Indirective sentence types

Lars Johanson

The paper deals, mainly on the basis of Turkish data, with levels of grammatical analysis of indirective (evidential) sentences, the relationship between forms and functions, and between sentence types, speech-act types and registers. It is claimed that indirective markers of the broad Turkish type permit speakers to be vague about the source of evidence for the propositional content.

Lars Johanson, Seminar für Orientkunde, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Germany. E-mail: johanson@uni-mainz.de

Introduction

The present paper will briefly discuss the interaction of various sentence types with markers of indirectivity, a specific type of evidentiality. It will deal with levels of grammatical analysis of evidential sentences, and the relationship between forms and functions, between sentence types and speech-act types. The discussion will mainly be illustrated with examples from Turkish.

Evidential modalities and categories

The evidential sentences dealt with here represent a certain kind of modal sentences, and are, as such, opposed to non-modal or 'indicative' sentences. Evidentials may be taken to belong to the attitudinal modalities, which express attitudes towards the content of the proposition. It is, however, important to note that they do not primarily express evaluation or assessment of the truth value of the utterance. Evidential categories, as defined here, state the existence of a source of evidence for a propositional content (cf. Aikhenvald 2003: 1).

The term 'evidential category' will be reserved for cases in which evidentiality finds unique expressions in a language. Evidential categories have the indication of evidence as their primary meaning, not only as a pragmatic inference. Languages lacking them may use various evidentiality strategies based on optional expressions. The linguist has to decide whether and by what means a given language codes evidentiality. Evidential modalities may be grammatically expressed by markers such as verbal inflectional affixes or particles. The realization of evidential sentences comprises two components, one proposition operator expressing the evidential meaning, and another component representing the propositional content. Evidential operators do not contribute to the description of the narrated event, but just add an attitudinal

specification. They represent meanings grounded in a conceptualizer's subjective perspective and awareness with respect to the content of the proposition.

Though evidentials do convey epistemic notions and may express the speaker's cognitive attitude towards the propositional content, they are not attitudinal or 'subjective' modalities in the evaluative or volitional sense. As already mentioned, they do not primarily concern the assessment of the truth of the propositional content, i.e. the personal opinion that the content is more or less certain, probable or possible. They do not express volition, i.e. the wish or hope that the content is or will be realized. Evidentiality will thus not be used here in the sense of marking the speaker's 'attitude towards his/her knowledge of reality' (Chafe 1986: 271). Expressions of epistemic stance in the sense of dubitatives, presumptives, assertives, etc., may include comments on the source of information. But this does not conversely imply that evidential sentences, which primarily state the existence of a source of evidence, also express the reliability of the information in terms of certainty and doubt or the strength of commitment to the content.

Various kinds of evidential meanings may be expressed grammatically. The languages of the world display a broad variety of simpler and more complex types of evidentiality systems. Traditional treatments are mostly based on distinctions between information based on first- or second-hand evidence, witnessed or unwitnessed evidence, visual or auditory evidence, inference, etc. It is often difficult to judge on the relationship of these notions to each other and to use them for cross-linguistic descriptions. Many of them can probably be ordered on a few dimensions, if sufficiently abstract definitions are applied. It is clear, however, that the traditional notions do not cover the whole range of possible evidential meanings.

Indirectivity

The type of evidentiality dealt with in the present paper will be referred to as indirectivity (see, e.g., Johanson 1998a, 2000b, 2003). In languages possessing indirective categories, the propositional content is presented in an indirect way. A content marked for indirectivity is characterized by reference to its reception by a conscious subject. The result is two-layered information: 'it is stated that the narrated event is acknowledged by a recipient'. The recipient, who is or becomes aware of X, may be the speaker as a participant of the speech event, or a participant of the narrated event, e.g. a protagonist in a narrative. The core meaning may be periphrased in a stereotype way as 'it appears to the recipient that X is the case'.

Specification of the source of information—the way in which the event is acknowledged by the recipient—is not criterial for indirectivity as such. The reception may be realized through hearsay, inference or perception. The perceptive uses cannot, of course, be subsumed under 'non-first-hand knowledge'. Indirectives thus do not fit into evidential schemes distinguishing between the speaker's non-first-hand and first-hand information. Their primary task is not to express the foreign origin of the speaker's knowledge. Indirective specifications are possible in all persons. A

definition of indirectivity as the expression of the speaker's non-first-hand informa-
tion would exclude the first person except in cases such as lack of awareness, con-
sciousness or control due to inattention, sleep, drunkenness, coma, etc. However,
with a definition based on the presentation of the event by reference to its reception
by a conscious subject, it is by no means contradictory to use indirectives with first-
person referents who are aware of the event.

Indirectivity is a characteristic feature of Turkic, though not unique to this family.
The crucial element of indirectivity, the presentation of an event by reference to its
reception by a conscious subject, may be basic to a number of other evidentiality
systems, and even qualify as a crosslinguistic definition of evidentials (Comrie 2000:
1).

Some languages with which Turkic has been in close contact display conspicu-
ously similar traits in their evidentiality systems (see Johanson 1998, 2002a: 99-100,
144-145). Features of Turkic evidential systems have proven highly attractive in
language contact situations and have been copied into non-Turkic languages of
Southwestern and Central Asia, Southeastern and Northeastern Europe, etc. (On the
concept of code-copying, see Johanson 1999b, 2000a: 8-19, 2002b.) Indirective cate-
gories similar to the Turkic ones typically appear in contact areas such as the Bal-
kans, Anatolia, Caucasus, Central Asia and the Volga region, e.g. in Bulgarian, Ma-
cedonian, Albanian, Kurdish, Armenian, Georgian, Tajik and Eastern Finno-Ugric.
For example, Northern Tajik has developed a comprehensive evidential system on
the Southeastern Turkic model as represented by Uzbek. Indirective functions have
been copied onto postterminals of the 'perfect' type, and onto related copulas (see
below). The Balkan Romance languages Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian and Daco-
Romanian also display items signaling indirectivity. Megleno-Romanian utilizes an
inverted perfect that contains an auxiliary verb meaning 'have' occurring after the
past participle. This construction is formally similar to the Albanian so-called admi-
rative. In the Albanian evidentality opposition, the admirative is a marked indirective
with reportive, inferential and perceptive readings.

