Evidential auxiliaries as non-reliability markers in Bulgarian parliamentary speech

Ekaterina Tarpomanova
Sofia University Saint Kliment Ohridski
`katya@slav.uni-sofia.bg`

Abstract

In the evidentiality system of Bulgarian, there are three evidential auxiliaries that form complex verbal forms. The paper analyzes their potential to mark non-reliability in political discourse by using the ParlaMint-BG corpus of parliamentary debates. The method of the study includes detection, categorisation and context analysis of the evidentials formed with auxiliaries. The results prove that the evidential auxiliaries function as markers of non-reliability, especially in argumentative text type such as political discourse.

Keywords: evidentiality, non-reliability, political discourse

1 Introduction

Evidentiality in Bulgarian is a grammaticalized category coding the source of information of an utterance and its classification according to the speaker's cognitive states (Nitsolova, 2008: 332). The category is based on the opposition between direct and indirect source of information: the indicative mood is marked for direct (firsthand) evidence whereas a paradigm of three indirect (non-firsthand) evidentials, i.e. reportative, inferential, and dubitative, emerged from the perfect tense. According to Plungian (2001: 354), Balkan systems are an example of modalized evidential systems. He suggests that the evidential system in Bulgarian is based on the opposition personal vs. non-personal information rather than on directly observable vs. non-observable evidence, and furthermore the speaker's mental states are no less personal (and reliable) than their visual observations. Such interpretations of the Bulgarian evidential system rely on the fact that observable evidence is considered more reliable and mediated information less reliable, respectively. On the other hand, the dubitative is the only indirect evidential that includes the value

of reliability in its core semantics, as it expresses the personal stance of the speaker to a non-firsthand information which is evaluated as non-reliable, while the reportative and the inferential are rather neutral to reliability (Tarpomanova, 2016). However, in certain contexts, such as media texts, all indirect evidentials can signal different levels of (non-)reliability (Guentcheva, 1996; Tarpomanova, 2015: 32-33) or even disinformation (Margova, 2022). Political speech can also favour the use of indirect evidentials to mark certain levels of reliability of the information.

2 Objectives and methodology

This is a corpus-based study whose objective is to explore three evidential auxiliaries as markers of non-reliability of the information: *бил* 'be-evidential', *щял* 'will-evidential' and *нямал(о)* 'will not-evidential'. As a grammatical form, *бил* is the past active participle of the verb 'be' and can be incorporated in the (present) perfect tense as a full verb – *съм бил* 'have been' but in the evidential paradigm it is an auxiliary that forms different tenses. Similarly, *щял* can be either past active participle of the colloquial verb *ща* 'want' or future evidential auxiliary, and *нямал* – either past active participle of the verb *нямам* 'don't have' or negative future evidential auxiliary. In fact, *нямал* should function as a particle and should be used only in neuter as invariable form – *нямало*, but in the colloquial speech it often agrees in gender and number with the subject. All three evidential auxiliaries are found both in the paradigm of the reliability-neutral evidentials, i.e. the inferential and the reportative, and in the reliability-marked dubitative. The main hypothesis of the study is that in political discourse, which can be viewed as argumentative text type, indirect evidentials are used to suggest non-reliability of the information

and the evidential auxiliaries *бил*, *щял* and *нямал(о)* have mostly dubitative value and to a lower extent reliability-neutral interpretation. To test this assumption, the occurrences of the evidential auxiliaries in the ParlaMint-BG corpus of Bulgarian parliamentary debates have been automatically extracted, manually classified, and analyzed in context.

3 Evidentiality recognition and disambiguation

In corpora of Bulgarian as a rule evidentiality is not annotated, but different schemata can be applied for (automatic) recognition of evidential forms. The use of the aorist active participle and especially of the imperfect active participle (the letter occurs only in indirect evidentials, but not in the perfect tenses of the indicative) with omission of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' is a reliable marker although it applies for the 3rd person only. However, the 3rd person is the most frequent grammatical form as compared with the 1st and the 2nd person. The omission of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' in the indicative perfect is possible but rare (Nitsolova, 2008: 296). Additionally, the evidential auxiliaries *бил* 'be-evidential', *щял* 'will-evidential' and *нямал(о)* 'will not-evidential' are unambiguous markers of evidentiality.

