

GORAN PAVELIĆ  
(Zagreb)

## ON EVIDENTIALITY, PARTICULARLY IN TURKISH

(O EVIDENCIJALNOSTI, NAROČITO U TURSKOM JEZIKU)

Ovo je informativni pregled (pod)kategorije evidencijalnosti, njenih osnovnih morfo-sintaktičkih obilježja, arealne distribucije i lingvističkih istraživanja evidencijalnosti. Data su 22 primjera iz različitih jezika svijeta. Slijedi opis evidencijalnosti u turkijskim jezicima koju karakterizira semantičko-pragmatička domena *neizravnosti* (*indirektivnosti*). Slijedi osam kratkih primjera iz izumrlih i suvremenih turkijskih jezika. Pregled se nastavlja osnovnim evidencijalnim razlikama unutar neizravnosti u suvremenom turskom. Pragmatička važnost evidencijalnosti primjetljiva je u diskursu, mirativnim iskazima i različitim narativnim oblicima. Dato je 29 primjera iz turskoga. Predled završava ponudom čitatelju da sam odluči je li evidencijalnost pod-kategorija unutar modalnosti ili je samostalna kategorija. Ukratko su predstavljena tri različita mišljenja iz suvremene literature.

*Ključne riječi:* evidencijalnost, iskustvo, izvještaj, mirativnost, neizravnost, pretpostavka, sufiks, turkijski, turski

### 1. GRAMMATICAL (SUB)CATEGORY OF EVIDENTIALITY

In every language a speaker has means by which (s)he can point out the kind of source from which a particular information comes or how s/he obtained it. In some languages these kinds of statements are expressed by lexical means (using the adverbs like *navodno* in Croatian, or *reportedly* in English), by the choice of the verb (*pretpostavljati* in Croatian, *assume* in English) or by modal verbs (e.g. *sollen* in German). There are also periphrastic constructions combined of the main predicate plus complement as in Croatian *mislim/vjerujem/siguran sam/istina je/*

*vidio sam/čuo sam/rekli su /priča se da ...[complement]* or in English *I suppose/ it is true/they say/it is thought that ...[complement]*. In some languages certain verbal forms (e.g. *conditionnel de l'information incertaine/hypothétique* in French or perfect in some languages) may acquire secondary evidential meanings without explicit description of the source of information. Such forms of evidential marking Alexandra Aikhenvald calls “evidential strategies”.<sup>1</sup>

Besides lexical means and evidential strategies, in about 1/4 of the world's languages every statement must specify the source on which its content is based. Such statements are marked grammatically and most commonly this is effectuated by affixes or clitics on verbs (sometimes, but rarely, on other kinds of words). Particles are also used often. Also, evidential meanings may be a part of wider TAM frame. In such cases we may speak about grammatical (sub)category of **evidentiality**. There is one important difference between languages with no evidentiality and those which have evidentiality as an obligatory category, and this difference surpasses linguistic level and enters the domain of human social life. In those languages where evidentiality is fully grammaticalized the speaker is obliged to use it. If s/he does not do so or uses it incorrectly, s/he is bound to be called a liar or a person not to be trusted, or in the mildest case s/he will not be understood. Thus evidentiality also shows its important pragmatic (discourse) function.

Should we understand evidentiality as a sub-category inside the general frame of modality<sup>2</sup> or as a category by itself<sup>3</sup>? More on this will be said at the end of this overview. It should be emphasized that evidentiality is not typologically limited - a language with evidentiality may be fusional, agglutinative, isolative or polysynthetic. A language with evidentiality may have accusative, ergative or active SAO relational marking. Also, it should be noted that creoles and pidgins very rarely have evidentiality as obligatory category. As yet, evidentiality has not been registered neither in sign languages.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., “Evidentiality in typological perspective” in Aikhenvald and Dixon [A&D], *Studies in Evidentiality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2003, 2

<sup>2</sup> see Palmer, Frank R., *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001

<sup>3</sup> see Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., *Evidentiality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004

<sup>4</sup> A.Y. Aikhenvald, *Evidentiality*, 8

## 2. LINGUISTS AND EVIDENTIALITY

The beginnings of researches of evidentiality are found in Boas's works (1911, 1938, 1947) on Amerindian languages of the North America and in Jakobson (1957). In his description of Kwak'wala language (Wakashan, Northwestern USA) Boas noticed affixes with evidential meanings, and in the chapter "Language" in his "General Anthropology" (1938) he wrote: "...while for us definiteness, number, and time are obligatory aspects, we find in another language location near the speaker or somewhere else, [and] source of information - whether seen, heard, or inferred - as obligatory aspects"<sup>5</sup>. Boas also used the term "evidentiality" formally in 1947. One decade later this term, with the same meaning, was used by Jakobson, who "expanded its meaning to apply to Balkan Slavic [languages]"<sup>6</sup>.

Typological researches after Greenberg<sup>7</sup> and many grammatical descriptions of the world's languages (regardless on the size and "importance" of a particular language) have made it possible that many linguists pay attention to evidentiality in their works. Besides the linguists mentioned in this article there are many others who have described evidentiality in particular languages or in general syntactic researches.

## 3. FORMAL DESCRIPTIONS OF EVIDENTIALITY

In following definitions of evidentiality it may be seen that all the authors agree on the basic division into direct and indirect evidentiality. Thus Matthews<sup>8</sup> says that a language may formally distinguish statements based on *direct observation* from ones based on *inference*, or on what someone else has told the speaker (*quotatives*), or on *guesswork*. In their syntax Van Valin and LaPolla distinguish *sensory* and *reportative* evidentiality which, together with epistemic modality shares domain of *inferring*<sup>9</sup>. (In their syntax evidentiality is a clausal operator and has

<sup>5</sup> A.Y. Aikhenvald, "Evidentiality in typological perspective", [A&D], *Studies*, 1 and A.Y. Aikhenvald, *Evidentiality*, 1

<sup>6</sup> Friedman, Victor A., "Evidentiality in the Balkans with special attention to Macedonian and Albanian" in [A&D], *Studies*, 189

<sup>7</sup> a concise and clear overview of typological theories in linguistics see in Matasović, Ranko, *Uvod u poredbenu lingvistiku*, Matica Hrvatska, Zagreb, 2001, 233-279

<sup>8</sup> Matthews, Peter H., *Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997, 20

<sup>9</sup> Van Valin, Richard D. Jr. and LaPolla, Randy J., *Syntax: structure, meaning and function*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, 42-51

a scope over other operators like tense, internal negation, modality, directionals etc. In his functional-typological syntax Givón distinguishes two hierarchical categories of evidentiality (which may overlap with epistemic modality)<sup>10</sup>:

- access: direct experience vs. inference vs. hearsay
- sensory modality: visual vs. auditory vs. others

Languages then rank “the strength of reliability of evidence” along the following universal hierarchies:

- a)** access hierarchy: direct sensory experience > inference > hearsay
- b)** sensory sub-hierarchy: vision > hearing > others
- c)** personal deictic hierarchy: speaker > hearer > 3rd person
- d)** spatial deixis: near > far
- e)** temporal deixis: present > perfect/immediate past > remote past

Givón also points out that the grammaticalized evidential systems primarily code *the source* of information<sup>11</sup>. In his synthetic works on the category of modality (1986 and 2001) Palmer classifies evidentiality (together with epistemic modality) into propositional modality (deontic and dynamic modality are two main types of event modality). Further, evidentiality is divided into two basic types (following Willet):

**I. direct evidence:** a) visual; b) auditory; c) sensory

**II. indirect evidence:** A) reported (1. second hand, 2. third hand, 3. from folklore)  
 B) inferring (1. from results, 2. from reasoning)

In the copious and detailed “The World Atlas of Language Structures”, de Haan broadly distinguishes direct (sensory evidence) and indirect evidentiality (inference, quotatives)<sup>12</sup>. Up to now Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (2003 and 2004) has most extensively researched evidentiality and made a detailed division of evidential systems. The basic division is made into languages in which<sup>13</sup>:

<sup>10</sup> Givón, Talmy, *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction I*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2001, 327

<sup>11</sup> T. Givón, *Syntax*, 326

<sup>12</sup> de Haan, Ferdinand, “Evidentiality” in Haspelmath, Martin et alii (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005, 314-321

<sup>13</sup> A.Y. Aikhenvald, “Evidentiality in typological perspective”, [A&D], *Studies*, 3-6 and A.Y. Aikhenvald, *Evidentiality*, 23-66

- 1) the source of evidence is stated, but not specified (e.g. Turkic languages)
- 2) the source of evidence is specified (visual, auditory, inference, report etc.)