Sentence types

The use of indirectives depends on properties of certain basic sentence types that can
be distinguished across languages. To cite some Turkish examples, declarative sen-
tences are primarily used for representative speech acts such as stating, asserting and
claiming, e.g. Turkish *Ali geldi* <A. come-PAST> 'Ali came / has come', *Ali geliyor*
<A. come-INTRA> 'Ali comes / is coming'. Interrogative sentences are typically used
for eliciting information. Polar interrogative sentences involve the same proposition
as the corresponding declarative sentences, e.g. *Ali geldi mi?* <A. come-PAST Q> 'Did
Ali come? / Has Ali come?'. There are alternative questions such as *Ali geldi mi gitti
mi?* <A. come-PAST Q leave-PAST Q> 'Did Ali come or leave? / Has Ali come or
left?', and there are constituent interrogative sentences which elicit answers that
provide the information specified by an interrogative word they contain, e.g. *Kim*

geldi <who came-PAST> 'Who came / has come?'. Imperative sentences will be left out, since they do not interact with the kind of indirective operators dealt with here.

Each sentence type has a wide range of uses. The connections between them and their illocutionary functions are often complex. Declarative sentences do not only have descriptive functions, but may also be used for speech acts of accusing, promising, complaining, etc., e.g. Turkish *söz veriyorum* <word.give-INTRA-1.P.SG> 'I promise'. Interrogative sentences are, as is well known, not only used for questions, but also, for example, for more or less polite requests, e.g. *Can you close the window?* Speech act distinctions result from interaction of the sentence types with other structural properties and contextual conditions.

Turkish markers

Some examples from Turkish will be cited in order to illustrate the issue of sources. In Turkish, indirectivity is expressed by the inflectional verbal suffix *-miş* and the indirective copula particle *imiş*, originally a form of a verb 'to be' (see Johanson 2000b, 2003, Csató 2000a). The copula particle is mostly used in its suffixed form *-(y)miş*.

The simple inflectional marker *-miş* is suffixed to verbal stems and capable of carrying high pitch. It is a rather stable marker of indirectivity, mostly with past time reference, e.g. *gülmüş* <laugh-MIŞ> 'has / had evidently laughed'. It is homonymous with the postterminal participle suffix *-miş*, which does not, however, express indirectivity.

The copula particle *imiş* cannot be added to verbal stems, but may follow nominals, including nominal stems of the verb. It is not capable of carrying high pitch. It is a stable marker of indirectivity with reportive, inferential and perceptive uses. Since *imiş* normally exhibits suffixed allomorphs in the shape of *-(y)miş*, some of its written realizations coincide with those of the inflectional marker *-miş*, e.g. *gülmüş* [rose-IMIŞ] 'it is / was evidently a rose'. This copula particle may, for example, form indirective intraterminals, i.e. presents and imperfects, e.g. *geliyormuş* <come-INTRA-IMIŞ> 'is / was evidently arriving', prospectives such as *gelecekmiş* <come-PROSP-IMIŞ> 'will / would evidently arrive' and unequivocally indirective postterminals such as *gelmişmiş* <come-POST-IMIŞ> 'has / had reportedly arrived'. Indirective copula particles are incompatible with the simple past marker *-di* and the copula form *idi* 'was', e.g. Turkish **-diymiş*, **-(y)diymiş*.

The deceptive similarity of certain allomorphs of the two markers *-mIş* and *imiş* has led linguists to confuse them, referring to both as 'the suffix *-miş*', allegedly attachable to both verbal and nominal stems, or to speak of an 'evidential perfect' that is taken to include both markers.

Oppositions

Turkic languages display paradigmatic contrasts between marked indirectives and their unmarked counterparts. The indirective terms of the Turkish oppositions, *gelmiş*

<come-MIŞ> 'has obviously come / obviously came' and *geliyormuş* <come-INTRA-IMIŞ> 'is / was obviously coming, obviously comes' etc. are the marked ones, systematically opposed to the corresponding unmarked terms *geldi* <come-PAST> 'has come / came', *geliyor* <come-INTRA> 'is coming / comes', etc. The marked members of the oppositions represent the positive value of indirectivity. The unmarked members represent non-indirectivity, implying negation of, or neutrality towards, the positive notion on a common basis of comparison.

Thus the Turkish inflectional suffix *-miş,* which mainly displays indirective uses, is opposed to an unmarked simple direct past in *-di,* which negates the notion of indirectivity but also displays neutral uses. Since Turkish lacks a competing pure postterminal (see below), this item covers both 'perfect' and 'preterite' functions, e.g. *geldi* <come-PAST> 'has come / came'.

Sources

As mentioned, specification of the way the event is acknowledged by the recipient is not criterial for indirectivity as such. The reception may be realized through hearsay, inference, or perception. All these readings can be translated by *evidently, obviously,* etc. The interpretations may also be intertwined or overlapping.

A quotative or reportive interpretation means that the source is hearsay: the recipient reports what (s)he has heard from someone else. The narrated event or its effect is reported to the recipient. The basis of knowledge is a foreign source. We may translate: 'the recipient is told / has been told that X is the case'. English translation equivalents include *reportedly, allegedly, as they say / said,* etc. Example: Turkish *Bakan hastaymış* <minister sick-IMIŞ> 'The minister is / was reportedly sick', typically referring to a recipient who is informed about the sickness. Note that the recipient's source is not necessarily the original source; the source quoted may have the information from another source.

