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1. Indirectives in Turkic

The aim of the present paper is to give a brief general survey of Turkic indirectives. All older and more recent Turkic languages known to us display indirective categories expressed by specific grammatical items opposed to non-indirective items. 'Indirectivity' will be used as a cover term—instead of 'inferentiality' used in previous work—for various shades of meaning traditionally referred to as 'hearsay', 'inferential', 'admirative', etc.

Turkic indirective marking only applies to asserted sentences, i.e. those with a contradictable content. It also has a marginal use in certain interrogative sentences. It does not occur in embedded clauses that are integrated into sentences and thus not asserted as such. It will be argued that indirectivity is the linguistic expression of 'Eo appears to P'. This means that a narrated event Eo is not stated directly, but in an indirect way: by reference to its reception by a conscious subject P. English translation equivalents include apparently, evidently, it appears/ appeared that, it turns/turned out that, etc. The source of knowledge—the way in which the event is acknowledged by the conscious subject in question—is not criterial; it is unessential whether the reception is realized through hearsay, logical conclusion or direct perception. The receiver P is not necessarily the speaker, P0, but may also be a participant of the narrated event, P0. Consequently, markers of indirectivity do not fit into narrow evidential schemes primarily distinguishing between the speaker's non-first-hand and first-hand information.

Indirectivity represents a cognitive category firmly integrated into the grammar of Turkic languages. In many other languages, e.g. English, it is expressed optionally by means of modal words. The indirective items are the marked members of their respective oppositions, which means that the unmarked items also display relatively neutral uses. Turkic languages are strikingly similar with respect to the encod-
ing of indirectivity, though the conventions of formal marking may vary in the individual languages.

2. The situation in East Old Turkic

2.1. The postterminal indirective marker -miš

The first known example of an indirective Turkic verbal item is the frequently used East Old Turkic finite item in -miš, negated -madoq. It is opposed to the non-indirective simple past in -Di, and the competition resulting from this opposition is decisive for its semantics. The finite -miš must be sharply distinguished from the nonfinite (participial suffix) -miš, which shares its basic quality of postterminality, but does not display any indirective uses, since it does not take part in a corresponding opposition.

The uses of the finite -miš ultimately derive from its aspectual value of postterminality. This statement requires some explanation.

Turkic languages exhibit two kinds of viewpoint operators expressing the view of a narrated event with respect to its limits. The intraterminal perspective envisages an event within its limits, in its course, 'be doing'. The postterminal perspective, which is typical of -miš, envisages an event at a point where its relevant limit is transgressed, 'having done'.

The relevant limit, however, varies according to the types of actional phrases operated on. If the actional content does not imply any transformation, it is the initial limit. If the actional content implies a transformation, either the final or the initial limit is the so-called crucial limit. In the postterminal aspect, finittransformatives such as öl- 'die', express the transgression of the crucial last limit, e.g. ölmiš 'having died'. Initio-transformatives such as öltur- 'sit down' + 'sit' express the transgression of the crucial initial limit, e.g. öltürmiş 'having sat down' = 'be sitting'.

Envisaged in the postterminal perspective at a given point of observation, an event may thus present itself as totally or partially by-gone, though still of some current relevance. What appears to the view may be a partially past event, or, in the case of finittransformatives, only remaining effects or traces. Resultative interpretations—in the sense that the postterminally envisaged event leaves results after the transgression of the crucial limit—presuppose transformative actional phrases.

By virtue of their viewpoint value, postterminals signal anteriority, thus representing a kind of 'past'. Past items may in principle be more or less event-oriented. They may be predominantly historically oriented, in which case the psychological interest concerns the event as such at its localization interval. They may also be more diagnostically oriented, in which case the interest rather concerns the event in its relation to a subsequent orientation point (Johanson 1971: 67). Postterminals per definition represent the second kind of orientation, capturing what is 'visible' at a certain postterminal point of orientation.

The state obtaining at this point may be more or less focussed on. According to the focus on the postterminal state, postterminals exhibit various degrees of focality. Focal postterminals are 'diagnostic', whereas less focal ones are more event-oriented, 'historical', fit to serve as propulsive ('plot-advancing') basic items in narrative discourse types and combining freely with time expressions specifying the interval of localization. Postterminals tend to decrease their degree of focality over time, but this defocalisation has led to the renewal of high focality in most Turkic languages (Johanson 1999).