Systems from group 2 are further classified according to the number of different evidential meanings they can express. The simplest systems have a two-term division and marking of the source of evidentiality (Jarawara, Yukaghir, Abkhaz, Enga, Lezgian). Some languages have a three-term division (Aymara, Quechua, Qiang, Northern Pomo), and some have a four-term division (Tariana, Tsafiki, Wintu). Even more complex semantic distinguishing of a five-term (Tuyuca) and a six-term is recorded (Nambiquara).

It is important to mention a semantic-pragmatic extension of evidentiality, perceived in almost all the languages with evidentiality - *mirativity*, a way of expressing unusual or unexpected information.

#### 4. SOURCES OF EVIDENTIALITY

The sources of evidentials are various<sup>14</sup>. They may be grammaticalized verbs, deictics, locative or directional markers; evidentiality may develop through re-analysis and re-interpretation of evidential strategies - tense/aspect or modal categories or from nominalisation. Furthermore, evidentiality may develop from complement clauses. Adverbs and sometimes nouns may also be sources of evidentiality. In languages with more extensive evidential system (e.g. Wintu) the markers of evidentiality are of heterogenous origin.

Grammaticalized verbs that become evidentials are commonly the verbs of utterance (reportatives and quotatives) as recorded in e.g. Lezgian, Tibetan, Maricopa, Akha and Kora. Grammaticalized verbs of perception (visual, audial) are the source of direct evidentiality markers, e.g. in Maricopa, Wintu, Tariana and Hupda. Sometimes the verbs of physical posture/position, movement or existing may become the sources of evidentiality, e.g. in Wintu, Hupda, Dulong and Jarawara. Deictic elements (proximal demonstratives and pronominals) may also develop into evidentials (e.g. in Hupa, Wintu and Lega). In Sisala, the particle of reportative evidentiality developed from locative-demonstrative root “here/this”. Directionality markers are the source of evidentials

<sup>14</sup> A.Y. Aikhenvald, *Evidentiality*, 271-302 and Joseph, Brian D., “Evidentials. Summation, questions, prospects”, [A&D], *Studies*, 316-317

in some Tibeto-Burman languages. Evidential strategy is the source of evidentiality in Abkhaz (evidential of indirectivity originated from the marker of future tense), Tajik (indirective meanings developed from perfective forms) or in Tuvan (evidential of indirectivity developed from periphrastic construction of the non-finite verbal form and auxiliary verb “stand”). De-subordination of subordinate clause is also frequent as an originator of evidentiality (e.g. Estonian).

## 5. CODING OF EVIDENTIALITY

Morphological coding of evidentiality with a verbal affix or clitic is the most common strategy. In 237 languages with evidentiality (in a sample of 418 languages)<sup>15</sup>, 131 of them express evidential meanings by mentioned strategy. Separate evidential particle is used in 65 languages, in 24 languages evidentiality is a part of tense/aspect category. Modal morphemes are used in 7 languages (“evidential strategy” in Aikhenvald’s terminology), while 10 of them have mixed systems. Different coding strategies reflect directly the origin of evidentials. For example, if in some language evidentiality is a part of verbal system this means that a particular evidential originally was a morpheme of tense/aspect category. Aikhenvald says in short: “...there are hardly any morphological limitations on how evidentials can be expressed”<sup>16</sup>.

The areal distribution of languages with evidentiality according to morphological coding shows certain areal particularities. Evidentiality as a part of tense/aspect categories is common in the Balkans, in Caucasus and in Turkic languages. Languages of both Americas most commonly code evidentiality with affix on the verb or with particle. Other areas do not show any significant preferences. The use of modal verbs (“evidential strategy”) is noticeable in the languages of Europe (e.g. French, German, Dutch and Finnish).

## 6. AREAL DISTRIBUTION OF LANGUAGES WITH EVIDENTIALITY

Even cursory examination of the map “Semantic Distinctions of Evidentiality” shows that the distribution of evidentiality is uneven. In this map de Haan applied three parameters on the mentioned sample of 418

<sup>15</sup> F. de Haan, “Evidentiality”, *The World Atlas*, 318

<sup>16</sup> A.Y. Aikhenvald, *Evidentiality*, 69

languages. In languages which have only indirect evidentiality he also includes those which Aikhenvald classifies as languages with evidential strategies (e.g. French and Dutch)<sup>17</sup>:

1. no grammatical evidentials (181)
2. only indirect evidentials (166)
3. both direct and indirect evidentials (71)

Almost complete absence of evidentiality is noticeable in Africa; languages having only indirect evidentials (or evidential strategies) are common in Europe; languages with both direct and indirect evidentials appear to be clustered along the western coast of the USA, in the western Amazonia region, Caucasus, and in the Himalayas; languages of both Americas are very likely to have at least indirect evidentials; languages of the Pacific area, including New Guinea, are slightly more likely to have no evidentials. The map in Aikhenvald (2004:303) has two parameters: evidentiality in continuous areas and isolated instances of evidentiality. Continuous areas cover north-western parts of North America, central northern part of South America and the whole central Asia. Isolated instances are registered in central South America, Central America, Africa, New Guinea and Australia.

One of the features of evidentiality as an areal phenomenon is the fact that in some language it may develop or disappear due to intensive language contact. A very good example are exactly Turkic languages. Thus Macedonian, Bulgarian and Albanian developed grammatical means of indirect grammatical evidential marking as a result of a few centuries old contact with Turkish<sup>18</sup>. The same kind of contact may result in loss of evidentiality as in the case of Karaim, a Turkic language which has been in a long contact with Lithuanian and Slavic languages<sup>19</sup>. It may be concluded that the evidentiality is an areal feature, transparent both semantically and in the manner of coding. It easily spreads from language to language even when languages are not genetically related.

<sup>17</sup> F. de Haan, "Evidentiality", *The World Atlas*, 314; 316-317

<sup>18</sup> F. de Haan, "Evidentiality", *The World Atlas*, 315 and V. Friedman, "Evidentiality in the Balkans", [A&D], 209

<sup>19</sup> Johanson, Lars, "Evidentiality in Turkic", [A&D], *Studies*, 288

## 7. EXAMPLES OF EVIDENTIALITY IN LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD

Let's have a look at diverse means for expression of evidential meanings in different languages (evidentials are printed in bold). The examples also show typological diversity of the languages. Some examples were taken *de segunda mano*, some were taken *de primera mano*, from descriptive grammars available at the Zagreb Faculty of Arts Library (Linguistics).

### **01. Eastern Pomo**<sup>20</sup> (Hokan; North America)

This Amerindian language has four verbal suffixes (with allomorphs) for expression of direct and indirect evidentiality and one particle with prominent discourse function:

- ya*            the direct knowledge evidential of the event that is actually happening or has just happened)
- (*i/a*)*nke*    the non-visual sensory evidential)
- (*l*)*e*            reportative/hearsay suffix marking transmission of some other person's experience of some action; it always comes with the particle *xa*)
- (*i*)*ne*        the logical inferential evidential)
- xa*            particle)

méyalal míp wál-*a* ("He's coming here" [speaker's direct experience])  
 bá háyuhé?mip khěš kaNúl-*inké* ("The dog was barking last night" [I heard it])

báy *xa* xáy khilayax-*le* ("They're going to have a good time, they say" [hearsay])

míp'qa ?i-*ne* cháwuhu ("He must have gone away" /speakers's assertion is based on a logical inference/)

?íqan *xa* káwa?yéwa?he?mìt xa t'anéhe? mimúk-*ine-le* ("Then the mare must have smelled the fish bones" [the narrator is distancing himself from the events described in a folktale - co-occurrence of two evidentials])

<sup>20</sup> McLendon, Sally, *A Grammar of Eastern Pomo*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1975, 98-100, 173 and S. McLendon, "Evidentials in Eastern Pomo", [A&D], *Studies*, 103-112



## **2. Eskimo**<sup>21</sup> (Eastern Siberia)

This polysynthetic language uses suffixes for indirect evidentiality. Verbal suffix is *-kana*, while participles and nouns are suffixed with *-lgi*. These suffixes denote speaker's re-telling of event(s) not witnessed by himself. In this language evidentials may also express mirativity - unusual or surprising information. They are also used in story-telling:

nagasjuḡakəh-*kajat* - "they want to hear him out" [it looks like that, it seems] tuṅtu snamun pijama-*lgi* - "the deer has gone to the hill" [it looks like that, it seems]