An inferential or experiential interpretation means that the source is pure reflection, logical conclusion based on indirect evidence or previous personal experience. The narrated event or its effect is inferred by the recipient. We may translate: 'the recipient concludes / has concluded that X is the case'. English translation equivalents include *as far as R understands / understood,* etc. Example: Turkish *Uyumuşum* <sleep-MIŞ-1.P.SG> 'I have / had obviously slept', typically referring to a recipient just waking up.

The source may, however, also be first-hand knowledge based on direct sensory perception: the narrated event or its effect is perceived by the recipient. The source may be what the recipient sees, hears, tastes, smells or feels. We may translate: 'the recipient perceives / has perceived that X is the case'. English translation equivalents include *it appears / appeared that, it turns / turned out that, as R can / could see, hear,* etc. Examples: Turkish *Burnun kanamış* <nose-POSS.2.P.SG bleed-MIŞ> 'Oh, your nose has bled [as I see]', *Elbisem leke olmuş* <dress-POSS.1.P.SG stain become-MIŞ> 'It appears that my dress is stained', *Yanağına domates bulaşmış* <cheek-

POSS.2.P.SG-DAT tomato smear-MIŞ> 'You've got tomato on your cheek', *Ali baktı, yıldızlar silinmiş gitmiş* <A. look-PAST star-PLUR expire-MIŞ go-MIŞ> 'Ali looked and saw: the stars had faded out completely', *Ali iyi çalıyormuş* <A. good play-INTRA-IMIŞ> 'Ali is / was [as I hear / heard] playing well', typically referring to a recipient listening to a musical performance. This last type can also be used when the recipient of second-hand knowledge agrees with the source: 'I observe that the source I got the information from was right'.

As stated above, the perceptive uses cannot possibly be subsumed under 'non-first-hand knowledge'. They express that the event or its effect turns out to be the case, becomes manifest, visible, or apprehended through one of the senses and thus open to the recipient's mind. These uses cannot be derived from reportive or inferential meanings.

Some Turkic languages with more elaborated evidentiality systems, e.g. Turkmen and Uyghur, distinguish 'reportive' and 'non-reportive' (inferential / perceptive) evidentiality. None of them distinguishes other types of sources in a systematic way, e.g. visual information versus other kinds of sensory information.

Aspect and tense

When analyzing the aspecto-temporal systems of indirective and non-indirective sentence types, we will use the viewpoint notions of intraterminality and postterminality. These two aspectual ways of envisaging events with respect to their limits are grammaticalized in Turkic as well as in many other languages (Johanson 1971, 1994, 1996a, 2000a, 2001).

The intraterminal perspective, +INTRA, envisages, at a given aspectual vantage point, an event within its limits, *intra terminos*, i.e. after its beginning and before its end. Non-intraterminality, -INTRA, disregards this view. Intraterminality is an introspective manner of presentation allowing to perceive an event from inside, and not in its totality. It is typical of progressives, present tenses and imperfects. Intraterminals are marked imperfectives expressing 'the state of doing'. Combinations with tenses yield expressions such as -PAST (+INTRA) 'intraterminal-in-present', e.g. English *writes, is writing*, and +PAST (+INTRA) 'intraterminal-in-past', e.g. *was writing*.

The postterminal perspective, +POST, envisages, at a given aspectual vantage point, an event after the transgression of its decisive limit, *post terminum*, i.e. after its beginning or its end. Non-postterminality, -POST, disregards this view. Postterminality is typical of perfects and resultatives. Postterminals express 'the state of having done' and can thus refer to preexisting events in an indirect way. The event is totally or partly absent from the view, but it is still relevant at the vantage point, possibly through observable results or traces. Combinations with tenses yield expressions such as -PAST (+POST) 'postterminal-in-present', e.g. English *has written*, and +PAST (+POST) 'postterminal-in-past', e.g. *had written*.

Indirective markers often go back to postterminals. The type of indirectives found in Turkic languages are closely connected with postterminality, the view of the event

after the transgression of its relevant limit. Postterminals can refer in an indirect way to an event that has already, entirely or partly, disappeared from the range of vision, but is still relevant in one way or another. It may extend right up to the orientation point, have left observable traces or effects or other forms of present knowledge of it at this point. This indirect perspective creates an element of distance. It may suggest that information becomes available *post factum*, that a preexisting state is discovered, etc.

Postterminals may exhibit both aspectual and more or less vague evidential uses. In many languages, perfects, expressing past events with present relevance, tend towards indirective readings (Johanson 1971: 280-292, 2000a: 121-123), without being stable evidentials. They may acquire additional secondary evidential meanings through pragmatic inference and use them for evidential strategies. For example, Persian *kærdæ-æst* 'has done' and Eastern Armenian *gnac-el ē* 'has gone' are ambiguous with respect to indirectivity. Genuine indirective categories may develop through further grammaticalization, as a semantic extension in the sense of conventionalized implicatures.

In many cases it may be difficult to decide whether a given perfect-like item is a pure postterminal or an indirective postterminal. The Balkan Slavic oppositions with respect to direct vs. indirect experience are claimed to obtain between confirmative vs. nonconfirmative terms. The basic evidential oppositions of Bulgarian and Macedonian are described as relying on marked 'confirmative' items indicating unequivocal and direct assertion, whereas the corresponding unmarked items convey indirective meanings in particular contexts. According to Friedman, who admits that the label 'evidential' for these oppositions is infelicitous (2000: 357), the choice between confirmative vs. nonconfirmative terms is determined by the speaker's attitude toward the information, confirmativity expressing the speaker's vouching for the truth of the information. The Macedonian past tense formed with the *l*-participle is claimed to be an unmarked past rather than one marked for nonconfirmation. Friedman takes the Albanian 'admirative' to be "a marked nonconfirmative, expressing the three basic types of nonconfirmative meaning described for the Balkan Slavic *l*-form: reportedness, dubitativity, and admirativity" (2000: 343).

