

REPRESENTATIVE, EXPRESSIVE AND APPELLATIVE FUNCTION IN THE BULGARIAN LANGUAGE

Helmut W. Schaller (Marburg, Germany)

At first we have to answer the question: What are the communicative functions of language? A lot of traditional publications describe the communication as conveying of propositions from the mind of interlocutors to the mind of one or more interlocutors. So we have today the general conception that sentences may be about some state of affairs, real or imagined, but this is not the question of representative, expressive or appellative functions of language. In the linguistic descriptions reference is made to entities in the state of affairs, and predications are made about actions involving entities in the state of affairs, and predications about them involve the entities or relations among them. It is the way in which speakers construct linguistic representations of situations, they have to organize “nominalizations” and also “temporalizations” as in the English sentence “The schoolboy managed his tasks in the class-room”. The Bulgarian language especially shows grammatical categories which are typical for special functions of language, especially in the verbal category of admirative as a sign of surprise of the speaker, the vocative of nouns or names as a sign of persons to whom an order is given. But language is used for much more than representing states of affairs. It is also used in all kinds of verbal social interactions: asking questions, giving commands, making promises, expressing wishes or feelings, etc. These different uses are known as speech acts.

It is true that there are language structures which, at first glance, seem to stand outside of syntactic regularities and which contradict the traditional principles of syntactic descriptions. To these structures belong vocatives, used beside nominatives as the form of addressing persons in direct speech like commands, questions or sentences with an expressive character. It was the Austrian psychologist and linguist Karl Bühler (1879–1963)¹, who proposed in his publications a threefold function of language,

¹ Karl Bühler: Kritische Musterung der neueren Theorien des Satzes. In: *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* 6, 1918–1920, p. 1–20. Vom Wesen der Syntax. In:

namely: the representative function, whereby speakers inform listeners of whatever extralinguistic facts or states they are talking about. (=German: “Darstellungsfunktion”), the expressive function (=German: “Kundgabefunktion” or “Ausdrucksfunktion”) whereby information is revealed to the listener about various aspects of the speaker himself and last but not least the appellative function (=German: “Appellfunktion”), which serves to provoke well definable impressions of feelings in the listener, for example an imperative tone in which a military order is given by a superior officer, who urges soldiers to undertake a certain action². Or, a specific intonation with which an utterance is made may have the effect of inducing the listener to carry out a certain act, demanded by the speaker. In Karl Bühler’s “Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache”, first published in 1934, the author describes the representational function of language, he speaks about an “organon model” with its three largely independently variable relations, which was first completely shown in his paper on the sentence beginning with the words: “What human language does is threefold: profession, triggering and representation. Today I prefer the terms expression, appeal and representation, because among language theories “expression” is increasingly taking on the precise meaning

Idealistische Neuphilologie. Festschrift für Karl Vossler zum 6. September 1922. Heidelberg 1922. p.54–84. Über den Begriff der sprachlichen Darstellung. In: Psychologische Forschung 3,3, 1923, p. 282–294; Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. Stuttgart 1936. Translation: D. F. Goodwin: The representational function of language. Amsterdam-Philadelphia 1990; Die Axiomatik der Sprachwissenschaften. Einleitung und Kommentar von Elisabeth Ströker; Frankfurt a. M. 1960. p. 11: „Die deskriptive Grammatik ist schnell fertig mit den geformten Appellmitteln der Sprache. Da ist der Vokativ, von dem man immer schon wusste, dass er seiner Funktion nach aus dem System der anderen „Kasus“ des Nomens herausfällt und sich störrig benimmt im Satzbau. Daneben steht der Imperativ, der sich ebenso von den übrigen Verbalformen absondert und außerdem manchmal, z.B. in den indoeuropäischen Sprachen, als endungsloser Verbalstamm auftritt (veni, komm). Die Historiker deuten dies im Sinne des Hineinragens einer älteren in die jüngere Sprachschicht; das heißt eben in unserer Terminologie, dass die formhaften Appellwörter Fremdlinge geworden sind im Reigen der anderen Formen, deren Beruf rein oder reiner im Darstellen liegt.“

² D. F. Goodwin: The representational function of language. Amsterdam-Philadelphia, 1990.

demanded here, and because the Latin word “appellare”, English “appeal”, German more or less “ansprechen”, is apt for the second. As everyone knows today there is a sex appeal, and in additions to that speech appeal means to me to be just palpable a fact”³. It was the Polish linguist Zenon Klemensiewicz who developed independent by the theory of Bühler in his description of Polish syntax that human language generally shows three functions, namely the judgement, feeling and will.⁴ Concerning the participants of spoken language, each of two participants has its own position in the make-up of the speech situation, namely the sender as the agent of the act of speaking, as the subject of the speech action on the one hand, and the receiver as the one spoken to, as the addressee of the speech on the other hand. They are not simply a part of what the message is about, they are rather partners in an exchange and ultimately this is the reason why it is possible that the sound as medial product has a specific significative relationship to each, to the one and to the other severally.