## **03. Fasu**<sup>22</sup> (Papua)

There are six different verbal suffixes and infixes for expression of evidential meanings. The sentence "He/she/it comes" has these variants:

*a-pe-re* [I see]

*pe-ra-rakae* [I hear]

*pe-sa-reapo* [I infer from other evidence]

*pe-sa-pakae* [somebody said that, but I don't know who]

*pe-sa-ripo* [somebody said that and I know who]

*pe-sa-pi* [I suppose]

## **04. German**<sup>23</sup> (Germanic, IE)

Expression of indirect (reportative and quotative) evidentiality in German is realized by modal verbs *sollen* and *wollen*. Again, according to Aikhenvald, these are clear examples of evidential strategy:

Er *soll* steinreich sein ("He is said to be extremely rich" [reported])

Er *will* eine Mosquito abgeschossen haben ("He claims to have shot down a Mosquito/plane") [claimed by someone else - the speaker merely provides the evidence for the proposition]

## **05. Hidatsa**<sup>24</sup> (Siouan; North America)

This Amerindian language distinguishes between quotative and reported evidence:

<sup>21</sup> Menovšikov, G.A. and Vahtin, N.B., *Eskimoskij jazyk*, Prosvešenie, 1983, 169; 187

<sup>22</sup> B. Joseph, "Evidentials", [A&D], *Studies*, 313

<sup>23</sup> F. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, 9

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*, 42

wacéo íkipi kurè héo **wareac** (“The man carried the pipe, they say”  
[the speaker regards what he has said to be something that everyone knows])

wacéo wíira rakcí héo **rahe** (“The man carried the pipe, they say ”  
[the speaker was told the information by someone else, but has no evidence of its truth value])

**06. Hixkaryana**<sup>25</sup> (Carib; Brazil) This language has a sixfold division of evidential meanings expressed by suffixes. Following four sentences show direct evidentiality, reportative evidentiality, inferred evidentiality, and uncertainty about truthfulness of information:

Ton Waraka (“Waraka has gone “[I know from seeing it myself; direct observation, unmarked statement])

Ton **ha-tí** Waraka (“They say Waraka has gone” or “It is reported that Waraka has gone” [hearsay])

Yaworo mikan **ha-mí** (“It is evident that you are telling the truth” or “I’m sure you are telling the truth” [based on speaker’s previous knowledge/experience])

Kana yanimno **ha-na** (“I don’t know if he caught any fish” or “I doubt he caught any fish” or “Maybe he caught some fish ” [speaker has doubt or is uncertain about the statement’s truthfulness])

**07. Huallaga Quechua**<sup>26</sup> (Quechuan; Peru)

All Quechuan languages have suffixes for expression of evidentiality. Three evidential suffixes in the example below are **-mi** (direct evidence), **-shi** (indirect evidence) and **-chi** (assumption). These suffixes may be attached both to verbal and nominal forms:

Qam-pis maqa-ma-shka-nki-**mi** (a)      “You also hit me”  
  **-shi** (b)  
  **-chi** (c)

(a) I saw/felt you hit me (and was conscious)

<sup>25</sup> R.D. Van Valin and R.J. LaPolla, *Syntax*, 44

<sup>26</sup> Weber, D.J., *A Grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1989, 421

- (b) I was drunk when you hit me, and someone has informed me that you hit me  
 (c) a group of people beat me up, and I think you might have been one of them

[In older grammars these suffixes were classified as *sufijos independientes* together with some deictics, markers of negation and interrogation, markers of topic and others. The suffixes above Solá names *el morfema de información de primera mano*, *el morfema de información de segunda mano* and *el morfema de conjetura*.]<sup>27</sup>

### **08. Kewa**<sup>28</sup> (Papua)

This language has suffixes for expressing direct and indirect evidentiality: Íra-a-**na** (“He cooked it” [seen]) vs. Íra-a-**ya** (“He cooked it” [hearsay])

### **09. Ladakhi**<sup>29</sup> (Sino-Tibetan /Tibeto-Burman/)

This language has three grammatical means to express evidentiality:

#### a) 4 verbal suffixes (for present and past tense)

Sonəm Łeə čhə-**ət** (“Sonam goes to Leh” [reported])

pumoe Pəlldənlə pene təŋ-**duk**-pin (“The girl gave money to Paldan” [observed by the speaker])

ŋə Itokss-**ərək** (“I feel hungry/I am hungry” [expressing physical feeling])

dirŋ nəm khorte duk čhərpə təŋŋ-**ok** (“The sky is overcast today, it is going to rain” [inference on the basis of seeing])

#### b) combined form (infix **-thig-** and 4 evidential suffixes)

khyorəŋŋi zukspo thu-**thig-rək** (“You are taking a bath” [a guess by hearing sound])

khyorəŋ bəkstonlə rtse-**thig-yot** (“You might have danced at the wedding” [the speaker may have seen the action, but doesn’t remember correctly])

<sup>27</sup> Solá, Donald F., *Gramática del Quechua de Huánuco*, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima, 1967, 47-49

<sup>28</sup> R.D. Van Valin and R.J. LaPolla, *Syntax*, 43

<sup>29</sup> Koshal, Samyukta, *Ladakhi Grammar*, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, 1979, 185-218

khyorəŋŋi čhəŋməŋpo thuŋ-**thik-son** (“You might have drunk chang /local alcohol/ a lot” - [the speaker has some vague or partial knowledge about some action in the past])

ibo gonpəžik yin-**thig-duk** (/it appears that/ “It is a monastery” [guessing on the basis of incomplete evidence])

### c) 3 evidential copulas

lčəŋmə sŋonpo-**duk** (“The tree is green” - [on the basis of seeing it])

pumo əru-**yot** (“The girl is there” - [definite knowledge; the speaker saw her there earlier])

ikušu ŋərmə mi-**rək** (“This apple is not sweet” - [sensory experience])

In mirative expressions suffix **-tshuk** is used (1st and 2nd person).

## **10. Lega**<sup>30</sup> (Bantu)

This is one of rare African languages which has a developed evidentiality category. Two particles mark the opposition of (a) indirect (inference) and (b) direct (sensory) evidentiality. The particles are of pronominal origin:

(a) **ámbo** mûnwé ko máno maku ([it seems that] “You may drink this beer”)

(b) **ampó** ékurúra mompongé (“She is assuredly pounding rice” [I can hear it])

## **11. Macedonian**<sup>31</sup> (South Slavic, IE)

In the sixth paragraph it was said that Macedonian developed the category of indirect evidentiality due to the long contact with Turkish. This resulted in re-interpretation and extension of the already existing opposition aorist/imperfect ↔ perfect:

Marija go vide brodot (“Marija saw the ship” [witnessed past, direct experience, unmarked utterance])

Marija go vide-**la** brodot (“Marija saw the ship” [non-witnessed, re-told past, marked utterance])

<sup>30</sup> F. de Haan, *The World Atlas*, 318

<sup>31</sup> native speakers; V. Friedman, “Evidentiality in the Balkans”, [A&D], 199

Iako site velat deka najgolemite problemi na Makedonija se vnatrešni, sepak, mene mi se čini deka atentatot treba da bi-*I* izvršen od nadvor (“Although everyone says that Macedonia’s greatest problems are internal, nonetheless it seems to me that the assassination attempt /against president Kiro Gligorov/ must have been effected from outside” [a speculation that the speaker wishes specifically not to confirm])

### **12. Makah**<sup>32</sup> (Wakashan; North America)

In this Amerindian language it is possible to express direct (sensory) or indirect evidentiality by choosing an appropriate suffix. The sentence “It’s bad weather” (literally “It bad-weathers”) may be evidentially marked in three ways:

wikicaxak-*pid* (“It’s bad weather” [from what it looks like] / “Looks like bad weather”)

wikicaxak-*qadi* (“It’s bad weather” [from what I hear] / “Sounds like bad weather”)

wikicaxak-*wad* (“It’s bad weather” [from what they tell me] / “They say it’s bad out”)

### **13. Nevome**<sup>33</sup> (Uto-Aztecan /Tepiman/; North America)

Besides “modals” (as Shaul names them) functioning as adverbs expressing epistemic modality, this extinct language had also a “modal” *xa* (reportative meaning) and “omnipresent” particle *igui* or *agui* (implication or supposition) which could be used together with *xa*:

divia *xa* (“They say (s)he arrived” [quotative/reportative])

va’-t’-*x’-igui* divia (“He has already arrived” [supposition])

