The Bulgarian Reportative

A marking on the verb, 
- Indicates that the speaker does not have direct evidence for the proposition, and therefore does not wish to commit.
- When on the matrix verb - generally acceptable in lack of direct evidence 
- generally bad when direct evidence is present

(1) Ivan celunal Maria. #Az gi vzdx
Ivan kiss-REP Maria. I them see
‘Ivan apparently kissed Maria. I saw them.’

1. A Modal associated with a Presupposition
Roumyana Pancheva 1997

Bulgarian evidentials are modal operators:
- default universal quantificational force
- presupposition that the speaker does not have direct evidence of the statement he is making.

Problems:
- That speaker’s knowledge is indirect cannot be a presupposition - It cannot be plugged (see handout) - always speaker oriented (see handout).
- The modal operator analysis is too weak for embedded reportative.


Problems:
- The reportative consist of two parts
  - presupposition part: y has in world v indirect evidence of p
  - assertion part: p (No modal operator)
- Obligatory in the lack of direct evidence.
- Cannot be used if the speaker has direct evidence to the contrary, the dubitative must be used instead.

The Data

- A set of sentences involving different options for REP marking on verbs
- Four Bulgarian Native speakers
- A set of scenarios, each involving a different knowledge status, relative to which the sentences were evaluated

Table A: Marina tells Peter that Ivan kiss Ana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tell (MV)</th>
<th>Direct Ev</th>
<th>Indirect Ev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop. OK</td>
<td>Prop. OK</td>
<td>Prop. OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell (MV)</td>
<td>Tell (MV)</td>
<td>Tell (MV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiss (EV)</td>
<td>Kiss (EV)</td>
<td>Kiss (EV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>-Rep</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
<td>-Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
<td>-Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B: Marina tells Ivan like Ana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tell (EV)</th>
<th>Direct Ev</th>
<th>Indirect Ev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop. OK</td>
<td>Prop. OK</td>
<td>Prop. OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell (EV)</td>
<td>Tell (EV)</td>
<td>Tell (EV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like (EV)</td>
<td>Like (EV)</td>
<td>Like (EV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>-Rep</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>-Rep</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>-Rep</td>
<td>+Rep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sketch of an analysis as a CI

Conventional Implicatures (Potts 2005):
- meaning triggers that:
  - contribute to meaning in a conventional way, hence non cancelable
  - are not part of the at-issue content, but may take part of at-issue content as arguments
  - do not take narrow scope with respect to at issue content and therefore invariant under plugs to presuppositions
  - Speaker oriented, except in quotations.

The fact that the speaker does not convey direct information when using the Bulgarian reportative is a Conventional Implicature, not a presupposition.
- It is always speaker oriented (does not shift even under embedding)
- Cannot be plugged (also shows that it is not a presupposition)

Meaning:
- The speaker commits to having indirect (hearsay) evidence that p

- The speaker utters Rep-p if CB supports p.
- *Even Bigger Problem*: the speaker can have indirect information supporting both p and ~p.

(2) Marina me tell that Ivan kiss-REP Ana, but Katja me tell that Ivan kiss-Rep Maya
Marina told me that Ivan apparently kissed Ana, but Katja told me that Ivan apparently didn’t kiss her.

(3) Marina me tell that Ivan kiss-REP Ana and Katja me tell that Ivan kiss-Rep Maya
Marina told me that Ivan apparently kissed Ana and Katja told me that Ivan apparently kissed Maya

(4) Ivan celunal Ana and Maya
Ivan kiss-REP Ana and Maya
‘Ivan apparently kissed Ana and Maya’

(5) entails (4), even though the information sources are different.
- What does it mean that S supports p?
  - Increases the chances that p is correct.
  - Most of S ‘lent’ most of p (the interaction between S-worlds and p-worlds is big enough).

- Lack of reportative marking does not commit the speaker to having direct knowledge, this is a conventional implicature, which can be cancelled.

Some people accept the reportive form on embedded verbs even in the presence of direct evidence.
Why? They interpret these sentences as the speaker referring to the indirect evidence he has (i.e., the hearsay) rather than the direct evidence.