2.1.1. Postterminality and indirectivity

Postterminality and indirectivity are closely interconnected (Johanson 1971: 280–292), and the semantic link between them is a general typological one. Indirective readings easily emerge from the view of an event at a vantage point that is posterior to the transgression of the relevant limit. A connection between the postterminal state and the event itself may be established by way of inference: the situation is such that it may be concluded that the relevant limit of the event has already passed. The indirect perspective on the event view creates an element of distance and may even suggest uncertainty concerning the actual realization of the narrated event. The source of information, the basis on which the conclusions regarding a past or partly past event are drawn, may vary: inference from perception of traces and other consequences
or other forms of present knowledge including hearsay. Such latent properties of postterminals are occasionally activated in order to convey indirective nuances.

So-called perfects, expressing past events with present relevance and typically not used for narrative purposes, often tend towards readings of inferentiality or indirectivity (Comrie 1976: 108–110; Johanson 1971: Chapter 8). This tendency is common in various Indo-European languages, from Sanskrit down to modern languages such as Persian, Armenian, English and Scandinavian. Generally, however, the indirective semantics is unstable and elusive, suggested by categories that have rather different central meanings. Thus, the indirective capacities of Scandinavian perfects are far more modest than sometimes stated in the literature (e.g. Haugen 1972). Another example is the Persian type karde (ast) ‘has done’, which has more or less vague indirective shades of meaning and which, according to Lazard, represents two categories, both a present perfect and an indirective (“mediative”); see Lazard (1985, 1996); cf. Windfuhr (1982).

In Turkic, however, the situation is different, the postterminal items generally being more stable markers of indirectivity. General tendencies of postterminals to convey indirective shades of meaning are not sufficient to account for the existence of the Turkic indirective systems, which are the results of special developments in which the indirect aspectual value of postterminality is reinterpreted and grammaticalized as indirective meaning. Indirectivity is expressed much more systematically by certain Turkic postterminals than by perfects in other languages. A postterminal view is signalled, but not always with a subsequent confirmation of the postterminally envisaged event. As members of oppositions with competing ‘indicative’ items, the postterminal items are mostly used to signal indirectivity in a systematic way, i.e. for past events whose occurrence is inferred from information available at some later orientation point (posterior observation; “nachträgliche Feststellung”). In competition with -Di, the item -miš does not contain any subsequent confirmation of the postterminally envisaged event.

2.1.2. The functions of -miš

The functions of East Old Turkic -miš are frequently misunderstood. Its central meaning is mostly incorrectly taken to be ‘hearsay’ or ‘assumption’. It is wrong to define it as a marker of a ‘personally not perceived event’ (Pritsak 1963: 46), to claim that it always expresses non-testimony, that it expresses the result of an unobserved process, that the speaker has not been present at the course of the event and not witnessed its accomplishment, that the speaker is not the conscious originator of the event, that the event has occurred without the speaker’s conscious participation (Konovalov 1980: 188), etc. In spite of its indirect way of presentation, -miš does not always express nonconsciously experienced events.

In East Old Turkic, as in all other older and later Turkic languages known to us, the simple past in -Di is the unmarked member of the opposition and, as such, both negates the notion of indirectivity and displays uses that are neutral to this notion. It is important to understand this asymmetry. The widespread opinion that it consistently signals ‘direct experience’, ‘visual evidence’ etc. is incorrect. It is wrong to claim that the use of -Di is always testimonial, signalling that the speaker considers the event to be certain.

East Old Turkic -miš is used both as a pure postterminal and as an indirective, the uses being very closely interconnected. Thus, -miš is used for totally or partially past events acknowledged by means of information available at some postterminal orientation point. The basic indirective meaning is the reception of an impression that creates awareness of a situation. No information concerning P’s mental preparation or preceding expectation is conveyed. With respect to the source of knowledge, three types of uses may be distinguished:

- Perceptive uses: ‘E’ or its effect is perceived by P’. The basis is first-hand knowledge, direct perception of the event or indirect perception on the basis of effects, traces, consequences. The consequences may still be perceivable.