The main difficulty in evidentiality recognition is the disambiguation of two types of grammatical homonymy: between the inferential aorist and the indicative perfect (cf. Aleksova, 2003), and in the paradigm of the indirect evidentials. The first type is not relevant for the study as neither the inferential aorist, nor the indicative perfect contain the analyzed auxiliaries, and what is more, both forms are neutral to reliability. As for the homonymies of the second type, several of them should be considered: i. the inferential and the reportative coincide in the 1st and the 2nd person and differ only in the 3rd person by the presence and the omission of the auxiliary *съм* 'be', respectively; ii. in all the forms of the dubitative the auxiliary *бил* 'be-evidential' can be omitted and in that case, they coincide with the reportative; this means that formally the reportative can express doubt, i.e. non-reliability; iii. the reportative perfect/pluperfect and the dubitative aorist are homonymous (*бил чел* 'he reportedly has/had read' or 'he allegedly read'), i.e. the auxiliary *бил* can function either as a

temporal marker of the reportative or as a non-reliability marker in the structure of the dubitative.

4 The corpus

The ParlaMint is a project contributing at the creation of comparable multilingual corpora of parliamentary debates with uniform annotation (Osenova, 2023: 62). The corpora contain transcriptions of the sessions of the 17 European national parliaments with half a billion words (Erjavec et al., 2023: 415). The Bulgarian part used for this study comprises 20 million words attributed to 606 speakers and the political parties and organizations they belong to, collected from October 2014 to July 2020 (Erjavec et al., 2023: 431). The linguistic annotation of the corpus was performed automatically by the CLASSLA pipeline (Ljubešić and Dobrovoljc, 2019). The ParlaMint corpora are available through Sketch Engine, a corpus manager and text analysis software. There are several query types: by word, lemma, character, phrase, and regular expressions based on the Corpus Query Language (CQL).

5 Results

To obtain quantitative data for the use of the evidential auxiliaries *бил* 'be-evidential', *щял* 'will-evidential' and *нямал(о)* 'will not-evidential' several regular expressions have been applied. As one of the purposes is to differentiate between evidentials that contain and do not contain the auxiliary *съм* 'be', seven regular expressions have been set to search the following strings:

(1) 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, singular and plural of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' + masculine, feminine, neuter and plural of the auxiliary *бил* 'be-evidential' + words ending in *-л, -ла, -ло, -ли* (to cover all grammatical genders and numbers of the past active participles);

(2) no lemma of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' + masculine, feminine, neuter and plural of the auxiliary *бил* + words ending in *-л, -ла, -ло, ли*;

(3) 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, singular and plural of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' + masculine, feminine, neuter and plural of the auxiliary *щял* 'will-evidential' + particle *да*;

(4) no lemma of the auxiliary *съм* 'be'+ masculine, feminine, neuter and plural of the auxiliary *щял* 'will-evidential' + particle *да*;

(5) 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, singular and plural of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' + masculine, feminine,

neuter and plural of the auxiliary *нямал* 'will not-evidential' + particle *да*;

(6) no lemma of the auxiliary *съм* 'be'+ masculine, feminine, neuter and plural of the auxiliary *нямал* 'will not evidential' + particle *да*;

(7) masculine, feminine, neuter and plural of the auxiliary *щял* 'will-evidential' + masculine, feminine, neuter and plural of the auxiliary *бил* 'be-evidential'.

Strings (1) and (2) present evidentials containing the auxiliary *бил* 'be-evidential' which are ambiguous. Provided that the results are not so numerous, the disambiguation between non-dubitatives and dubitatives has been manually performed. Besides that, as the third element of the string can be any word ending in *-л, -ла, -ло, -ли*, i.e. not necessarily a past active participle, there were many irrelevant results, usually collocations of the perfect tense and a masculine noun ending in the suffix *-тел*, the most frequent among them being *е бил свидетел* 'he has been a witness'. The irrelevant results were significant in string (1) – 215 out of 298, and minor in string (2) – only 20 out of 365. Of course, they have been excluded from the study. The inverted structure, with the auxiliary *бил* in the first position and the auxiliary *съм* in the second one, has been checked too but only 6 occurrences have been found, 5 of which irrelevant, that is why it is not taken into account for the study.