The function of conveying propositional information, i.e. linguistic description of state of affairs, is but one of many communicative functions that language has. All of these different functions may have structural ramifications in language. As a simple example, let us have a look at how two different languages express assertion, statements, interrogative, questions, and imperatives, commands. In English, each of these requires a different syntactic structure, but not in Bulgarian:

- a. You are travelling today.//statement// **Вие пътувате днес.**
- b. Are you travelling today?//question// **Вие пътувате ли днес?**
- c. Travel today! Not tomorrow!//command// **Пътувайте днес! Не утре!**

It should be mentioned here that the Polish language in contrast to other Slavic languages has a special marker for questions, namely “czy”, e.g. “*Czy pan mówi po bułgarski?*”. Here is perhaps astonishment in the Polish sentence that somebody speaks English and not Bulgarian. In Bulgarian we find specific word order rules for the formation of questions, but there are also different rules for yes-no questions and for word questions, containing a question word, e.g.:

³ Vom Wesen der Syntax. In: Idealistische Neuphilologie. Festschrift für Karl Vossler zum 6. September 1922. Heidelberg, 1922, p. 54.

⁴ Zenon Klemensiewicz: *Składnia opisowa współczesnej polszczyzny kulturalnej*. Kraków, 1937, p. 6–7.

Вие пътувате.// Вие за къде пътувате?// За къде пътувате?

We suppose that expression is a manner of speaking, a way of externalizing feelings, attitudes and moods of the speaker himself – conveying information about an emotional state. The reasons for emotion may be fear, surprise, astonishment, mourning, misfortune, pity, grief or sorrow, in some languages expressed by special words. In Bulgarian we find also the rarely used verbal form of “admirative”, a category which is also found in Albanian. It describes surprise of the speaker, who feels a sudden, non-expected extralinguistic situation. But there are also words to characterize sentences with the function of imperatives. Sometimes there are ambiguities and we might be confused as to a speaker’s exact feeling, but often expression can be very clear, for example, anger or happiness in someone’s voice is usually not difficult to detect but subtly conveyed suspicion or irony may be more difficult or even misread by the listener.

There seem to be different degrees of appellation and expression indicated by language markers as there are interjections and particles beginning with a neutral speech to a higher degree of appellation or expressiveness, perhaps by doubling nouns with vocative forms or double use of interjections. But there are also means of word order to mark a higher degree of expression. Thus we have to see differences within these three functions of language performance, demonstrated by some Bulgarian examples. Starting with neutral speech, perhaps a special case of expression, we can see it as one end of a scale of expressiveness. Different degrees of expression are indicated by language markers as there are interjections or articles, but also by means of vocative or nominative forms, referring to the person, who receives a command, sometimes strengthened by particles.

I think that the “organon-model” of Karl Bühler with its three functions, namely representative, expressive and appellative function didn’t lose its importance for linguistic studies, it should be also put to use in all European languages we have to do with.

Vocative cases with the function of exclaiming or addressing are not used in representative function, but in indexical or expressive, in appellative or conative functions, revealing various aspects of the speaker to the listener, e.g. impressions or feelings or imperatives. In Eastern and Southeastern European languages we find a widespread use of synthetic

vocative forms in addresses. They are used not only in the majority of Slavic languages, except Russian with some remnants of Church Slavonic vocatives, but also in Latvian and Lithuanian, in most of the Balkan languages and outside East and South-East Europe also in the western part of Ireland. Masculine and feminine substantives may appear in a special vocative case form within the singular, whereas in the dual and plural vocative forms are identical with the nominatives in Old Church Slavonic/Old Bulgarian. There is no doubt that most of the Slavic languages today use vocative forms to a different extent. White Russian uses vocative forms in a very restricted way, may be because of its neighbourship to Great Russian and the widespread use of Russian in the country. One has to comment the disuse of vocative forms in the history of Russian, beginning with texts in the 11th century. The Old Russian alternations of the consonants k, g and ch with č, ž and š lapsed with the disuse of the vocative case, which began to be gradually replaced by the nominative form. But the real reason for the disappearance of vocative forms in the history of Russian in contrast to other Slavic languages has not been discovered so far. Ukrainian uses vocative forms perhaps in consequence of an old long-lasting Polish influence, Slovenian has today no vocative forms, Lusatian languages show a very restricted use of vocative case forms, perhaps in consequence of German influence. Polish and Czech, also Slovak use vocative forms of masculine and feminine noun classes.