The Bulgarian copulaless *l*-periphrasis has been judged to be an unmarked past that has nonconfirmativity as its main contextual variant meaning. Levin-Steinmann suggests that it is still an item whose invariant value is based on 'Zustandskonstatierung': "eine auf das Subjekt bezogene, zu einem vergangenen Moment bereits eingesetzte Handlung als eine ihm bis zu einem bestimmten Zeitpunkt anhaftende Eigenschaft". This is clearly a viewpoint aspectual notion in the sense of high-focal postterminality (resultativity). Though the item is said to have contextual readings such as renarrative, conclusive, admirative, etc., it is not, if the analysis is correct, a fullfledged evidential.

Regarding the question whether the Balkan Slavic systems based on marked confirmatives have emerged through areal contact with Turkic systems based on marked indirectives, Comrie considers the possibility that the semantic distinction can be

reduced to a single prototype with markedness inversion: "one of the systems, almost certainly the Balkan one, has undergone a shift whereby an old indirective was reinterpreted as unmarked, with the originally unmarked non-indirective then becoming a marked confirmative" (2000: 8).

Turkic systems under foreign influence

Despite certain system differences, almost all known older and recent stages of Turkic possess grammatical means of expressing indirectivity. Indirectives play a central part in almost all Turkic languages. However, due to strong influence from Indo-European languages such as Persian, Greek and Slavic, a few languages and dialects lack them. Karaim, spoken in Lithuania, has lost them under Slavic and Lithuanian impact (Csató 2000b). In the Turkish dialects of the Trabzon province on the east Black Sea coast, the inflectional suffix -miş exhibits an atypical behaviour under the impact of Greek (Brendemoen 1997).

Some dialects only exhibit evidentiality strategies. The status of the Azerbaijanian inflectional marker -miš, which forms a common mixed paradigm with -(i)b, is different from that of Turkish -miş. Thus -miš / -(i)b represents an ambivalent type: a postterminal past ('perfect') with secondary indirective readings, e.g. gelmišem <come-POST-1.P.SG> 'I have arrived', yazïbsïn <write-POST-2.P.SG> 'you have written'. The unmarked term -di tends towards preterite rather than perfect functions, e.g. geldi <come-PAST> 'came' versus gelib <come-POST> 'has come'. This behaviour is most probably due to Persian influence, e.g. yapïb 'has done', cf. Persian karde(-ast). Also in the non-Oghuz language Khalaj, spoken in central Iran, -miš does not display any indirective meaning (Kıral 2000). In some East Anatolian dialects that are close to Azeri, the finite inflectional marker -miş, which conveys indirectivity in Standard Turkish, tends to express pure postterminality in the sense of a perfect, e.g. uyumuşum <sleep-MIŞ-1.P.SG> 'I have slept'. In Cypriot dialects, the simple finite -MIŞ is absent as an indirective suffix and rather used as a postterminal (perfect) marker, like in the Anatolian dialects mentioned, e.g. Şimdi gelmişem <now come-MIŞ-1.P.SG> 'I have arrived now'. However, the particle miş (< imiş), which is placed in front of the predicate core, expresses indirectivity, e.g. Ali miş gelecek <A. MIŞ come-PROSP> 'Ali will obviously come'; cf. Standard Turkish Ali gelecekmiş <A. come-PROSP-IMIŞ>.

Reduced aspect-tense inventories

An interesting point is that indirective sentences are characterized by a reduced inventory of aspectotemporal markers. In the simple past we find the following opposition in Turkish: Ali geldi <A. come-PAST> 'Ali came / has come' vs. Ali gelmiş <A. come-MIŞ> 'It appears that Ali came / has come / had come'. The Turkish indirectivity distinction is not, as is sometimes claimed, restricted to the past tense. Other combinations utilize the indirective copula particle imiş, which is temporally indifferent, i.e. ambiguous between past and present time reference. Examples: Ali geliyor <A.

come-INTRA> 'Ali comes/is coming', *Ali geliyordu* <A. come-INTRA-PAST> 'Ali was coming' vs. *Ali geliyormuş* <A. come-INTRA-IMIŞ> 'It appears that Ali comes / is coming / was coming'.

The Turkish inflectional suffix *-miš* is also temporally neutral between past and non-past. Thus, *Ali gelmiş* <A. come-MIŞ> may also refer to the past tense: 'Ali had apparently come'. The addition of *idi* or *-(y)dI* 'was' would remove the indirective meaning and create a pluperfect in the sense of +PAST (+POST) 'postterminal-in-past': *Ali gelmişti* <A. come-MIŞ-PAST> 'Ali had come'. An example from a novel by Adalet Ağaoğlu: *Kaldırımda, elim hâlâ elindeydi* <pavement-LOC hand-POSS.1.P.SG. still hand-POSS.3.P.SG.>. *Koyvermemişiz* <let.go-NEG-MIŞ-1.P.PLUR> 'On the pavement my hand was still in his hand. [I realized that] we hadn't let go'.