Strings (3) and (4) present positive future evidentials, and strings (5) and (6) exhibit negative future evidentials marked by the respective auxiliaries – *щял* and *нямал*. Adding to the string the modal subordinator *да* which functions as a particle linking the future evidential auxiliary and the full verb in a complex verbal form limits the output to the future evidentials. The disambiguation between dubitatives and non-dubitatives has been manual, considering the context.

The output of string (7) should be unambiguously a future dubitative, but it appeared to be a very rare structure.

The results of the search are presented in the tables, which contain the evidentials extracted after disambiguation and elimination of the wrongly recognized outputs (column 1), further divided into reliability-neutral evidentials labeled as non-dubitatives (column 2) and evidentials that express non-reliability labeled as dubitatives (column 3).

Table 1 displays the evidentials containing the auxiliary *съм* 'be', which allows for person and number differentiation, and the auxiliary *бил* 'be-evidential', which has separate forms for masculine, feminine, neuter and plural. The most frequent form is the 3rd person, both singular and plural, and it is expected to be reliability neutral as it marks the inferential. However, there are a few occurrences that have dubitative reading and express non-reliable information. The 1st and the 2nd person, on the other hand, are grammatically ambiguous given that the reported and the inferential may be differentiated in the 3rd person only. The results show that the 1st and the 2nd person tend to be interpreted as dubitatives, with one exception in the 2nd person plural.

	Evidentials	Non-dubitatives	Dubitatives
1 sg m	7	0	7
1 sg f	0	-	-
2 sg m	0	-	-
2 sg f	0	-	-
3 sg m	7	7	0
3 sg f	13	9	4
3 sg n	9	8	1
1 pl	19	0	19
2 pl m	0	-	-
2 pl f	0	-	-
2 pl	5	1	4
3 pl	22	19	3
Total	82	44	38

Table 1: Auxiliary *съм* 'be' + auxiliary *бил* 'be-evidential' + *-l*-participle.

	Evidentials	Non-dubitatives	Dubitatives
M sg	168	1	167
F sg	48	1	47
N sg	25	0	25
Pl	100	1	99
Total	341	3	338

Table 2: Auxiliary *бил* 'be-evidential' + *-l*-participle.

Table 2 presents the occurrences of the strings containing the evidential auxiliary *бил* and the past active participle, and excluding the lemma of the auxiliary *съм* 'be'. With those parameters, the query can give as an output only 3rd person evidentials differentiated by gender and number. There is a clear preference for dubitative interpretation of that structure, with very few exceptions that are neutral to reliability and have a temporal value of perfect or pluperfect.

In Table 3, future evidentials with the auxiliary *съм* 'be' are presented. The total is almost equally distributed between non-dubitative and dubitative values, but the preferences for a given value differ among grammatical persons: the 1st and the 2nd person corelate with dubitative reading, and the 3rd person with non-dubitative reading. Similarly to the structure with *бил* 'be-evidential', those correlations can be explained with the grammatical ambiguity of the 1st and the 2nd persons: they can be interpreted either as inferentials or as reportatives and the letter may have dubitative value. On the other hand, the 3rd person is expected to have only inferential reading, but still, some of the contexts are clearly dubitative. There were no negative future evidentials containing *съм* 'be' in the corpus.

Three occurrences of negative future evidentials with the auxiliary *съм* 'be' have been found, all of them in neuter, one in the 1st person singular with dubitative reding, and two in the 3rd person singular which have inferential value.

Table 4 and Table 5 present future evidentials with omission of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' (which occurs in the 3rd person only), with the positive and negative future evidential auxiliaries respectively. In both cases, there is a clear preference for dubitative interpretation. The negative future evidential marker is expected to function as a particle, i.e. to be invariable (in neuter), but in fact it is often used inflected for gender and number in the colloquial speech.

In the corpus, there is only one cooccurrence of the two auxiliaries *щял* 'will-evidential' and *бил* 'be-evidential' in neuter – *щяло било*, and none of the negative future auxiliary *нямал* 'will not-evidential' and *бил* 'be-evidential'.