### **14. Ngiyambaa**<sup>34</sup> (Pamanyungan)

In this Australian language the same evidential clitic of direct evidence, *-gara*, is used for visual and auditory evidence (but also with other verbs of sensory perception). Indirect evidentiality (reported) is expressed by the clitic *-dhan*:

<sup>32</sup> McWhorter, John, *The Power of Babel*, Arrow Books, New York, 2001, 181

<sup>33</sup> Shaul, David L., *Topics in Nevome Syntax*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1986, 59; 62

<sup>34</sup> F. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, 17-18

ŋindu-**gara** girambiyi (“One can see you were sick”)  
 gabuga:-**gara**-lu (“It’s laid an egg by the sound of it”)  
 ŋindu-**dhan** girambiyi (“You are said to have been sick”)

### **15. Odul /Kolyma Yukaghir**<sup>35</sup> (Paleosiberian)

Evidentiality in this language may be expressed by two overt suffixes: inferential **-l’el** (in Krejnovič “non-evident mood”) and prospective **-moži-** (in Krejnovič “forthcoming action mood”):

tudel qodoj (“He is lying” [if we see a person lying; unmarked utterance, direct evidence])

tudel qodo-**l’el** (“He has lain” [if we see traces of a hunter’s lying on the snow and know exactly whose traces they are; non-witnessed past])

tudel qodo-**l’el**-te-l (“Probably, it was he who has lain” [if we are not sure that these are his traces; evidential suffix is combined with suffix of future tense **-te**])

mid’um (“S/he took/has taken” [unmarked utterance; I saw it])

min-**moži**-m (“Then (s)he is going to take” [as a consequence of something else; hypothetical meaning])

### **16. Sherpa**<sup>36</sup> (Sino-Tibetan /Tibeto-Burman/)

This ergative language has particles for expressing reported/inferred meanings and for direct experience in both the progressive present and perfective/past. This contrast is marked for third person subjects, but neither for the first person nor in future/irrealis:

tigi cenyi caaq-**sung** (“S/he broke the cup” [direct evidence])

tigi cenyi caaq-**no** (“S/he broke the cup” [reported/inferred])

ti lagha kiyin **no** (“S/he works” [direct evidence])

ti lagha kiyin **way** (“S/he works” [reported/inferred])

### **17. Shipibo-Konibo**<sup>37</sup> (Panoan; Peru)

The coding of evidentiality in this language distinguishes first-hand information from second-hand information. Then a further specification may indicate either inference or speculation:

<sup>35</sup> Krejnovič, Eruhim A., *Issledovanija i materialy po jukagirskomu jazyku*, Nauka, Moskva, 1982, 140 and Maslova, Elena L., *personal communication*, 2003

<sup>36</sup> T. Givón, *Syntax*, 328-329

<sup>37</sup> Valenzuela, Pilar M., “Evidentiality in Shipibo-Konibo”, [A&D], *Studies*, 34

Jawen jema-*ra* ani iki (“Her village is large” [I have been there; direct evidence])

Jawen jema-*ronki* ani iki (“Her village is large” [I have not been there, I have been told that it is large])

Two other possibilities involve the morphemes *-bira* (generally co-occurs with *-ra*) and *-mein* (combination with *-ra* is less common).

Ani-*ra* i-*bira*-[a]i jawen jema (“Her village must be large” [e.g. because it has a secondary school])

Ani-*mein*(-*ra*) iki jawen jema (“Perhaps her village is large” [I am just guessing, I ask myself])

Additionally, *-bira* and *-mein* may combine with *-ronki*.

Ani-*ronki* i-*bira*-[a]i jawen jema (“Her village must be large” [from what I heard])

Ani-*mein*(-*ronki*) iki jawen jema (“Perhaps her village is large” [from what I heard])

### **18. Tariana**<sup>38</sup> (North Arawakan; Brazil)

Tariana distinguishes obligatory direct and indirect evidentiality. This must be said in one of four ways. The sentence “Cecilia scolded the dog” may have these evidential variants:

- |                                     |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Ceci tfinu-nuku du-kwisa- <i>ka</i> | (a) I saw it; visual                                   |
| - <i>mahka</i>                      | (b) I heard it; non-visual                             |
| - <i>sika</i>                       | (c) I inferred it on the basis of<br>general knowledge |
| - <i>pidaka</i>                     | (d) I have learnt it from someone<br>else; reported    |

### **19. Tuyuca**<sup>39</sup> (Tucanoan; Brazil, Colombia)

The sentence “He played soccer” may be evidentially marked in five different ways in order to express direct and indirect evidential meanings:

diiga apé-*wi* (I saw him play)

-*ti* (I heard the game and him, but I didn’t see it or him)

-*yi* (I have seen evidence that he played: his distinctive shoe print on the playing fields, but I did not see him play)

-*yigi* (I obtained the information from someone else)

-*hiyi* (it is reasonable to assume that he did)

<sup>38</sup> A.Y. Aikhenvald, “Evidentiality in Tariana”, [A&D], *Studies*, 134-135

<sup>39</sup> F. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, 36

## **20. Tümpisa /Shoshone**<sup>40</sup> (Uto-Aztecan; North America)

The quotative particle *mii* is normally used immediately following direct quotes or generally accepted truths which people talk about:

Tuwittsi sepa'a pitühi *mii* yükkwi ("A young man is arriving here" - direct quote; it is said)

Tümpisakkatu kütaa ütúiuna *mii* ("They say Death Valley is really hot" - general truth)

## **21. Western Apache**<sup>41</sup> (Southern Athabaskan; North America)

This language has six evidential particles: *hilts'ad* covers various kinds of direct (physical) non-visual experience, *laq* is the inferential/mirative, *goln̄* expresses deduction or inference; *noliḥ* is used for expression of inferences on the basis of physical appearances; particles *ch'in̄* i *lek'eh* are used as quotatives:

Train hilwoł *hilts'ad* ("I hear the train /running/" [noise heard])

Gozdod *hilts'ad* ("It's hot" or "I sense it's hot" [physiological sensation])

Dinshñiih *hilts'ad* ("I am not feeling well" [sensed inside ones body])

Łikah gonłchih *hilts'ad* ("You smell good" [smelled])

Shash isdzán oyinłshōöd *laq* ("A bear dragged a woman" [inference with mirative meaning based upon the news heard on the radio and description of wounds])

Chaghąshé doo ákū nádabini' da *goln̄* ("I don't think the children want to go back there" or "I think the children do not want to go back there" [father inferring about his children's wishes])

Mízhaazhé míł na' iłbaąs *noliḥ* dak'eh ałdó' áí ("Her daughter seems to drive her at times also" [inference on the basis of the speaker's seeing the daughter's car driving around])

Particles *ch'in̄* i *lek'eh* are used in myths, folk-tales and fairy-tales and they are interchangeable.

Ma' hanazḥi' sitiḥ *ch'in̄* ("Coyote was lying on the other side /of the fire/" [traditional story of the Coyote story genre])

Łah jii, gah dii' i dagóliḥ *lek'eh* ("Once upon a time there were four rabbits, it is said" [the first sentence of a story translated from English *The Tale of Peter Rabbit*, by Beatrix Potter])

<sup>40</sup> Dayley, Jon P., *Tümpisa (Panamint) Shoshone Grammar*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1989, 313-314

<sup>41</sup> de Reuse, Willem J., "Evidentiality in Western Apache", [A&D], 80-82



## 22. *Wintu*<sup>42</sup> (Penutian; North America)

There are five suffixes with evidential meanings. The clause “he is chopping/chopped wood” may have following evidentially marked forms (allomorphs are also shown):

- pi kupa-*be* (direct visual evidence, imperfective aspect)
- pi kupa-*nthe* (non-visual sensory evidence - hearing, touch, smell or taste; I hear the sound of chopping)
- pi kupa-*re* (inferred from logic applied to circumstantial sensory evidence, or evidence of natural necessity; he and his axe are gone from the cabin, so I infer it)
- pi kupa-*?el* (deduction from experience; he has a job chopping wood and at this time he is usually there doing that)
- pi kupa-*ke* (used in hearsay, myths, gossip and description of something not experienced)