Some other Turkic languages exhibit very similar systems, which will not be dealt with in detail here. Yakut, the northern- and easternmost Turkic language, spoken at the opposite extreme of the Turkic world, has an indirective system that is similar to the Turkish one. The inflectional marker *-bit* conveys reportive, inferential and perceptive nuances, e.g. *kelbit* <come-BIT> 'has obviously arrived', *barbït* <go-BIT> 'has evidently gone'. The temporally indifferent indirective particle *ebit* is similar to Turkish *imiş* and allows similar combinations with intraterminals, postterminals, etc., e.g. *turar ebit* [stand-INTRA-EBIT] 'evidently stands / stood', *kelbit ebit* [come-POST-EBIT] 'has / had evidently arrived' (Buder 1989).

Many Turkic languages utilize the indirective copula particle *eken*, which is also originally a form of a verb 'to be' and equally ambiguous between past and present time reference. Temporal ambiguity is often observed in other languages that possess indirective operators. The Turkish expression of past tense in the opposition *-di* vs. *-miş* corresponds to Bulgarian *čete* 'read' vs. *čel* 'apparently read' or Tajik *kærd* 'did / has done' vs. *kærdœ-œst* 'apparently did/has done'. But Bulgarian intraterminal, i.e. present and imperfect, forms display the same temporal indifference as their Turkish counterparts, e.g. *Ali čete* <A. read-INTRA> 'Ali reads/is reading', *Ali četese* (<A. read-INTRA-PAST> 'Ali was reading' vs. *Ali četjal* <A. read-INTRA-INDIR> 'It appears that Ali is / was reading'.

The Turkish indirective copula particle has close equivalents in Bulgarian *bil* (Johanson 1996b), Tajik *-œ œst*, Armenian *eɣel*, all of which are also forms of 'to be'. These elements show similar temporal neutralizations, e.g. Persian *Æli mekunæd* <A. do-INTRA-NON-PAST> 'Ali does / is doing', *Ali mekærd* <A. do-INTRA.PAST> 'Ali was doing' vs. *Æli mekærdœ-œst* <A. do-INTRA> 'It appears that Ali is / was doing'. *Æli kærdœ-œst* <A. do-POST> 'Ali has done', *Æli kærdœ bud* <A. do-POST-PAST> 'Ali had done' vs. *Æli kærdœ budœ-œst* <A. do-POST-INDIR> 'It appears that Ali has / had done'. Bulgarian examples: *Ali čel e* <A. read-post> 'Ali has read', *Ali čel beše* <A. read POST.PAST> 'Ali had read' vs. *Ali čel bil* <A. read-POST-INDIR> 'It appears that Ali has / had read'.

Turkish indirective sentence types

Turkic evidentials are limited to main clauses with a stated, contradictable content. Oppositions with respect to indirectivity are not possible in embedded clauses. Turkic languages lack grammatical evidentiality oppositions in embedded clauses: they have no indirective subjunctors, i.e. complementizers, adverbializers and relativizers. It is thus not possible to mark embedded clauses for indirectivity in the sense of 'that X is obvious', 'X being obvious', etc.

Cases such as the following illustrate the purely postterminal value ('having done') of the participle in *-miş*: *Ali ölmüştü* <A. die-POST-PAST-3.P.SG> 'Ali had died' (pluperfect), *Ali kazanmış gibi güldü* <A. win-POST like laugh-PAST> 'Ali laughed as if he had won', *Ali'yi ölmüş sandım* <A.-ACC die-POST believe-PAST-1.P.SG> 'I thought Ali had died'.

One feature of negative sentences is that indirectivity is not within the scope of the negation. It is not the reception by a conscious subject that is negated (*'it does not appear that X is the case'), but the narrated event itself (*'it appears that X is not the case '), e.g. *Ali gelmemiş* <A. come-NEG-MIŞ> 'It appears that Ali did not come / has not come / had not come'.

Indirectives occur in declarative sentences used for representative speech acts which make claims and inform about situations: *Ali gelmiş* <A. come-MIŞ> 'Ali has, as it appears, come'. They also combine with interrogative sentences, i.e. polar interrogative sentences, e.g. *Ali gelmiş mi?* <A. come-MIŞ Q> 'Has Ali, as it appears, come?', alternative questions, e.g. *Ali gelmiş mi gitmiş mi?* <A. come-MIŞ Q leave-MIŞ Q> 'Has Ali, as it appears, come or left?', and constituent interrogative sentences, e.g. *Kim gelmiş* <who come-MIŞ> 'Who has, as it appears, come?'. The interrogative operator takes the indirective operator in its scope. Speakers typically choose indirective questions if they anticipate indirective responses. The meaning 'it appears that ...' of the corresponding declarative sentence is changed into 'does it appear that ...?'. The answer is expected to express a certain reservation, not stating what is the case, but what appears to be the case, e.g. *Ali delirmiş mi?* <A. go.mad-MIŞ Q> 'Has Ali, as it seems, gone mad?'. Indirectives may also be used in questions asked on behalf of someone else. They do not express the speaker's assumption about the addressee's source of information.

Indirectivity is mostly incompatible with sentences used for non-representative speech acts, e.g. acts of accusing, promising, complaining, etc. The strength of a performative utterance such as 'I (hereby) promise', which only refers to the speaker, would be neutralized by an indirective sentence such as Turkish *söz veriyormuşum* <word give-INTRA-IMIŞ-1.P.SG> '*It appears that I hereby promise'.