6 Discussion

The results extracted from the ParlaMint-BG corpus justify the hypothesis that political speech is a text type that supports the use of the evidential

	Evidentials	Non-dubitatives	Dubitatives
1 sg m	3	0	3
1 sg f	0	-	-
2 sg m	1	1	0
2 sg f	0	-	-
3 sg m	11	11	0
3 sg f	5	3	2
3 sg n	6	5	1
1 pl	12	1	11
2 pl m	0	-	-
2 pl f	0	-	-
2 pl	8	3	5
3 pl	8	4	4
Total	54	26	26

Table 3: Auxiliary *щял* 'will-evidential' + auxiliary *съм* 'be' + particle *да*.

	Evidentials	Non-dubitatives	Dubitatives
M sg	107	5	102
F sg	56	3	53
N sg	112	0	112
Pl	140	1	139
Total	415	9	406

Table 4: Future evidential without auxiliary *съм* 'be'.

	Evidentials	Non-dubitatives	Dubitatives
M sg	0	-	-
F sg	0	-	-
N sg	59	2	57
Pl	1	0	1
Total	60	2	58

Table 5: Negative future evidential without auxiliary *съм* 'be'.

auxiliaries as markers of non-reliability but depending on the cooccurrence with the auxiliary *съм* 'be' and its omission. For all evidential auxiliaries analyzed here, the structures containing the auxiliary *съм* 'be' in the 1st and the 2nd person are grammatically ambiguous but tend to be interpreted as dubitatives. Constructions with the auxiliary *съм* 'be' in the 3rd person should be interpreted as inferentials, i.e. reliability-neutral, as the inferential cannot express dubitativity. They have temporal value, as in (8).

(8) *Когато ГЕРБ е дошла на власт, **е бил влязъл** [be-3SgPrInd be-EvMSg enter-AAPMSg]¹ в сила. Така ли е? Така е.* 'When GERB came to power, it had (supposedly) been put into effect. Is that correct? That's correct.'

Still, 8 out of 42 cooccurrences of *съм* 'be' and *бил* 'be-evidential' and 7 out of 30 of *съм* 'be-evidential' and *щял* 'will-evidential' in the 3rd person express non-reliability. As compared with the forms with omission of the auxiliary *съм* 'be', they are rather stylistically neutral, i.e. do not imply irony or negative stance.

(9) *Седя и слушам колегите от ляво, голяма част от тях бяха депутати и през 2009 г. – със същите аргументи заставаха пред нас, за да защитят колко добър бюджет **са били сътворили** [be-3PlPrInd be-EvPl create-AAPPl].* 'I am listening to my colleagues from the left, a large number of them were MPs in 2009 as well – they stood before us with the same arguments to defend what a good budget they had allegedly created.'

On the contrary, constructions with omitted auxiliary *съм* 'be' in the 3rd person are most often interpreted as dubitatives, as in (10), with very few exceptions: in contexts (11) and (12), for example, the evidentials with omitted auxiliary *съм* 'be' designate tenses of the reportative – perfect in (11) and future in (12). There were also a few contexts, in which the evidentials, although with omitted auxiliary, have inferential reading and do not express non-reliability – (13) and (14).

(10) *Какъв е доводът? Другите **били приели** [be-EvPl accept-AAPPl]. Ние на състезание ли се намираме?* 'What is the argument? The others (allegedly) accepted. Are we in a competition?'

(11) *Колко хора в тази зала не са поставили маските си правилно? Тоест маската знаем, че трябва да покрива и носа. Един колега каза, че синът му **бил ходил** [be-EvMSg go-AAPMSg] една седмица на училище тази година. Уважаеми колеги, от отговорността на всеки един от нас зависи колко време децата няма да бъдат в класните стаи.* 'How many people in this room didn't put their masks on correctly? That is, we know that the mask must also cover the nose. A colleague said his son has gone to school for a week this year. Dear colleagues, it is the responsibility of each of us how long the children will not be in the classrooms.'