## 8. EVIDENTIALITY IN TURKIC LANGUAGES

The earliest recorded mention of evidentiality (of course, not named with this term) comes exactly from a description of Turkic languages. In his famous work *Dīwān Luyāt at-Turk* (“Compendium of the Turkic Languages”, a work on grammars and dialects of Turkic peoples dating from 11th century) Mahmūd al-Kašyari<sup>43</sup> describes the difference between *-dl* past tense and *mIš* past tense as a notional opposition between witnessed event and a non-witnessed one. In Ottoman Turkish these opposed terms were called *māzī-i šūhudī* (“witnessed past”) and *māzī-i naqlī* (“re-told past”). Johanson emphasizes that all known older and more recent stages in diachrony of Turkic languages possess grammatical means of expressing *indirectivity*<sup>44</sup>. Further, he says: “this firmly integrated cognitive category covers various notions traditionally referred to as *hear-say*, *inferential etc.* (...) narrated event is not stated directly, but in an indirect way, by reference to its reception by a conscious subject, a recipient.(...) The recipient may be the speaker as a participant of a speech event, or

<sup>42</sup> Pitkin, Harvey, *Wintu Grammar*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1984, 130-134; 146-153

<sup>43</sup> more on al-Kašyari in Baskakov, N.A., *Vvedenie v izučenie tjurkskih jazykov*, Vysšaja škola, Moskva, 1969, 70-72), Brendemoen, Bernt, “Turkish Dialects” in Johanson, L. and Éva Á. Csató [J&C] (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*, Routledge, 2006, 236 and Friedman, V., “Evidentiality in the Balkans”, [A&D], 189

<sup>44</sup> Johanson, L. “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&D], 274

a participant of a narrated event, e.g. a protagonist in a narrative”. What follows is a survey of basic features of the grammatical (sub)category of evidentiality in Turkic languages. It is completely valid for Turkish as well. It has been said that Turkic languages do **not** specify the source of information. The reception of information is realised through<sup>45</sup>:

- i. report (the source of information is outside the speaker - reported speech, hearsay)
- ii. inference (the source of information is the speaker’s own reflection, logical conclusion)
- iii. perception (first-hand knowledge, direct sensory perception of the event or indirect perception on the basis of traces or results)

Van Schaik makes a similar division. He points out that the speaker’s personal responsibility for the content of an utterance “is conveyed through expressions for *Subjective Modality* and *Evidential Modality*.” He distinguishes three sub-areas inside evidentiality<sup>46</sup>:

- a) experiential (on the basis of his previous personal experience the speaker concludes that the proposition in question holds)
- b) inference (on the basis of available evidence the speaker infers that some proposition is true)
- c) hearsay (on the basis of what the speaker has been told, he takes the proposition for true)

There is an opposition between evidentially marked utterances and their unmarked counterparts in Turkic languages. Functionally marked forms which explicitly express evidential meanings stand in paradigmatic interface with non-evidential forms. Unmarked forms always express neutral use in cases when a speaker thinks that evidential marking is not important and consequently, does not use it<sup>47</sup>. This is illustrated with the example from Turkish. The example is one of the most quoted ones, and was used first (as I have been able to research) by Aksu-Koç<sup>48</sup>:

<sup>45</sup> *ibid*

<sup>46</sup> Van Schaik, Gerjan van, “Periphrastic tense/aspect/mood” in Taylan, Eser Erguvanlı, *The Verb in Turkish*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2003, 71

<sup>47</sup> L. Johanson, “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&D], 275

<sup>48</sup> Aksu-Koç, Ayhan, *The Acquisition of Aspect and Modality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988

contrast between direct (suffix **-dl**) and indirect (suffix **-mlş**) evidentiality in Turkish (in past tense):

Ahmet gel-**di**                    “Ahmet came” (I saw it)  
come-PAST.3SG

Ahmet gel-**miş**                    “Ahmet came” (I was told/I hear/I infer/to my surprise)  
come-EV.3SG

The clause “Ahmet geldi” (“Ahmet came” - directly witnessed, I saw it) is opposed to the clause “Ahmet gelmiş” (“Ahmet /probably/ came”) which can be interpreted depending on the context. The mirative use has been confirmed by the native speakers. Opposition **geldi/gelmiş** does not necessarily mark the difference between direct and indirect experience (see the 9th paragraph about the neutral use of the unmarked form).

The coding of indirectivity in Turkic languages is morphologically “dispersed”. Two kinds of markers are used<sup>49</sup>:

- i. inflectional markers: verbal suffixes filling obligatory slots and opposed to other inflectional morphemes, e.g. -MIŞ, -GAN, -IBDIR
- ii. copula particles: enclitic or suffixed elements, occurring after predicate cores, filling non-obligatory slots and opposed to zero forms, e.g. ERMIŞ, ERKEN

All inflectional morphemes with indirect meanings in Turkic languages have developed from aspectually perfective forms -MIŞ, -IBDIR i -GAN. These forms usually had indirect meanings and by semantic extension such evidential strategies have become stable markers of indirectivity. The origin of markers -MIŞ i -GAN is not clear (most probably it is lexical), while the marker -IBDIR is the result of re-analysis of perfective periphrastic construction composed of gerund and auxiliary verb. Inflectional markers in Turkic languages appear as:

IPAST-1 (*indirective past*) - unequivocal indirective pasts: -IBDIR

IPAST-2 (                    ”                    ) - less stable indirective pasts: -MIŞ, -GAN

PPAST (*postterminal past*) - postterminal pasts with secondary indirective readings, e.g. : -MIŞ, -GAN

<sup>49</sup> L. Johanson, “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&D], 276

DPAST (*direct past*) - direct pasts, not signalling indirective meanings: -DI

Evidential copulas ERMIŠ i ERKEN originated from the verb *er-* (“be”). Johanson says that both copulas may be of postterminal origin if *er-* was originally an initiotransformative verb expressing **i**) an initial dynamic phase to ‘become’ and **ii**) a subsequent stative phase ‘to be’<sup>50</sup>. The postterminal perspective of such a verb may envisage the event as still going on at the aspectual vantage point: *er-miš* ‘has become (evident)’, ‘has appeared’ = ‘is (evident),’ ‘appears’. Copulas of indirectivity are not tense-marked. In some Turkic languages two copulas divide the area of indirectivity in a way that one copula (ERMIŠ) expresses reportive and the second (ERKEN) expresses non-reportive meanings of inference and perception. This feature is present in e.g. Uyghur, Kazakh, Uzbek and Turkmen. Semantic types of indirective evidential copulas are:

IC-1 (*indirective copula*) - general indirectivity: ERMIŠ

IC-2 (                    ”                    ) - indirective evidential with reportive meaning: ERMIŠ

IC-3 (                    ”                    ) - indirective evidential with non-reportive meaning: ERKEN and BOLIBDIR (frequent in speech)

Modern Uyghur and Uzbek (Southeastern branch), Kazakh (Northwestern branch) and Turkmen (Southwestern branch) differ three kinds of evidential meanings in inflectional morphemes paradigm: -IBDIR (marker type IPAST-1), -GAN (marker type PPAST) i -DI (marker type DPAST).

Some languages have all three inflectional markers (indirectivity, perfect and direct past), but a subsystem of copulas is simplified - there’s an opposition between “indirect” vs. “unmarked”. Such a language is Noghay (Northwestern branch). Some languages have a simplified system of inflectional markers, but more complex copula system. For example, Tatar, Bashkir (Northwestern branch) and Chuvash (Bulgarian branch) in their verbal paradigm have only marker -GAN (less stable indirective past). Copulas ERMIŠ and ERKEN express reportive or non-reportive meanings. There are also languages with the simplest evidential system consisting of only one inflectional marker and one copula, both opposed to unmarked forms. Such languages are Turkish (Southwestern branch) and Yakut (Northeastern branch).