Note that, with initiotransformatives, P may also bear witness of direct observation of the part of the event that follows upon the transformation, e.g. olurmiš (i) ‘has sat down’ = (ii) ‘is sitting’ (simultaneously with the point of observation).
Inferential uses: 'E' is inferred by P'. The basis of knowledge is pure reflection, logical conclusion.

- Reportive uses: 'E' is reported to P'. The basis of knowledge is a foreign source, reported speech, hearsay.

The meaning of 'something established postterminally' may often be interpreted as 'something acknowledged postterminally', in which case the relevant shades of meaning can be translated as 'evidently', 'obviously', 'so far as can be judged', 'to all appearances', etc. Though the indirective shades of meaning are more or less perceptible and highly variable according to the context, they are not presumptive or dubitative in the sense of reducing the facticity of the statement. Neither doubt nor confirmation is expressed by East Old Turkic -miš.

East Old Turkic -miš is often used as a diagnostically oriented past with stative, perfect and complexive readings. With transformative actional phrases, it may denote qualities acquired as a result of the transgression of the crucial limit. A typical way of stressing the diagnostic dimension and not envisaging the event directly is observed in the complexive use, i.e. in subsequently summarizing general statements referring to events, often complex and discontinuous ones, outside a narrative chain; cf. Comrie’s 'experiential perfect' (1976: 58–59).

Some Old Uygurhur examples:

1. Ýllig ëmiš men
   realm-ACC organize-miš I
   'I have organized the realm.'

2. İçýänmiš men keńçim
   lose-miš I young-Poss-1SG-ACC
   'I have lost my child.'

3. Bu ýörijüg belğülüg qilyalı
   this explanation-ACC manifest make-CONV
   tüsün yavaş öldüler qanlar nom
   noble gentle king-PL ruler-PL doctrine
   nomlayu yarlıqamiš
   preach-CONV diegn-miš
   'Noble and gentle rulers have deigned to preach in order to make this interpretation clear.'

In examples such as these, the item -miš does not only signal ‘past tense’ (Gabain 1950: 114), for which -D1 would be sufficient. It is a postterminal expressing that the narrated event is not envisaged directly, but with respect to its relevance to a subsequent observation point. This complexive way of accounting for events belongs to the typical potential of postterminals. The reasons for using it may include modesty, cautiousness, etc., but it does not involve any evidential meaning concerning the source of information.

2.2. The indirective copula particle ernoş

East Old Turkic also possesses a special indirective copula particle as a stable marker of indirectivity:ernoş, derived from er- ‘be’. Unlike -miš, it is not a postterminal item but expresses indirectivity in the sense of ‘E appears to P’ in an unequivocal way. It has an ambiguous temporal value allowing both past and present interpretations. It is added to non-verbal stems of the sentence predicate. Combinations with particles include indirective intraterminals (presents, imperfects) of the type -Vrernoş ‘appeared/appears to be doing’ and indirective postterminals (perfects, pluperfects) of the type -mišernoş ‘appeared/appears to have done’.

All other known Turkic languages exhibit indirective copula particles of this kind. Many other languages such as Mongolic, Finno-Ugric, Caucasian languages, Nuristan languages, and Tibetan possess similar particles (‘reportive’ particles, ‘distance’ particles, etc.), which form indirective counterparts to various aspectotemporal items.

The indirective copulaernoş consistently expresses the reception of an impression creating awareness of a situation. Again, no information concerning P’s mental preparation or preceding expectation is conveyed. Surprise, mental unpreparedness are possible, but not necessary elements. It does not seem essential whether or not the event is contrary to P’s expectations. An important difference in comparison with the simple -miš is that the event is not envisaged postterminally. The copulaernoş may also be used systematically to convey the perceptive impression of events that are going on at the point of orientation. The source of information can thus be first-hand knowledge based on direct
perception. The event may be apprehended through the senses, e.g., P may be an eyewitness of it. With respect to the source of knowledge in the scheme ‘Eₚ appears to P’, three types of uses of ermiš may be distinguished:

- Perceptive: ‘Eₚ is perceived by P’.
- Inferential: ‘Eₚ is inferred by P’.
- Reportive: ‘Eₚ is reported to P’.