(12) *Нещо повече, смятам, че така нареченото дистанционно или електронно обучение трябва много да се внимава и в сферата на висшето образование. Онзи ден синът ми получил в университета съобщение, че изпитът им по физическо **щял да се проведе** [will-EvMSg Part be held-3SgPresPerf] с тест. Предполагам, че изпитът им по търговско право ще се проведе с лицеви опори.* 'Moreover, I think that we should be very careful with the so-called distance or electronic learning in the field of higher education as well. The other day, my son received a message at the university that their PE exam will be held with a test. I guess their commercial law exam will be held with push-ups.'

(13) *Били са назначавани и служители на Агенцията срещу подкуп. [...] Престъпната схема **била функционирала** [be-EvFSg function-AAPFSg], според разследващите органи, чрез добре изградена мрежа от посредници. По време на претърсванията разследващите органи са открили равностойността на 175 хил. лв. в различна валута в дома на Цветанов, както и значителна сума пари в дома на неговия тъст.* 'Agency employees were also appointed for bribes. [...] The criminal scheme functioned, according to the investigating authorities, through a well-established network of intermediaries. During the searches, the investigating authorities found the equivalent of 175,000 leva in different currencies in Tsvetanov's home, as well as a significant amount of money in his father-in-law's home.'

(14) *Невероятни боеве – описани са. Третия ден – решаващия, когато може би Добрич **щял да падне** [will-EvMSg Part fall-3SgPrPerf], генерал Колев спасява града със своята конна дивизия, като разбива сръбската дивизия.* 'Amazing fights – they are described. On the third day – the decisive one, when perhaps Dobrich was about to fall, General Kolev saved the town with his cavalry division, defeating the Serbian division.'

As already noted, the cooccurrence of the future evidential auxiliary *щял* (or the negative *нямал*) and the evidential auxiliary *бил* is unambiguously interpeted as future dubitative but the whole verbal

---

¹ Glosses of the evidentials are provided in square brackets with the following abbreviations: 1, 2, 3 – 1st, 2nd, 3rd person, Sg – singular, Pl – plural, M – masculine, F – feminine, N –

neuter, Pr – present, Ind – indicative, Ev – evidential, AAP – aorist active participle, Part – particle, Perf – perfective, Imperf – imperfective, Refl – reflexive

form becomes overmarked and somehow heavy and subsequently very rare – there is only one such case found in the corpus.

(15) *… **щяло било да попречи** [will-EvNSg be-EvNSg Part hinder-3SgPresPerf] на проверката на сделките и на ревизията на политиката в последните 4 или 10 години. Абсурдни твърдения! Оправдания!* '… it would have hindered the scrutiny of transactions and the revision of policy in the last 4 or 10 years. Absurd claims! Excuses!'

A survey of the evidentials expressing non-reliability reveals that they occur in specific contexts that support the dubitative reading. In her study on the dubitative in Bulgarian, Krasimira Aleksova argues that as a grammatical form the dubitative is the core of the dubitativity subfield of the functional and semantic field of reliability, whose periphery comprises different lexical modifiers, such as expressions of general evaluation of non-reliability, the particle *уж* 'allegedly', words expressing negative subjective stance of the speaker towards the reliability of a non-firsthand information (*lie*, *bullshit*, *speculations*, etc.), emotive expressions denoting disapproval (Aleksova 2023: 273-290). The analysis of the occurrences in the ParlaMint-BG corpus confirms Aleksova's observations and adds some more contexts that are not described by her.

The particle *уж* 'allegedly' is generally accepted as one of the most frequent lexical markers of dubitativity as its main semantics is to explicitly expresses doubt towards non-firsthand source. However, its function in dubitative contexts should not be exaggerated because the evidentials are most often sufficient to express dubitayivity, even if the dubitative marker *бил* 'be-evidential' is omitted. Indeed, there are 27 cooccurrences of *уж* 'allegedly' and *бил* 'be-evidential', and only 3 of *уж* 'allegedly' and *щял* 'will-evidential' (in a distance of 0 to 10 tokens). Another marker of dubitativity and non-reliability with similar semantics is the expression *едва ли не* 'scarcely, hardly' which cooccurs 37 times with *бил* 'be-evidential', 7 times with *щял* 'will-evidential', and 2 times with *нямал(о)* 'will not-evidential'.