Let’s see some examples of evidentiality in the Turkic languages:

<sup>50</sup> L. Johanson, “Evidentiality Turkic”, [A&D], 288

**1. Azerbaijani**<sup>51</sup>

Atam onu yaxşı tanıyar *imiş* (“My father apparently knew him well”)

**2. Chaghatay**<sup>52</sup>

Ma’lum boldi kim xabardār bol-*miş*-lar (“It became clear that they have been informed”)

**3. Chuvash**<sup>53</sup>

Atte kun sinçen ěnereç pël-*ně* mën (“It turns out father already knew about this yesterday”)

Kala-*naă* (“It seems that he spoke”)

**4. Kirghiz**<sup>54</sup>

Elge tınçtıq berbe-*ptir* (“/S/he apparently did not give peace to the people”)

**5. Old Turkic**<sup>55</sup>

Qarloq eşiñe kelme-*dök* (“The Karluk have obviously not come for service”)

Qañi xan ögi qatun oyliña neçe aytsar neñ kiginç berme *dök*  
 (“However often his parents asked him, he never gave an answer”)

**6. Turkmen**<sup>56</sup>

Gid-*ip-dir* (“has /apparently/ gone, went /once/”)

Gid-*ip-miş*-in (“they say it has gone”)

**7. Uyghur**<sup>57</sup>

Kir-*ipti*-men (“I entered /reportedly, apparently, etc./”)

<sup>51</sup> Schönig, Claus, “Azerbaijani”, [J&C], 256

<sup>52</sup> Boeschoten, Hendrik and Vandamme, Marc, “Chaghatay”, [J&Csató], 172

<sup>53</sup> Clark, Larry, “Chuvash”, [Johanson and Csató], 445 and L. Johanson, “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&Dixon], 280

<sup>54</sup> Kirchner, Mark, “Kirghiz”, [J&Csató], 351

<sup>55</sup> Erdal, Marcel, “Old Turkic”, [J&Csató], 146

<sup>56</sup> C. Schönig, “Turkmen”, [J&Csató], 268

<sup>57</sup> Hahn, Reinhard F., “Uyghur”, [J&Csató], 392 and L. Johanson, “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&D], 279

Kirme-*pti*-men (“I did not enter /reportedly, etc./”)

Yez-*iptu* (“He /obviously/ wrote it”)

Yaz-*yan* (“He wrote it /apparently/” - suffix expressing primarily perfect aspect with secondary indirective meanings)

### 8. Yakut /Saha<sup>58</sup>

Kelbi-*te* (“/S/he came /reportedly, apparently/”)

Kelbe-*tey*-e (“/S/he did not come /reportedly, apparently/”)

Turar *ebit* (“He’s obviously standing/was standing”)

## 9. EVIDENTIALITY IN TURKISH

Indirect evidentiality in Turkish is actualized by suffixing the morpheme *-mİş* to verbs or copula *imİş* (as enclitic *-(y)mİş*) to nominals. The verbal suffix *-mİş* is a stable marker of indirectivity and is capable of carrying high pitch. Besides expressing (1) a wide spectrum of indirective experiences (report, inference, assumption, doubt, distrust, amazement), it also (2) denotes the referential tense - postterminal (perfect) tense expressing past events with present relevance and (3) as a postterminal participle it has attributive function (results of an event without evidential meanings). It has been documented that in acquiring their mother tongue Turkish children first acquire aspectual value and then later evidential value of the suffix.<sup>59</sup> Copula *-(y)mİş* is a stable marker of indirectivity, it is temporally indifferent (ambiguous between past and present) and is not capable of carrying high pitch. The deceptive similarity between the verbal suffix and suffixed copular allomorphs has led some to refer to both as ‘the suffix *-mİş*’, allegedly attachable to both verbal and nominal stems, or to speak of an ‘evidential perfect’ that would include both markers.

Suffix *-mİş* or copula *imİş* may combine with suffixes denoting categories of tense, aspect or modality, but there are some restrictions. For example, copula cannot be suffixed to the marker of witnessed past *-dİ* due to semantic discrepancy (*\*geldimİşim*). Also, imperative cannot be marked with indirectivity (except the third person in rare cases - *gelsinmİş!* *gelsinlermİş!*). Inferring conditional (*imİşse*) is not compatible with *-dİ* past, optative and necessitative. Comparing the

<sup>58</sup> Stachowski, Marek and Menz, Astrid, “Yakut”, [J&C], 426 and L. Johanson, “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&D], 281

<sup>59</sup> see A. Aksu-Koç, *The Acquisition of Aspect and Modality*

verbal paradigms in two grammars of Turkish<sup>60</sup> it is possible to identify 15 combinations of *-miş* suffix with other TAM suffixes. Besides, there are two marginal forms as well!

It has been said that indirectives do **not** explicitly signal that the person obtaining a certain information was *not* present, that he was *not* consciously participating in an event, that he did *not* have a control over event or that he was *not* directly involved into an event. This is clear from the examples where speaker's inference is a result of personal perception (mostly visual). Saying "Ahmet gelmiş" ("Ahmet came") may mean that the speaker saw Ahmet coming and expresses his conscious reception of information (this kind of linguistic "device" does not tell us how did something happen but how the speaker decided to present it). On the other hand, evidentially unmarked forms do **not** explicitly signal that the source of information *is* personal experience, that the speaker *was* consciously involved into an event or that he *had* control over an event. Examples like "Çok büyüdün" ("You've grown a lot") or "Kemal Paşa, Selânik'te doğdu" ("Kemal Pasha was born in Thesaloniki") describe unwitnessed (reported or inferred) events/results or generally accepted opinions (e.g. historical data).

I begin with the examples which express indirect evidentiality based either on visible clues or on the knowledge of the whole situation.

01. inference/assumption; the speaker infers on the basis of observation and/or knowledge of Orhan's habits<sup>61</sup>:

Orhan gel-*miş*, odasının penceresi açık  
 Orhan come-EV.3SG room.P3SG.GEN window.P3SG open  
 "Orhan has come /it seems/, the window of his room is open"

02. inference based on the speaker's observation of the opponent's strength<sup>62</sup>:

Eğer kaçmasaydık bizim hepimizi döver-*miş*  
 SUBJ escape.NEG.COND.PAST.1PL P1PL we all.ACC beat up.AOR-EV.3SG  
 "If we have not had escaped, he would have beat us all up"

<sup>60</sup> Čaušević, Ekrem, *Gramatika suvremenoga turskog jezika*, Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Zagreb, 1996, 526 and Lewis, Geoffrey, *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000, 139

<sup>61</sup> E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 255

<sup>62</sup> E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 515

03. inference based on observed fact<sup>63</sup>:

Yağmur yağ-*muş*, sokaklar ıslak  
rain.ABS to rain-EV.3SG streets wet

“It looks like it rained, the streets are wet”

04. inference with imperative illocutional force<sup>64</sup>:

Gitmeli-*ymış*-sin  
go.NEC-EV-2SG

“You evidently ought to go”

Indirectives can have epistemic meanings as well - a speaker may have doubts about truthfulness of information on some event. Doubt and mistrust are pragmatic - by showing that information is considered as “second hand” speaker does not take responsibility over expressed events<sup>65</sup>:

05. Amerika’da oku-*muş*, dillere merak sar-*muş*, birkaç dil  
America.LOC study-EV.3SG languages.DAT to have interest-3SG.EV a few language.ABS

öğren-*miş*, doktora tezinin savunmasını yap-*miş*, falan filan...  
study-EV.3SG doctorate.GEN defence.P3SG.ACC make-EV.3SG itd...

Hepsi kuru yalan!  
all transparent lie.ABS

“He has (allegedly) studied in America, he (allegedly) got interested in languages, he has (allegedly) learned a few languages, he has (allegedly) defended a doctorate etc...

A downright lie!”

06. İngiltere’de okumuş-*muş* güya

England. LOC study.PP-EV.3SG MOD.ADV

“He has (allegedly) studied in England”

Other kinds of indirective experiences may also be expressed evidentially, for example if a speaker was not consciously present at the moment of event (he was too young to remember/asleep/drunken/unconscious).

<sup>63</sup> ibid, 255

<sup>64</sup> L. Johanson, “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&D], 286

<sup>65</sup> E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 256, 305



This knowledge of certain events may also be inferred on basis of other people's telling<sup>66</sup>:

07. Bir yaşındayken kalp ameliyatı ol-*muş*-um  
1 age.LOC.GER heart operation.P3SG AUX-EV-1SG  
“I had a heart operation when I was a year old”

08. Söзде inatçı-*ymış*-ım  
MOD.ADV obstinate-EV-1SG  
“I am supposedly obstinate” (intensified with modal adverbial)

09. Yirmi dakika kadar uyukla-*mış*-ım  
20 minute about doze-EV-1SG  
“I dozed for about twenty minutes”

In examples 10-11 evidentiality marks events that were not witnessed directly by speaker but who is able to infer about those events on the basis of their results or consequences (“assumption” in Čaušević). The examples are given with contexts:

10. on finding one's glasses are not in one's bag/pocket<sup>67</sup>:

Gözlüğümü yanıma alma-*mış*-ım  
glasses.P1SG.ACC PSTP take.NEG-EV-1SG  
“I seem not to have brought my glasses with me”

11. the speaker is commenting on a painting without having seen the painter painting it<sup>68</sup>:

Ressam iki figürün arasını boş bırak-*mış*  
painter 2 figure.GEN between.P3SG empty leave-EV.3SG  
“The painter has left the space between the two figures empty”

The other semantic field of indirectivity (unspecified source of information) is report. In such cases the speaker informs that he obtained information via mediator which can be some other person or a certain medium (TV, radio, newspapers, internet...). The speaker is not a direct witness of some event - he retells it. Generally, such sentences are

<sup>66</sup> Göksel, Aslı and Kerslake Celia, *Turkish – A Comprehensive Grammar*, Routledge, London and New York, 2005, 357 and E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 258

<sup>67</sup> A. Göksel and C. Kerslake, *Turkish – ACG*, 358

<sup>68</sup> ibid

translated into most IE languages using phrases like “I heard/I was told/they say”.