Serbian as well as Croatian shows a fully equipped system of vocative forms like Bulgarian and Macedonian, perhaps a consequence of mutual influence of Balkan languages. It seems to be evident that languages with classes of declension, where no morphologically distinct vocative is to be used, the nominative always takes over the function of addressing persons or sometimes also things and has – strictly spoken – no sentence-syntactic function. All Macedonian nouns representing human beings, but also some non human beings have specific vocative forms, while some of them can also have general oblique case forms, to which belong genitive//accusative forms. Vocative forms of masculine name ending on a consonant are constructed by the addition of the vowel –e, e.g. Стојане! Вардапе! Vocative forms of masculine singular common nouns ending on a consonant are marked by the vowels –u or –e, e.g. овчару = shepherd!, Боже = my God!, мажу = husband! граду наш =

our town!, дену божии = what a day, You God's day! Vocative forms of singular nouns, ending on –а irrespective of their gender, are marked by the vowel –о, which replaces the final vowel of the nominative form, e.g. жена// жено!

Vocatives in Bulgarian are also morphologically marked, but as performance structures they belong like in other languages to a secondary level of syntax, vocatives are marked with masculine and feminine nouns, e.g. брат//brate or гражданин//гражданине, or труженик//труженико, царица//царице. Vocative forms belong here also to the sphere of appellative function, but also to the sphere of expressive function, but not to the sphere of representation. In the Bulgarian language the majority of human and many non-human animate nouns have vocative case forms, which are morphologically marked, e.g. юнак//юначе or старец//старче. We will have a look not only on the use of vocative forms, but also on special words, known in Bulgarian as interjections and particles, known as words without lexical signification, e.g. хайде, ехе, ехо, ало, хей, ела and others e.g.:

– Хайде, всеки от нас да разкаже нещо за бай Ганя.

– Хайде – извикаха всички. – Аз ще разкажа. – Чакайте, аз зная повече. Не, аз, ти нищо не знаеш.⁵

The following example uses the interjection bravo, the acclamation of the Italian opera “bravo” to the capable man, a word we know also from other languages like German:

Бай Ганю от любопитство не изпушаше случая да опита иностранните продукти.

– Туй какво е, грозде ли е? Bravo! Гледай! Я дайте една чепчица.

Mm! Хубаво! Bravo!⁶

They all can be used as functional words, as markers for communication, especially for the sphere of performance of expressivity. We find beside lexical units, morphosyntactic markers and also phonetic markers sometimes reproduced in written texts, e.g. with a lengthened “о”:

⁵ Aleko Konstantinov: Baj Ganju (Otkâsi): Baj Ganju trâgna po Evropa. In: *Bulgarisches Lesebuch*. Halle (Saale) 1956, p. 136.

⁶ Aleko Konstantinov: Baj Ganju (Otkasi): Baj Ganju tragna po Evropa. In: *Bulgarisches Lesebuch* 1. Halle (Saale) 1956, p. 146.

Бабооо, господ се възнася. – чуеш ли?⁷

Syntactic markers can be found also for expressive use by means of word order, e.g. strengthened by an adverbial:

Не, аз съм българин. – ?! Българин съм, от България.⁸

In Bulgarian we have remnants of synthetic cases as a feature of the noun, largely functionally definable, nominative for mentioning the subject, accusative for mentioning the direct object, genitive for indicating ownership, dative for indicating benefit or indirect object, ablative for indicating direction or agenthood and finally vocative for exclaiming or calling, the form of a noun used when addressing someone. All these definitions are not watertight and there are variations within languages. In most of the Indo-European languages the functions of the vocative were taken over by the nominative and it is now the question how the vocative is used, e.g. in Bulgarian today. When a person or object is being addressed, the special form of the vocative is used. But the endings for the vocative are different in Bulgarian. In personal names, the vocative ending is used more and more rarely, and for some speakers it carries a tinge of unfriendliness. Students are advised, as I heard, to avoid these vocative forms. Vocative cases with the function of exclaiming or addressing somebody directly are not used in representative functions in the sense of Bühler, but in indexical or expressive, appellative or conative function, revealing various aspects of the speaker to the listener, e.g. impressions or feelings or imperatives, e.g.:

Ти не ходи ли, Бай Ганю, да се разходиш, да видиш Виена.⁹

A higher degree of expressive sentences seem to be the following Bulgarian sentences with double vocative forms and double interjection:

– Иванчо, Иванчо, ела, ела тука, я виж лале.

