages. (Lars Johanson, Bo Utas Eds.), Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000.

Kim, Seung Kon (1992). Hankukaeui tossiwa ssikkeut. (The suffix and ending in Korean). Seoul:Saekyang academic date center Press.

Ko, Kyounghee (1989). The integrated/new knowledge makers in Korean. M.A. thesis, Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon.

Kutzarov, Iv. (1984). Preizkazvaneto v bălgarskija ezik. (Re-narration in Bulgarian Language.) Sofia: Narodna prosveta, 1984.

Kutzarov, Iv. (1994). Edno ekzotichno naklonenie na bălgarskija glagol. (An Exotic Mood of Bulgarian Verb.) Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski", 1994.

Lazard, G. (1999). Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other? – In: Linguistic Typology 3 (1), 1999, p. 91-109.

Lazard, G. (2000). Le médiatif: considérations théoriques at application à l'iranien. – In: Evidentials: Turkish, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages. (Lars Johanson, Bo Utas Eds.), Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000, pp. 209-229.

Lazard, G. (2001). On the Grammaticalization of Evidentiality. – In: Journal of Pragmatics 33, 2001, pp. 359-367.

Lee, Ho Sang (1985). Consciously-known but unassimilated information: A pragmatic analysis of the epistemic modal -kun in Korean. – In: Proceedings of the First Pacific Linguistics Conference, 183-210. Eugene: Department of Linguistics, University of Oregon.

Lee, Ho Sang (1993). Cognitive constraints on expressing newly perceived information with reference to epistemic modal suffives in Korean. – In: Cognitive Linguistics 4:135-167.

Maslov, Y. (1956). K voprosu o sisteme form pereskazyvatel'nogo naklonenija. (On the problem of paradigme of renaration forms.) – In: Sbornik v chest na Aleksandăr

Third International Academic Conference of KACEES
Bulgaria, Korea, Central & East Europe - Humanities and Social Science
14th – 15th July, 2003Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria

17

Teodorov-Balan. (In Honour to Aleksandăr Teodorov-Balan.), Sofia, 1956, pp.311-318.

Mel'čuk, I. (1998). Kurs obshtej morfologii. (A Course in General Morphology.). Vol. II. Moskva – Vienna: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury, Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Izdatel'skaja gruppa "Progress", 1998.

Nitsolova, R. (2002) Modalizovannaja evidencial'naja sistema bolgarskogo jazyka. (Modalised evidential system in Bulgarian Language.) (to appear)

Sae, Jaeng Su (1996). Korean Grammar. Seoul.

Slobin, D., Aksu, A. (1982). Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Use of the Turkish Evidential. – In: Hopper, Paul (ed.) Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1982, pp.185-200.

Stankov, V. (1969). Bălgarskite glagolni vremena. (Bulgarian Tenses.) Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1969.

Stojanov, St. (1964/1980). Gramatika na bălgarskija ezik. (Grammar of Bulgarian Language.) Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo, 1964/1980.

Tatevosov, S. (2001). From Resultatives to Evidentials: Multiple Uses of the Perfect in Nakh-Daghestanian Languages. – In: Journal of Pragmatics 33, 2001, pp. 443-464.

Tournadre, N. (1996). Comparaizon des systèmes médiatifs de quatre dialectes tibétain (tibétain central, ladakhi, dzongkha et amdo). – In: L'Enonciation médiatisée. (Editeur Zl. Guéncheva.) Louvain-Paris:Editions Péeters, 1996, pp.195-215.

Internet Corpora of Spoken Bulgarian

Aleksova's Corpus of Spoken Bulgarian – http://www.hf.uio.no/easteur-orient/bulg/mat/Aleksova

Nikolova's Corpus of Spoken Bulgarian – http://www.hf.uio.no/easteur-orient/bulg/mat/Nikolova