12. evidentially marked question and answer<sup>69</sup>:

Hocamız gel-*miş* mi? - Gel-*miş*.

teacher.P1PL come-EV.3SG Q come-EV.3SG

“Has our teacher come? - He has come” (I haven’t seen him personally, but I was told he’s here)

13. reported evidentiality, the source of the information is someone else<sup>70</sup>:

Babasının dediğine göre, Ayla da geliyor-*muş*

father.P3SG.ACC say.PRTC.DAT ADV Ayla CONJ come.PROG-EV.3SG

“According to her father’s words Ayla is coming too”

14. reported evidentiality in a newspaper article<sup>71</sup>:

Bursa yolunda korkunç bir kaza ol-*muş*. Bir kamyon,  
Bursa road.P3SG.LOC terrible INDEF accident.ABS AUX-EV.3SG INDEF  
lorry.ABS

bir otobüse çarp-*mış*. Beş ölü, on yaralı var-*mış*

INDEF bus.DAT collide-EV.3SG 5 dead 10 wounded EXT-EV.3SG

“A terrible accident happened on the road to Bursa. A lorry hit a bus. There are five dead and ten wounded”

For combination of the evidentiality with the future tense Palmer points out that only the hearsay interpretation is possible, and not the inferential one<sup>72</sup>. However, native speakers confirm that inference is also possible.

15. reported/inferred

Yağmur yağacak-*mış*

rain to rain.FUT-EV.3SG

“It is reported that it will rain” (reportative) or “It looks like it will rain” (inference)

<sup>69</sup> E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 256

<sup>70</sup> *ibid*, 305

<sup>71</sup> E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 256

<sup>72</sup> F. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, 48

It has been mentioned that the evidential marker *-miş* may express wonderment or surprise because the mirative extension of the evidential may denote unexpected or unusual information (v. de Haan u Frawley 2006:59-60; G&K 2005:358). In the examples below it is clear that the speaker has a direct visual experience of the situation, but still uses the evidential/mirative marker:

16. opening the fridge the speaker sees it is empty<sup>73</sup>:

Aaa, yiyecek hiçbir şey yok-*muş*  
 EXCL food nothing thing EXT-EV.3SG  
 “Oh, there’s absolutely nothing to eat”

17. the first comment to a friend after meeting his sister/brother ibid<sup>74</sup>:

Kardeşin pek tatlı-*ymış*  
 sister/brother.P2SG ADV lovely-EV.3SG  
 “Your sister/brother is lovely”

Using the evidential in 2nd person (intensified by modal adverbials), the hearer is informed about himself<sup>75</sup>:

18. Siz babamla tanışıyor-*muş*-sunuz galiba  
 2PL father.P1SG.INSTR know.PROG-EV-2PL ADV  
 “I believe/suppose you know/knew my father”

Evidential marker’s function in interrogatives is different from the one it has in declaratives. Namely, indirectivity is not connected with the speaker - his question shows his ignorance of some event (he was not present at that particular time and that particular place when the event occurred). An interrogative may be evidentially marked if hearer’s knowledge is indirective and if the speaker assumes that the hearer will be the source of information.

19. addressed to someone reading the financial page of the newspaper<sup>76</sup>:

Bugün dolar ne kadar-*mış*?  
 today dollar how much-EV.3SG  
 “How much does it say the dollar is today?”

<sup>73</sup> A. Göksel and C. Kerslake, *Turkish - ACG*, 358

<sup>74</sup> ibid

<sup>75</sup> ibid, 357

<sup>76</sup> A. Göksel and C. Kerslake, *Turkish - ACG*, 358

20. addressed to someone who has gone into the kitchen<sup>77</sup>:

Fasulye ol-*muş* mu?

bean.ABS AUX-EV.3SG Q

“Do the beans seem to be done?”

21. expecting an answer for an action that speaker did not witness<sup>78</sup>:

O böyle de-*miş* mi?

3SG so say-EV.3SG Q

“Did s/he [reportedly] say so?”

In negative sentences evidentiality is not under the scope of negation. It is the event which is negated, not the speaker’s experience of it<sup>79</sup>:

22. Doğrusu, onun neden eşinden boşandığını  
indeed 3SG.GEN why husband.P3SG.ABL divorce.PRTC.P3SG.ACC  
bir türlü anlayama-*miş-im*  
INDEF kind understand.POT.NEG-EV-1SG

“Indeed, I really could not (neither I can now) understand why did she divorce her husband”

23. Seni hiç görme-*miş-im*. İlk görürüm  
2SG.ACC never see.NEG-EV-1SG first see.AOR.1SG

“I have never seen you (until this moment). I see (you) for the first time”

It has been said that nominal predicates may also be evidentially marked. Auxilliary copula of the verb “to be” (in the oldest texts this infinitive had a form *ermek*; two initial phones gradually eroded creating the *imek* form. Perfective *imiş* is suffixed with personal suffixes of the type I which as an enclitic has form *-(y)mİş*. The meanings expressed do not differ from the ones in sentences with verbal predicates. This kind of modality is sometimes referred to as “subjective modality”). A personal attitude towards an event is expressed by a copula marked for indirectivity in its various sub-meanings. Though, Lewis claims<sup>80</sup> that the copula *imiş* does not by itself presupposes doubt or uncertainty. A

<sup>77</sup> ibid

<sup>78</sup> L. Johanson, “Evidentiality in Turkic”, [A&D], 286

<sup>79</sup> E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 258

<sup>80</sup> G. Lewis, *Turkish*, 99

sentence which begins with “Orhan hastaymış” (“Orhan is supposedly ill”) may continue with “we should visit him” or “but I bet he’s making it up”. Also, a sentence “Ben gericiymişim” (“I am reactionary, they say”) may continue with “and that is the truth of which I’m proud” or “but this is an ordinary lie”.

24.-26. examples of evidentially marked nominal predicates<sup>81</sup>:

Türk i- <i>miş</i> / Türk- <i>müş</i>	Hazır i- <i>miş</i> -iz / hazır- <i>müş</i> -iz
Turkish be-EV.3SG	ready be-EV.1PL
“He is said to be Turkish”	“We are said to be ready”

Sorumlu i-*miş*-siniz / sorumlu-*ymuş*-sunuz  
 responsible be-EV.2PL  
 “You are said to be responsible”

Speaker’s choice of a particular form is considerably influenced by discourse (pragmatic) influences. The example below illustrates information transfer by two given forms. The first speaker expresses his direct experience of an action (realis) with *-dl* past, while the second and the third interlocutor retell the action in *-miş* past, pointing out indirective reception of information<sup>82</sup>:

27. (A) (Ali, to Gül)

Bahçeye bir meşe ağacı diktim  
 garden.DAT INDEF oak tree.P3SG plant.PAST.1SG  
 “I planted an oak tree in the garden”

(B) (Gül, to Orhan)

Ali bahçesine bir meşe ağacı dik-*miş*  
 Ali garden.P3SG.DAT INDEF oak tree.P3SG plant-EV.3SG  
 “Ali has apparently planted an oak tree in his garden”

(C) (Orhan, to Ali)

Sen bir meşe ağacı dik-*miş*-sin, bana göstere  
 2SG INDEF oak tree.P3SG plant-EV-2SG 1SG.DAT show.IMP.2SG  
 “I’ve heard you’ve planted on oak tree; show it to me”