(16) *Тук преждеговоривши показваха един междинен доклад, който уж не си **бил свършил** [be-EvMSg do-AAPMSg] работата, но който бил доказателство.* 'Here, previous speakers showed an interim report, which allegedly didn't work, but which was proof.'

(17) *Проблемът, уважаеми господин Председател, е, че вчера министър Радев просто излъга цялата страна, като заяви, че едва ли не той **бил получил** [be-EvMSg get-AAPMSg] подкрепа от всички политически сили – нещо, което не е вярно.* 'The problem, Mr. President, is that yesterday Minister Radev simply lied to the whole country by stating that he almost had the support of all political forces – something that is not true.'

Emotional expressions that convey contradiction and irony like *видите ли* 'you see', *разбирате ли* 'you know', *моля Ви (се)* 'please', *извинявайте* 'excuse me' may also cooccur with evidentials in a context of non-reliability.

(18) *Господин Димитров си позволи да обяснява, че не **се било направило** [Refl be-EvNSg do-AAPNSg] нещо някога от предишните управляващи. Извинявайте, Вие управлявате шест месеца, преди това с малки изключения този Министерски съвет управлява още половин година.* 'Mr. Dimitrov dares to explain that once upon a time something was not done by the previous government. Excuse me, you govern for six months, before that, with few exceptions, this Council of Ministers governed for another half a year.'

(19) *Никой няма да бъде изправен на съд за това, че **бил замислял** [be-EvMSg plan-AAPMSg]. Много Ви моля, това е несериозно.* 'No one will be prosecuted for planning. Please, this is not serious.'

(20) *Сега чувам как, видите ли, господин Кирил Ананиев, безспорно с добра биография и авторитет, между другото се чудя как се е съгласил да приеме тази позиция, той **щял да бъде** [will-EvMSg Part be-3SgFut] спасителят.* 'Now I hear that, you see, Mr. Kiril Ananiev, undoubtedly someone with a good biography and reputation, by the way, I wonder how he agreed to accept this position, he will be the savior.'

Dubitatives are often supported by lexical units denoting false statement – nouns, adjectives or verbs with the meaning of 'lie' – *лъжа* 'a lie', *спекулация* 'speculation', *инсинуации* 'insinuations', *неверен* 'untrue', *фалшив* 'false', *лъжа* 'to lie', *мамя* 'to lie', and also "softer" synonyms that suggest non-reliability, such as *мит* 'myth', *приказки* 'tales'.

(21) *Каза сума ти лъжи по адрес на ДПС, че, видите ли, Рашков **бил нанесъл** [be-EvMSg*

cause-AAPMSg] щети на ДПС заради купен вот! *Пълни <u>лъжи</u>, долни <u>лъжи</u>, господин Председател, от една политическа пеперудка!* 'He told you a lot of lies about the DPS, that, you see, Rashkov had caused damage to the DPS because of a bought vote! Complete lies, vile lies, Mr. Chairman, from a political butterfly!'

(22) *Друго <u>невярно</u> твърдение е, че новият акцизен календар **щял да облекчи** [will-EvMSg Part relieve-3SgPresPerf] най-евтините.* 'Another false claim is that the new excise calendar would relieve the cheapest ones.'

(23) *Четвърти <u>мит</u> – санирането **щяло да подкрепи** [will-EvNSg Part support-3SgPresPerf]местния бизнес.* 'Fourth myth – remediation will support local businesses.'

The expressions discussed so far are lexical markers of non-reliability. The context analysis shows that there are other mechanisms to suggest or even to intensify the non-reliability of a given information that function rather on textual level. When using an evidential with dubitative value to allude that the reported information is false, the speaker very often offers their version of the situation by making the opposite statement. One of the means to give the opposite information is to use a negation, usually in the next sentence, as disclaimer of the previous statement presented as false (contrariwise, negative evidentials are followed by confirmative statements).

(24) *Да, ама те ни **били останали** [be-EvPl left-AAPPl] нула. <u>Не</u>, останали са и изброяваме колко са останали.* 'Yes, but we had zero left. No, there are some left and we are counting how many are left.'