Turkic indirective markers do not combine with imperatives such as *Gel!* 'come!', which only express the speaker's own command and not some other person's will. On the other hand, indirective markers may occur with subjective moods such as optative, necessitative and debitive, which evaluate the actuality of an event in terms of moral or similar norms: 'it appears that X should be the case'. An optative

marker such as Turkish -*sin* (often erroneously referred to as an imperative) may combine with indirectivity, e.g. *Ali gelsinmiş* <A. come-OPT.3.P.SG.-IMIŞ> 'Ali is apparently requested to come'. In a sentence such as *Gitmeliymişim* <go-DEBITIVE-IMIŞ-1.P.SG> 'It appears / appeared that I ought to go', the indirective takes the objective deontic mood of the debitive marker -*meli* in its scope. The utterances in question do not refer to the speaker's will, but to some other person's will: 'it appears that (according to somebody's opinion) X should be the case'. Combinations with conditionals are also possible, e.g. *Ali gelseymiş* <A. come-COND-IMIŞ> 'if [as reported] Ali would come'.

Contextual meanings

As stated above, evidential categories have the indication of evidence as their primary meaning, and not only as a pragmatic inference. On the other hand, genuine evidential categories such as indirectives may acquire specific uses in discourse and gain additional meanings and extensions in certain speech-acts. The linguist faces the problem to determine how the coded values are used, on the pragmatic side, by discourse participants. Indirectives may, both in declarative and interrogative sentences, suggest nuances of 'subjectivity' or 'stance' that reflect the speaker's cognitive and emotional affective attitude. Such functions are due to interaction with contextual factors and pragmatic properties in specific speech-acts.

The motives for using Turkic indirectives may vary. They may get various contextual interpretations and display various pragmatic extensions of their central meaning. Their primary task is not to express doubt versus certainty. They are neither dubitatives nor presumptives. Indirective sentences do not necessarily signal that the content ranks lower in reliability. Still they may be used as downtoners in strategies of hedging, suggesting the speaker's distance to the information. One function is to disclaim responsibility for the validity by transferring it to a source ('I am just relating, not asserting').

Indirectives may evoke the impression that the recipient does not or did not witness the event, perceive it, or participate in it consciously; that (s)he is or was not present at the event, not in control of it, not directly involved in it. However, despite the indirect way of presentation, these meanings are not signalled explicitly. The indirectively marked event may indeed be apprehended by the recipient through the senses, consciously taken part in, etc. Lack of participation or control is limited to certain contexts and is not the common core meaning of indirectives. The source of information may be direct evidence, personal, even visually obtained knowledge. A sentence such as Turkish *Ahmet gelmiş* [A. come-MIŞ] 'Ahmed has / had [as I note / noted] arrived' can be felicitously uttered by a speaker who has witnessed the arrival in reality. The indirective statement just expresses the conscious reception.

'Distance' is another possible contextual realisation. It has sometimes even been suggested as the common core meaning of Turkic indirectives. Some kind of distance is likely to be involved if a speaker does not refer directly to the event itself, but

rather to the reception of it. One kind of dissociation from the event may be an ironic relation to it, reservation interpretable as sarcasm, disdain, etc. e.g. *Bunu yapacak-mışsın* <this-ACC do-PROSP-IMIŞ-2.P.SG> 'You will obviously [as you think] do this'.

The limitation to an indirective statement may be motivated by caution, modesty, need for a summarizing view, etc., e.g. Turkish *Ben her zaman vazifemi yapmışım* <I always duty-POSS.1.P.SG-ACC do-MIŞ-1.P.SG> 'I have [as it appears] always done my duty'.

Combinations with *güya* 'as if, supposedly' yield dubitative meanings, e.g. *Güya görmüşüm* <supposedly see-MIŞ-1.P.SG> 'It is alleged that I have seen it [but I refuse to accept this]', *Güya almış* <supposedly take-MIŞ> 'Supposedly (s)he has taken it [but I have doubts about it]'. Combinations with *sanki* 'as if' may have the same effect, e.g. *Sanki anlamış* <as.if understand-MIŞ> 'It is as if (s)he has understood [but I don't believe it]'. The last sentence can also have non-dubitative interpretations, if the verbal form is stressed: '(S)he seems to have understood'.

Turkish has other ways of expressing supposition or conjecture, for example by adding *-dir* (< *turur* 'stands') to intraterminals and postterminals, e.g. *Ali okuyordur* <A. read-INTRA-DIR> 'Ali is presumably reading', *Ali gelmiştir* <A. come-POST-DIR>'Ali has presumably arrived'. The relationship between *yapmıştır* and *yapmış* thus does not correspond to the relationship between the Bulgarian confirmative *napravil e* and its nonconfirmative counterpart *napravil*, as has sometimes been claimed.

Emotional nuances

Indirectives may also be used to signal personal emotions, affective responses to the propositional content. In expressive speech acts they may be used in an exclamative way, conveying the recipient's surprise at an unexpected or remarkable situation. Their use may, in particular contexts, be interpreted in terms of admiration, new knowledge, sudden awareness of revealed facts, mental unpreparedness, perception contrary to one's expectations, etc. This includes so-called mirative connotations, which follow naturally from the notion of indirectivity. The conscious reception ('as it turns out / turned out') may be sudden or unexpected; what the recipient turns the mind to may come as a surprise. The fact that Turkish indirectives may convey new information that is not yet part of the speaker's integrated picture of the world (Aksu-Koç & Slobin 1986) is compatible with the central value of indirectivity. Examples: *Bebek sütün hepsini içmiş!* <baby milk-GEN all-POSS.3.P.SG-ACC drink-MIŞ> 'Oh, the baby has drunk all the milk!', *Erken gelmişsiniz!* <early come-MIŞ-2.P.PL> 'Oh, you have come early!', *Ali sınavını geçmiş* (<A. exam-POSS.3.P.SG-ACC pass-MIŞ> '[I am surprised that] Ali has passed his exam!', *Ali şampiyon olmuş* <A. champion become-MIŞ> '[How surprising,] Ali has become a champion! In exclamations such as Turkish *Bu kız ne güzelmiş!* <this girl what beautiful-IMIŞ> 'How beautiful this girl is!', *Büyümüşsün!* <grow-MIŞ-2.P.SG> 'Oh, you have really grown!', the indirective marker just adds the meaning 'as I am / become aware of', which is the central value

of the category. Stress and intonation are important in these cases. The Albanian admirative, which is a marked indirective, can be used in the same way, e.g. *Ti kërcyeke shumë mirë!* 'You dance very well!' (Friedman 2000: 343). These uses do not mean that 'mirativity' is the central meaning from which the other uses of indirectives may be derived (DeLancey 1997). Surprise, novelty and contrariness to the speaker's expectation are not necessary elements of indirectivity. On the contrary, so-called 'hot news' is typically expressed by the direct past marker *-di*.