<sup>81</sup> G. Lewis, *Turkish*, 99

<sup>82</sup> A. Göksel and C. Kerslake, *Turkish - ACG*, 356

Copula marked only with evidential does not show categories of tense or aspect, but it takes them from the same unmarked sentence. Due to the rule that the predicate may have at most one copula there is ambiguity in referent tense. This can be avoided either by the use of time adverbials or the referent tense visible from a discourse. In reported information (B and B') the speaker uses the same predicate form (*rahatsızmış*), but with a different temporal reference<sup>83</sup>:

28. (A) (Ayşe, to Çiğdem)

Annem biraz rahatsız  
 mother.P1SG INDEF unwell  
 “My mother is not well”

(B) (Çiğdem, to Nesrin)

Ayşe'nin annesi biraz rahatsız-*miş*  
 Ayşe.GEN mother.P3SG INDEF unwell-EV.3SG  
 “It seems Ayşe's mother is not well”

(A') (Ayşe, to Çiğdem)

O gün annem biraz rahatsızdı  
 DEM day mother.P1SG INDEF unwell.PAST.3SG  
 “My mother was not well that day”

(B') (Çiğdem, to Nesrin)

O gün Ayşe'nin annesi biraz rahatsız-*miş*  
 DEM day Ayşe.GEN mother.P3SG INDEF unwell-EV.3SG  
 “Apparently Ayşe's mother was not well that day”

Modal markedness and pragmatics make the *-miş* perfect “a special narrative form (...) of transfer or re-telling” (Čaušević 1996:259) and for this reason it is found in various folk genres (fairy-tales, stories, legends) and in proverbs, anecdotes and jokes. I finish this survey with a longer example which, for reasons of clarity, I did not gloss<sup>84</sup>:

29. Bir *varmış* bir yok*muş* evvel zaman içinde yoksul bir oduncu *varmış*.  
 / Bir karısı, bir de kızı *varmış*. / Günlerden bir gün*müş*, yine dağdan

<sup>83</sup> ibid

<sup>84</sup> E. Čaušević, *Gramatika*, 259

odun indir*miş*. / Yorlu*muş*, bir kaya dibine dinlenmeye oturu*muş*. / O sırada kaya yerinden oynadı*mış*, zebânî suratlı bir adam çıkıver*miş* ortaya. / Oduncu bak*muş* ki adamın bir dudağı yerde bir dudağı gökte./ Kork*muş*, yalvarıp ağlamaya başla*mış*.

“Once upon a time there lived a poor wood-cutter. / He had a wife and a daughter. / One day he was carrying wood (for fire) from a mountain. / He got tired and sat beneath a rock to take a rest. / At that moment the rock trembled and suddenly a man with a terrible face appeared. / The wood-cutter looked up and the man had one lip on the ground and one in the sky (that is, he was huge, a giant, a genie). / He (the wood-cutter) got scared and started to beg and cry.”

From the given examples it can be concluded that evidentiality in Turkish expresses indirect witnessing through report, indices of “second hand” information source and inference (base upon previous results, experiences etc.). Evidentiality in Turkish may also express mirative meanings and in discourse it may supersede the direct *-DI* past and change it into retold indirect speech. The *-MIŞ* evidentiality marks the language of narrative genres (folk-stories, fairy tales), reported speech and public media.

## 10. EVIDENTIALITY: CATEGORY OR SUBCATEGORY?

And last, a few words on categorization of evidentiality. In my master thesis I have taken a particular opinion, but now I let the reader make decision on status of evidentiality for her/himself. It should be pointed out (following Trask) that “the use of notin *category* is so diverse that some general definition is not possible; practically speaking, category is simply every class of correlative gramatical objects”. However, there are three mutual features of grammatical category which make the set of syntactic features that:

- a) express meanings from the same conceptual domain
- b) occur in contrast to each other
- c) are typically expressed in the same fashion

Carefully examining the examples from Turkish, the reader can easily find out that all three conditions are fulfilled and the following Aikhenvald’s definition is valid: “Evidentiality is a category in its own right, and not a subcategory of epistemic or some other modality, or of

tense-aspect”. It has already been said that Palmer and Givón include evidentiality into a wider modal frame. In these frames evidentiality is connected with epistemic modality. Finally, Nuyts<sup>85</sup> considers evidentiality (together with emotionality) as a category on the margins of modality.

N.B. Consulted native speakers for Turkish were lectors Hediye Dizioğlu, Güldane Kalın and Mehmet İşiker from Zagreb Faculty of Arts. I'm grateful to professor Ranko Matasović on his patience.

### *Summary*

This informative survey is about the (sub)category of evidentiality, its essential morpho-syntactic features, its areal distribution and linguistic researches in evidentiality. Examples from 22 languages are provided. Then follows the description of evidentiality in Turkic languages, characterized by semantic-pragmatic domain of *indirectivity*. There are 8 examples from extinct and contemporary Turkic languages. The survey continues with the basic evidential differences of indirectivity in contemporary Turkish. Pragmatic importance of evidentiality is visible in discourse, in mirative expressions and in various narrative genres. There are 29 examples from Turkish. The survey ends with an offer to reader to make her/his decision whether evidentiality is a category or a sub-category. Three different opinions from recent literature are briefly exposed.

*Key Words:* assumption, evidentiality, experience, indirectivity, mirativity, report, suffix, Turkic, Turkish

### Abbreviations

**1, 2, 3** - person / **ABS** - absolutive / **ACC** - accusative / **ADV** - adverb / **AOR** - aorist / **AUX** - auxilliary verb / **COND** - conditional / **CONJ** - conjunctor / **DAT** - dative / **DEM** - demonstrative pronoun / **EV** - evidential suffix / **EXCL** - exclamatory particle / **EXT** - existential / **FUT** - future tense / **GEN** - genitive / **GER** - gerund / **INDEF** - indefinite article / **LOC** - locative / **MOD** - modal / **NEG** - negation / **P** - possession / **PAST** - definite past tense / **PL** - plural / **PP** - past perfect tense / **PROG** - progressive / **PRTC** - participle / **PSTP** - postposition / **PTC** - particle / **Q** - interrogative particle / **SG** - singular / **SUBJ** - subjunctive

<sup>85</sup> Nuyts, Jan, “Modality: Overview and linguistic issues” in Frawley, William, *The Expression of Modality*, Mouton de Gruyter, The Hague, 2006, 1-27



## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and Dixon, Robert M.W. [A&D] (eds.), *Studies in Evidentiality*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2003.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., *Evidentiality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.
- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan, *The Acquisition of Aspect and Modality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.
- Baskakov, N.A., *Vvedenie v izučenie tjurkskih jazykov*, Vysšaja škola, Moskva, 1969.
- Čaušević, Ekrem, *Gramatika suvremenoga turskog jezika*, Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada, Zagreb, 1996.
- Dayley, Jon P., *Tümpisa (Panamint) Shoshone Grammar*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1989.
- Frawley, William (ed.), *The Expression of Modality*, Mouton de Gruyter, The Hague, 2006.
- Givón, Talmy, *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction I*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2001.
- Göksel, Asli and Kerslake Celia, *Turkish - A Comprehensive Grammar*, Routledge, London and New York, 2005.
- Haspelmath, Martin et alii (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.
- Johanson, Lars and Csató Éva Á. [J&C] (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*, Routledge, London and New York, 2006.
- Koshal, Samyukta, *Ladakhi Grammar*, Motilal Banarsidass, New Delhi, 1979.
- Krejnovič, E.A., *Issledovanija i materialy po jukagirskomu jazyku*, Nauka, Moskva, 1982.
- Lewis, Geoffrey, *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000.
- Maslova, Elena L., *personal communication*, 2003.
- Matasović, Ranko, *Uvod u poredbenu lingvistiku*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 2001.
- Matthews, Peter H., *Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.
- McLendon, Sally, *A Grammar of Eastern Pomo*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1975.
- McWhorter, John, *The Power of Babel*, Arrow Books, New York, 2001.
- Menovšikov, G.A. and Vahtin, N.B., *Eskimoskij jazyk*, Prosvešenie, Lenjingrad, 1983.

- Palmer, Frank R., *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
- Pitkin, Harvey, *Wintu Grammar*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1984.
- Shaul, David L., *Topics in Nevome Syntax*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1986.
- Solá, Donald F., *Gramática del Quechua de Huánuco*, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Lima, 1967.
- Taylan, Eser E. (ed.), *The Verb in Turkish*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2001.
- Van Valin, Richard D. Jr. and LaPolla, Randy J., *Syntax: structure, meaning and function*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- Weber, D.J., *A Grammar of Huallaga (Huánuco) Quechua*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1989.