The perceptive use cannot be derived from the reportive or inferential use. What is more important, it cannot possibly be subsumed under ‘evidentiality’, if this term is used for non-first-hand knowledge, since it is clearly contradictory to that notion.

The traditional dogma implying that ‘-miš forms’ express non-testimonial content has often led scholars to overlook the perceptive uses. Most grammatical accounts of ermiš favour non-testimonial interpretations and disregard the perceptive ones. Consider cases such as the following in the East Old Turkic inscriptions:

(4) Süsí üč big ermiš.
army-POSS3SG three thousand be-MIŠ
Biz iki big erdimiš
we two thousand be-PAST-1PL.

In Turcological analyses of such examples, the ermiš form normally gets reportive translations, e.g. ‘Their army is reported to have amounted to three thousand. We were two thousand’ (“soll ... gewesen sein”; Gabain 1950: 114). However a more natural interpretation of ermiš would be ‘was [as we saw]’, ‘turned out to be’, ‘appeared to be’. There is no need to translate the content as reportive evidence. A perceptive meaning (‘as we experience’) is also found in Old Uyghur sentences such as:

(5) Bu yer engekig yer ermiš
this earth painful earth be-MIŠ
‘This earth is (= appears to us to be) a painful earth.’

Particularly in combinations such as -(V)r ermiš ‘appeared / appears to be doing’ and -miš ermiš ‘appeared / appears to have done’, ermiš is used to represent contents of perception.

The copula particle ermiš is not a normal paradigmatic form of the postterminal in -miš, but represents a special development. How can this development be explained? As we have noted, it may regularly express direct observation from a simultaneous—not only from a posterior—orientation point. This is a property regularly found with initiotransformatives, which express two phases of an action, (i) one initial dynamic phase and (ii) one subsequent stative phase as the natural result of the first one, e.g. olṭur- (i) ‘sit down’, (ii) ‘sit’. In the postterminal aspect, initiotransformatives may, as mentioned above, express an event that is still going on at the point of observation, e.g. olṭurmiš ‘has sat down’ = ‘is sitting’. The same situation is found with ur- (i) ‘stand up, stop’, (ii) ‘stand’, which has, like er-, developed into an existential copula (‘stand’ > ‘dwell’ > ‘be’) in most Turkic languages. Its postterminal form urmiš implies ‘has stood up, has stopped’ = ‘stands’. If er was originally an initiotransformative verb, this would explain the meaning of simultaneity (2.1.2) observed in ermiš, i.e. er-
(i) ‘appear’ = ‘become visible’, (ii) ‘appear’ = ‘be visible’, postterminal ermiš ‘has become visible’ = ‘is visible’. Note that English verbs of this type may display a similar ambiguity: something which has (already) appeared may (still) appear.

2.3. Other epistemic markers

Turkic indirectivity markers do not express the speaker’s attitude to the truth of the propositional content, to the degree of correctness or reliability of the statement. Their use does not indicate that the speaker, on the basis on the evidence in question, concludes whether the information is true or not. English expressions such as maybe, probably and possibly are not adequate translation equivalents.

On the other hand, indirectives may display various peripheral uses and pragmatic extensions of their central meaning, in particular different kinds of dissociation from the narrated event, cognitive or emotional distance to it such as irony. If one does not speak directly about the event itself, but rather about the reception of it, some kind of distance is always involved. The indirect manner of representation may occasionally create some uncertainty and also be interpreted as
non-testimonial reference in a sense of assumption or doubt, e.g. 'judging from the appearance'. It is natural that perceptive uses involve less reservation regarding the facticity than reportive and inferential ones.

The indirective copula ərmış must be carefully distinguished from the modal word ərinç, which is also derived from er- 'be' and occurs in older East Turkic varieties. It expresses doubt or uncertainty and can be translated as 'presumably', 'supposedly', 'likely', 'probably', 'indeed', 'possibly', 'perhaps', e.g. Karakhanid Turkic Ol keldi ərinç '(S)he has perhaps come'.

However, the main meaning of this dubitative particle is sometimes also claimed to be 'apparently'. At the same time, grammars often indicate 'supposition' or 'probability' as the main meaning of indirectives. It is a general problem in Turockological linguistic literature that few authors make efforts to distinguish between different modal meanings and tend to render both dubitatives and indirectives in an undifferentiated way as evidently, allegedly. A favourite German translation is wohl, a particle which displays a wide range of evidential and dubitative uses.