(25) *Но това е икономическата философия, която Вие проповядвате: да не вдигаме пенсиите, защото **щяла да се вдигне** [will-EvFSg Part Refl raise-3SgPresPerf] инфлацията. <u>Не</u>, не сме казали това.* 'But this is the economic philosophy you preach: let's not raise pensions because inflation would rise. No, we didn't say that.'

(26) *Този, който се учудва, че **не го бил видял** [Neg be-EvMSg see-AAPMSg], че го нямало разпечатан. <u>Има</u> го разпечатан – за първо четене е разпечатано, няма промени.* 'The one who is surprised that he had not seen it, that it had not been printed. It's printed out – for the first reading it's printed out, there are no changes.'

Another frequent mechanism to introduce a counterstatement is by using adversative conjunctions or discourse markers: *но* 'but', *само че* 'but, although', *всъщност* 'in fact', *ама* 'but', *ами* 'well', *обаче* 'but', *а* 'and, but', etc.

(27) *Световната банка **се била забавила** [Refl be-EvFSg be late-AAPFSg]. <u>Ами</u> нали тя Ви беше основният гуру, на който вярвахте?* 'The World Bank was too slow. Well, it was the main guru you trusted, wasn't it?'

(28) *Вече няколко часа от тази трибуна не знам колко човека разпространяват една полуистина – как в Стара Загора някой ги **бил блокирал** [be-EvMSg block-AAPMSg]. <u>Всъщност</u> системата е следната.* 'For several hours now, I don't know how many people have been spreading a half-truth from this stand – that someone blocked them in Stara Zagora. In fact, the system is as follows.'

(29) *Има един общ отговор, как този ток **щял да бъде изнасян** [will-EvMSg Part be-3SgFut exported] някъде. <u>Но</u> на конкретния въпрос къде точно ще го изнасяте, на този въпрос няма отговор.* 'There is a general answer, how this current would be exported somewhere. But there is no answer to the specific question of where exactly you will export it.'

(30) *...защото Брюксел **бил казал** [be-EvMSg say-AAPMSg] така. <u>Точно обратното</u>, ...* '… because Brussels said so. Just the opposite, …'

In the near context of evidentials with dubitative value, questions can be seen as a rhetoric device that raises objections to the reliability of the previous statement.

(31) *...днес чувам, че някой **се бил подвел** [Refl be-EvMSg mislead-AAPMSg]. <u>Кой</u> се е подвел?* '...today I hear that someone was allegedly misled. Who has been misled?'

(32) *Как да кажа, има разказ за това как изглеждал основният и допълнителният пакет и това **щяло да увреди** [will-EvNSg Part damage-3SgPresPerf], някой **щял за нещо да плаща** [will-EvMSg Part pay-3SgPresImperf]. <u>Как</u> го разбрахте?* 'How can I say, there is a story about what the basic and additional package looked like, and that would cause damage, someone would pay for something. How did you find out?'

In addition to introducing a question, *wh*-words can be used as intensifiers. In this function, they frequently co-occur with evidentials with dubitative value in repetitive syntactic constructions to suggest non-reliability.

(33) *Вие ми говорите тук за окабеляване, под <u>какъв</u> ъгъл **щяла да бъде** [will-EvFSg Part be-*

3SgFut] камерата, какво щяло да се заснеме [will-EvNSg Part Refl shoot-3SgPresPerf]? 'You're talking to me here about wiring, what angle would the camera be at, what would be shot?'

As a sign of reaction to the false statement, the speaker may address the audience thus imitating a rhetoric dispute. In such context, vocatives or discourse markers for urging reaction of the addressee(s) are used introducing the sentence that follows the evidentials with dubitative meaning.

(34) *Моето предложение към Вас е да не връщаме нещата там, където не бива – служебното правителство какво било казало [be-EvNSg say-AAPNSg], какво не било казало [Neg be-EvNSg say-AAPNSg]. Хайде да видим този доклад, той действително отразява състоянието на армията.* 'My proposal to you is that we should not put things back where they should not be – the caretaker government, whatever it said, whatever it did not say. Come on, let's see this report, it really reflects the state of the army.'