In some Turkic languages, elements of the type *eken,* superficially corresponding to indirective copula particles, may be used as exclamative and corroborative modal particles, expressing astonishment. This is a result of contamination with an old Turkic particle *e(r)ki(n).* These elements are not genuine indirective copula particles, but utterance-final particles that do not take personal suffixes, i.e. are added to complete main clauses. They may also cooccur with the simple past item *-di,* e.g. Kazakh *Keldi eken!* <come-PAST MOD> 'It has indeed arrived!'. As mentioned above, genuine indirective copula particles are incompatible with the simple past marker *-di* and the related copula forms *edi* and *idi* 'was'. The *eken* markers of this type also occur in interrogative sentences that do not express real questions. They may form rhetorical questions with readings of wondering and hesitation, in the sense of 'I wonder if ...', e.g. Kazakh *Ne ettim eken?* <what do-PAST-1.P.SG MOD> 'I wonder what I have done'. Here they are used as detensive markers to tone down questions, to give them meditative, skeptical or timid connotations, e.g. Kazakh *Keldi me eken?* <come-PAST Q MOD> 'I wonder if it has arrived'. The Noghay interrogative sentence *Nege kelgenler eken?* <what-DAT come-POST-3.P.PL MOD>, is a rhetorical question meaning 'I wonder why they have come'. By contrast, *Nege kelgen ekenler?* <what-DAT come-POST EKEN-3.P.PL> 'Why do they seem to have come?' ('Why have they, as it seems, come?') is an indirective sentence with the copula particle *eken* taking the personal suffix (see Karakoç 2005: 28).

Markedness

In analyses that take the indirectives to signal the speaker's doubt about the correctness of the content, it is sometimes claimed that the non-indirective terms, *geldi, geliyor,* etc., are the marked members, signalling confirmation, etc. The reason is that declarative sentences are typically used to express statements, thus suggesting an attitude of belief in the truth of the propositional content. Most speech acts typical of declarative sentences suggest that the proposition is true or will turn out to be true. Utterances stating 'X is the case' and 'X is not the case' suggest that the speaker is certain about the actuality or non-actuality of the event. Evidentially unmarked terms may suggest that the source of information is direct experience, that the speaker takes / has taken part in the event consciously, is / was in control of it, etc. Though the unmarked members of the indirectivity oppositions may imply certainty, they are not marked for direct experience, and they are even indifferent towards this notion. While the Turkish markers *-miş* and *imiş* signal indirective meanings, the markers

-di, -iyor, etc., do not necessarily imply that the source of information is direct ex-
perience. They may also be used for unwitnessed, uncontrolled, reported or inferred
events. Indirect experience is grammatically marked, whereas direct experience is the
default interpretation of the unmarked members of the oppositions. The widespread
opinion that unmarked items such as *geldi* 'has come / came' consistently signal
'direct experience' or 'visual evidence' is incorrect. In historical narratives, direct
pasts of the type *-di* are used as the basic items, also for events unwitnessed by the
speaker, e.g. *Kemal Paşa, Selânik'te doğdu* [A. S.-LOC be.born-PAST] 'Atatürk was
born in Salonika'. They just do not signal that the event is stated in an indirect way,
i.e. acknowledged by a recipient by means of report, inference or perception. They
just lack the two-layered information typical of indirectives, and may thus be used in
a neutral way if the speaker considers the evidential distinction unessential.

Discourse types and registers

Discourse-pragmatic factors in terms of registers and genres are important for the
realization of indirectives. Indirectives may play various roles according to different
discourse types. Two major text types seem to reflect different tendencies.

   Indirectives are typical of subjective registers relating to discourse types that fo-
cus on the immediate situation and the personal involvement of the speaker. They
prototypically represent direct interaction, oral, immediate face-to-face communica-
tion, conversations, speeches and oral narratives. The texts in which they occur
mostly exhibit elements of proximity, e.g. first- and second-person personal pro-
nouns, and predominantly paratactic clause-combining techniques yielding numerous
short simple sentences. These text types offer excellent context-sensitive options with
regard to marking propositional contents for indirectivity.

   In many languages, attitudinal particles are mostly used in relatively subjective
registers. The use of corresponding devices in Turkic, indirectives and epistemic
markers such as dubitatives, presumptives and assertives, is subject to similar restric-
tions.

   Indirectives are also typically used in certain types of traditional narrative dis-
course describing past events and referring to animate participants, e.g. fairy-tales. In
traditional story-telling they play the role of detaching the narrator from the narrated
events, e.g. *Bir varmış bir yokmuş* <one existing-IMIŞ one nonexisting-IMIŞ> 'Once
upon a time there was...', *Evvel zaman içinde bir padişahın üç kızı varmış* <earlier
time in one ruler-GEN three daughter-POSS.3.P.SG existing-IMIŞ> 'Once upon a time
there was a king who had three daughters'. (On traditional *-miş*-based narratives in
Turkish, see Johanson 1971: 79-80.)