– Марийке, Марийке, ела, ела тук, виж мимоза, това е мимоза, видиш ли?¹⁰

⁷ Christo Botev: Tova vi čaka. In: *Bulgarisches Lesebuch 1*. Halle (Saale) 1956, p. 50.

⁸ Aleko Konstantinov: Do Čikago I nazad. Otkâs. In: *Bulgarisches Lesebuch 1*. Halle (Saale) 1956, p. 121.

⁹ A. Konstantinov: Baj Ganju (Otkâsi). Baj Ganju trâgna po Evropa. *Bulgarisches Lesebuch 1*. Halle (Saale), 1956, p. 142.

¹⁰ A. Konstantinov: Baj Ganju (Otkâsi). Baj Ganju trâgna po Evropa. *Bulgarisches Lesebuch 1*. Halle (Saale) 1956, p. 156.

In Romanian the vocative case is specifically marked by the suffix –o with the feminine singular nouns, while masculine singular nouns show the alternation –e and –o. The Rumanian vocative marker –o seems to be a case form taken over from South Slavic languages. It cannot be found in other Romance languages. The suffixes –le for singulars and –lor for plurals can be also used as markers for addressing in Rumanian. In Albanian we don't find a special vocative form, when somebody is addressed directly, nouns carry the definite article.

In Modern Greek we find distinct markers for four cases, namely nominative, genitive, accusative and vocative in o-stems, e.g. φίλος, φίλε = friend! ἐχθρος, ἐχθρε = enemy! In all other classes of Greek declensions there can't be found a special form for the vocative. The nominative plural always is used with the function of the vocative. Thus the vocative forms do not occur in every noun. The actual use in the languages, mentioned here, must be treated separately.

The use of the vocative case forms seems to be not only a Balkanism but also a Europeism when we regard other Slavic languages except Russian, the Balkan languages as there are Rumanian and Modern Greek, but not Albanian. But the use of vocative forms is not only a question of descriptive, but also of historical linguistics, perhaps a consequence of mutual influence within neighboring languages in the Balkans or inherited within the Slavic and Baltic languages, but possibly it may be also a consequence of a new synthetism which developed in concurrence with analytism. The vocative as a marker of addressing persons, sometimes also things, is an Indoeuropean phenomenon, highly developed in Balkan and Slavic languages. Outside the Balkan languages and the Slavic languages we find vocatives in Baltic languages, in Lithuanian, e.g. v́yras/ /v́yre = man! In rare cases vocatives are also used in Latvian, e.g. Roberts (nominative)//Robert! (vocative), kurpneks (shoemaker, bootmaker)//kurpnek!, kalejs (smith)//kalej!. In Old Church Slavonic/Old Bulgarian and Old Russian we find вѣлкѣ (wolf)// вѣлче!, богѣ (God)// боже!, in Latin: lupus//lupe!, dominus//domine!, but: deus instead of “dee”, in Old Greek: λύκος (wolf)//λύκε!.

In a paper, published in 1956 by H. Schmid with the title “Über Randgebiete und Sprachgrenzen” we find the following interesting remarks concerning the vocative in European languages: “Zwei Gebiete Europas, die Hunderte von Kilometern auseinanderliegen, kennen noch heute eine

besondere Kasusform für den Vokativ: im Westen dem Atlantik zugewendet, der gälische Teil von Irland und Schottland; im Osten und Südosten des Kontinentes jene weiten Landstriche, die sich vom Mittelländischen und Schwarzen Meer bis zur Ostsee hinziehen und in denen fünf verschiedene indogermanische Sprachzweige vertreten sind: das Griechische, das Albanische, das Romanische mit dem Rumänischen, das Slawische mit dem Bulgarischen, Serbokroatischen, den westslawischen Sprachen, dem Ukrainischen und Weißrussischen, und endlich das Baltische (Litauisch und Lettisch). – In allen anderen europäischen Sprachen dient heute ausschließlich der Nominativ als Form der Anrede.