(35) *Да не говорим за това, че беше споменато за Варна как щяла да стане [will-EvFSg Part become-3SgPresPerf] логистичен център за износ на украинско зърно. А бе хора, в средите на българските зърнопроизводители ако кажете нещо такова, те ще умрат от смях...* 'Not to mention that it was said about Varna that it would become a logistics center for the export of Ukrainian grain. Come on, people, in the circles of Bulgarian grain producers, if you say something like that, they will laugh out loud...'

As it can be seen in the contexts discussed so far, different markers supporting the non-reliability interpretation can occur in the same text segment. On the other hand, there are contexts in which evidentials with dubitative value are the only marker of non-reliability.

(36) *Кирил Петков бил излъгал [be-EvMSg lie-AAPMSg] пред всички в залата – се каза по-рано днес.* 'Kiril Petkov had allegedly lied to everyone in the hall – it was said earlier today.'

7 Conclusions and applications

The auxiliaries *бил* 'be-evidential', *щял* 'will-evidential' and *нямал(о)* 'will not-evidential' are used to form complex evidentials, which in political discourse are most often interpreted as dubitatives. The research based on the ParlaMint-BG corpus reveals that 867 out of 955 occurrences, or 91% of the complex evidentials have dubitative

value. The percentage is higher if only the evidentials with omission of the auxiliary *съм* 'be' are considered: 803 out of 819, or 98%. The analyzed auxiliaries may be seen as a grammatical means to express non-reliability. As compared with some lexical means that suggest non-reliability, they are not less frequent in parliamentary speech: the evidential auxiliaries altogether have 955 occurrences, the lemma of the noun *лъжа* 'a lie'1304, the lemma of the noun *манипулация* 'manipulation' 688, the verb *излъга* 'he/she lied' 88.

The study has twofold application: for recognition, disambiguation and annotation of evidential forms in corpora, on one hand, and for sentiment analysis, on the other.

Acknowledgments

References

Aleksova, K. 2003. Udostoveritelen perfekt ili umozaklyuchitelen aorist – ot teoretichnite osnovi kam prepodavaneto na chuzhdentsi. In *Publikatsii ot Yubileynata nauchnoprakticheska sesiya "40 godini ICHS"*, pages 60 – 66. Sofia.

Aleksova, K. 2023. *Dubitativat v savremenniya balgarski ezik.* Sofia: UI "Sv. Kliment Ohridski".

Erjavec, T., Ogrodniczuk, M., Osenova, P. et al. 2023. The ParlaMint corpora of parliamentary proceedings. *Lang Resources & Evaluation*, 57, 415–448.

Guentchéva, Z. 1996. Le médiatif en bulgare. In Guentchéva, Z., editor, *L'énonciation médiatisée*, pages 45 – 70. Louvain – Paris.

Ljubešić, N., & Dobrovoljc, K. (2019). What does Neural Bring? Analysing improvements in morphosyntactic annotation and lemmatisation of Slovenian, Croatian and Serbian. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Balto-Slavic Natural Language Processing*, pages 29 – 34. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Margova, R. 2022. Problemi na upotrebata na renarativa i perfekta za konstatatsiya v presata i onlayn zhurnalistikata. In Koeva, S. & M. Stamenov, editors, *Proceedings of the International Annual Conference of the Institute for*

Bulgarian Language, pages 157 – 164. Sofia: Prof. Marin Drinov Publishing house of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

Nitsolova, R. 2008. *Balgarska gramatika. Morfologiya.* Sofia: UI "Sv. Kliment Ohridski".

Osenova, P. 2023. The Role of Language Technologies in Digital Humanities (The Case of Parliamentary Debates). In *Digital Presentation and Preservation of Cultural and Scientific Heritage*, 13, 61 – 68.

Plungian, V. A. 2001. The place of Evidentiality within the Universal Grammatical Space. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33.3, 349 – 357.

Tarpomanova, E. 2015. *Evidentsialnost v balkanskite ezitsi: balgarski i albanski.* Sofia: Ni plus.

Tarpomanova, E. 2016. Za semantichnoto sadarzhanie na kategoriyata evidentsialnost v balgarski i albanski. In *Aktualni problemi na lingvistikata. Yubileen sbornik v chest na prof. d.f.n. d-r hon. kauza Stefana Dimitrova*, pages 210 – 216. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN "Prof. Marin Drinov".