   Indirectives are not easily employed in objective registers implying relatively
precise text conventions, i.e. in more distanced, detached, descriptive texts with more
specific informative contents, a higher degree of formality, less personal involvement
of the text producer and thus a low degree of expressivity. Objective registers are
typical of more planned written discourse with a certain distance between text pro-

ducer and addressee. More or less fixed stylistic structures may leave the text producer with fewer options. Turkic indirectives are hardly used in these registers. The latter are rich in hypotactical devices, and Turkish lacks, as already mentioned, the possibility of embedding indirective clauses.

The main reason for the avoidance of indirectives in the dominant styles of modern media is, however, that these styles request less ambiguous modes of expression. The undifferentiated indirective meaning 'it appears that X is the case' without specification of the source is open to several interpretations.

This ambiguity can be compensated for by more differentiated lexical means that refer to specific sources. The indirect reception of a propositional content can be optionally signalled by higher clauses with complementation markers, e.g. *it seems that ..., I guess that..., they say that..., I hear that....* or by adverbial expressions such as *reportedly, in my experience, apparently, allegedly,* etc. When choosing one of these optional devices, I commit myself to a specific reading, tracing the information back to specific sources. I cannot leave the interpretation open. With an expression meaning *allegedly,* for instance, I disclaim responsibility for the propositional content, stating that somebody else has conveyed it. With an indirectivity marker, however, the question of source remains open. It allows me to be vague about sources that I do not want to lay open to view, which is a valuable linguistic option.

References

Aikhenvald, A. Y. 2003. Evidentiality in typological perspective. In: Aikhenvald, A. Y. & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.). *Studies in evidentiality.* (Typological Studies in Language 54.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1-31.

Aksu-Koç, A. A. & Slobin, D. 1986. A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish. In: Chafe, W. & Nichols, J. (eds.) *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology.* (Advances in Discourse Processes 20.) Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. 159-167.

Brendemoen, B. 1997. Some remarks on the *-mlş* past in the Eastern Black Sea coast dialects. *Turkic Languages* 1,161-183.

Buder, A. 1989. *Aspekto-temporale Kategorien im Jakutischen.* (Turcologica 5.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Chafe, W. 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In: Chafe, W. & Nichols, J. (eds.) *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology.* (Advances in Discourse Processes 20.) Norwood, N.J.: Ablex. 261-272.

Comrie, B. 2000. Evidentials: semantics and history. In: Johanson, L. & Utas, B. 2000. *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages.* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24.) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-12.

Csató, É. Á. 2000a. Turkish MİŞ- and IMİŞ-items. Dimensions of a functional analysis. In: Johanson, L. & Utas, B. (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages.* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 29-43.

Csató, É. Á. 2000b. Some typological features of the viewpoint and tense system in spoken North-Western Karaim. In: Dahl, Ö. (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe.*

(Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, Eurotyp 20-6.) Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 723-751.

DeLancey, S. 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1, 33-52.

Friedman, V. A., 2000. Confirmative/nonconfirmative in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian with additional observations on Turkish, Romani, Georgian, and Lak. In: Johanson, L. & Utas, B. (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages.* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 329-366.

Johanson, L. 1971. *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems.* (Studia Turcica Upsaliensia 1.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Johanson, L. 1994. Türkeitürkische Aspektotempora. In: Thieroff, R. & Ballweg, J. (eds.) *Tense systems in European languages.* Tübingen: Niemeyer. 247-266.

Johanson, L. 1996a. Terminality operators and their hierarchical status. In: Devriendt, B., Goossens, L. & van der Auwera, J. (eds.) *Complex structures: A functionalist perspective.* (Functional Grammar Series 17.) Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 229-258.

Johanson, L. 1996b: On Bulgarian and Turkic indirectives. In: Boretzky, N., Enninger, W. & Stolz, Th. (eds.) *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte. Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen.* (Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 24.) Bochum: Brockmeyer. 84-94.

Johanson, L. 1998a. Zum Kontakteinfluß türkischer Indirektive. In: Demir, N. & Taube, E. (eds.) *Turkologie heute – Tradition und Perspektive.* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 141-150.

Johanson, L. 1998b. The structure of Turkic. In: Johanson, L. & Csató, É. Á. (eds.) *The Turkic languages.* London: Routledge. 30-66.

Johanson, L. 1999. The dynamics of code-copying in language encounters. In: Brendemoen, B., Lanza, E. & Ryen, E. (eds.) *Language encounters across time and space.* Oslo: Novus Press. 37-62.

Johanson, L. 2000a. Viewpoint operators in European languages. In: Dahl, Ö. (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 27-187.

Johanson, L. 2000b. Turkic indirectives. In: Johanson, L. and Utas, B. (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 61-87.

Johanson, L. 2001. On three dimensions of aspectual terminality. In: Bisang, W. (ed.). *Aspects of typology and universals.* (Studia Typologica 1.) Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. 53-62.

Johanson, L. 2002a. *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts.* London: Curzon.

Johanson, L. 2002b. Contact-induced linguistic change in a code-copying framework. In: Jones, M. C. & Esch, E. (eds.) *Language change: The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors.* (Contributions to the Sociology of Language 86.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 285-313.

Johanson, L. 2003. Evidentiality in Turkic. In: Aikhenvald, A. Y. & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.) *Studies in evidentiality.* (Typological Studies in Language 54.) Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 273-290.

Karakoç, B. 2005. *Das finite Verbalsystem im Nogaischen.* (Turcologica 58.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kıral, F. 2000. Reflections on *-miş* in Khalaj. In: Johanson, L. & Utas, B. (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages.* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24.) Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 89-101.

Levin-Steinmann, A. 2002. *Bedeutung und Funktionen der kopulalosen l-Periphrase im Bulgarischen.* Habilitation thesis, University of Leipzig.