...Einzig das Slowenische als westlicher Ausläufer des Südslawischen und das Russische (oder nachmalige Großrussische) im Nordosten wären mit Sicherheit noch dem Vokativ-Gebiet zuzurechnen.”¹¹

Thus the use of vocative in modern European languages seems to be a question not only for Slavic and Baltic languages, but also for non-Slavic Balkan languages and even for Irish dialects, the use of vocative case forms seems to be also a Europeism.

As we have seen there are some open questions, e.g. in Bulgarian in spite of an analytic noun declension - wholly in contrast to the Old Bulgarian synthetic noun declension – the vocative is just used in the framework of a “new synthetism” – I would say. Are there possibilities of an influence by neighboring languages like Russian upon White Russian, of German upon Lusatian languages and upon Slovene to reduce or abolish the use of vocative forms? Independent of these questions the use of vocative forms seems to be characteristic for both Baltic languages, for most of the Slavic languages and most of the Balkan languages, belonging to different language families, languages spoken within one European area.

РЕПРЕЗЕНТАТИВНА, ЕКСПРЕСИВНА И АПЕЛАТИВНА ФУНКЦИЯ В БЪЛГАРСКИ ЕЗИК

Хелмут В. Шалер (Марбург, Германия)

Не някой друг, а австрийският психолог и лингвист Карл Бюлер (1879–1963) разграничава в публикациите си три функции на езика:

¹¹ H. Schmid: Über Randgebiete und Sprachgrenzen. In: Vox Romanica 1956, 15. Band, Nr. 2. S. 19–20.

Репрезентативна функция, когато говорещият информира слушащия за екстралингвистични факти и състояния (нем. *Darstellungsfunktion*).

Експресивна функция (нем. *Kundgabefunktion* или *Ausdrucksfunktion*) когато се предава информация на слушащия за говорещия.

И накрая, но не и по значимост *апелативната функция* (нем. *Appellfunktion*), чиято цел е да предизвика определени впечатления или чувства у слушащия. Напр. императивният тон, с който се издава военна заповед от висшестоящ офицер, кара войниците да предприемат дадено действие. Или в друг случай специфичната интонация на едно изказване може да накара слушащия да извърши акт, за който говорещият настоява. В книгата си „*Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*” (1936), в която Бюлер описва репрезентативната функция на езика, той говори за „модела органон” с трите негови променливи семантични отношения, до голяма степен независимо едно от друго и който модел той прилага в статията си за изречението. Тя започва с думите: „Езикът прави три неща: заявява, подтиква и репрезентира. Понастоящем аз предпочитам термините експресивност, апелативност и репрезентация”.

Предполагаме, че експресивността е начин на изразяване, начин на показване на чувствата, нагласите и на настроеността на говорещия или предаване на информация за емоционалното му състояние. Причините за чувството могат да бъдат различни: уплаха, изненада, учудване, тъга, съжаление и болка, изразявани на български със специални думи. В българския срещаме рядката глаголна форма „адмиратив”, каквато има и в албанския език. Тя изразява изненадата на говорещия, когато той преживява неочаквана екстралингвистична ситуация. На български съществуват думи за характеризане на изречения с функцията на императива. Понякога може да има двузначност и да не сме сигурни за чувството на говорещия, но често изразяването е много ясно. Така напр. обикновено не е много трудно да се открие гняв или щастие в нечий глас, докато фино предаденото подозрение или ирония са трудни за интерпретация и често са погрешно разбрани от слушащия.

Струва ни се, че има различни степени за изразяване на апелативност и експресивност в българския чрез езикови маркери като възкличания и частици, като се започне с неутрална реч и се стигне до по-голяма степен за апелативност и експресивност чрез удвояването на съществителни във вокативна форма или двойната употреба на възкличания. Но съществува и възможността чрез словоредата да се изрази по-висока степен на експресивност. Разликите между трите функции при речевата активност могат да се демонстрират с различни примери в българския език. Неутралната реч,

вероятно като специален случай на експресивност, може да се постави в единия край на скалата на експресивността. Различните степени на експресивност се изразяват чрез възклицания или частици, но също така и чрез вокатива и номинативните форми на съществителните, както и чрез името на слушащия, към когото говорещият се обръща, докато апелативните функции се изразяват не само с повелителната форма на глагола, но така също и чрез вокативни и номинативни форми на глагола, а също така и чрез вокативни и номинативни форми, именуващи слушащия, когато към него е отправена заповед, като понякога функцията се подсилва и с частици.

Мисля, че „моделът органон” на Карл Бюлер с трите си функции – репрезентативна, експресивна и апелативна, не е изгубил актуалността си при лингвистичните изследвания и трябва да се използва и при изследванията в българската лингвистика.