Old Uygur and Karakhanid ərki, likewise derived from er-, is another modal particle which is commonly rendered as wohl in German, though it must be distinguished from both ərmış and ərinç. It is mostly used in a defensive way to tone down questions, to give them a meditative, sceptical, timid, rhetorical connotation, often to indicate that they are not asking for explicit information ('I wonder'), e.g. Karakhanid Ol kelir mi ərki 'I wonder whether he will come?'. Compare the Tuvan politeness particle ərği used in questions, e.g. ... bar ərği be? 'I wonder if there is ...?' (Isakov—Pal'mba 1961: 433). For similar forms such as erkin, see under 5.2 below.

3. The notion of indirectivity

What has so far been stated concerning the use of indirective markers in East Old Turkic proves to be valid for later stages of Turkic as well. Turkic indirectives are propositional operators in another sense than evidentials of the canonical type expressing the speaker's attitude towards the proposition expressed in the sentence. As we have seen, indirectives often express a participant's own perception. For a unified characterization of the reportive, inferential and perceptive uses, the broader notion of indirectivity is required.

As noted above, it is crucial for Turkic indirectives that P is stated indirectly, by reference to its reception by a conscious participant. The basic function is to express the establishment of the event through the awareness of a conscious mind. What is signalled is the impression or reception of a content introduced from outside: the very fact that it becomes obvious to P. The result is two-layered information in the sense of a predication over a proposition: 'it is stated that E is acknowledged by P'. The indirectivity may not only concern the experience of the speaker, but may also be grounded in the subjective world of a participant of the narrated event. Some person referred to in the discourse may be the subjective ego that establishes the fact, e.g. Turkish Ali bakyor ki eski oluyormuş / olmış 'Ali looks (and sees that): the donkey is dying/has died'. What is characterized is thus the relation between a participant of the speech event (P) or of the narrated event (E) on one hand, and the narrated event (E) on the other hand, i.e. P — P/E. This establishment may be interpreted contextually in various ways. However, reference is not made to the way in which E is acknowledged.

Translation equivalents for this very broad notion include English evidently, obviously, it appears that; French evidentement, comme P constate, German offensichtlich, wie P feststellt, Russian vyjasnjaetsja, okazyvaetsja, etc.

Since the use of indirective markers does not presuppose that the subject referent is unaware of the event, there is nothing odd about using them in sentences with first-person subjects. Not even indirectives of the postterminal type necessarily imply unawareness due to sleep, inattention, etc., but may be used even if the speaker has actually witnessed the event. Perceptive uses of indirective copula markers in sentences with first-person subjects may be compared to English expressions such as 'I find / found myself ...ing'.

The use of indirectives may often be interpreted in terms of sudden discovery, unexpectedness, surprise, relative novelty, new knowledge without proper psychological preparation, perception contrary to P's
expectations. But such semantic nuances are not decisive factors; they do not manifest a “central meaning” of indirectivity from which other meanings derive.

4. Finite indirectives in later Turkic languages

Most later Turkic languages display postterminal items which are relatively stable markers of indirectivity. The type -mlş is today preserved in the languages of the south-western group. It is also present in Yakut, namely as -Blt.

In most languages, the type -GAn(dur) has come to be used instead of -mlş. It goes back to the periphrastic type -GAn turur, created to renew focal postterminality, e.g. Yazyan turur (lit. ‘stands having written’) ‘(S)he is in the state of having written = has written’, Ölgen turur (‘stands having died’) ‘(S)he is in the state of having died = is dead = has died’, Yatqan turur (‘stands having lain down’) ‘(S)he is in the state of having lain down, is lying’. -GAn turur was originally a focal postterminal item with diagnostic (‘stative’, ‘resultative’) uses, but later on developed into a perfect type used for both diagnostic and historical purposes. It is also susceptible to indirectivity, though it does not signal it consistently. This is thus another postterminal item interpretable as perfect and/or indirective. It signals a postterminal view without a subsequent confirmation of the postterminally envisaged event. The simple postterminal item -GAn has a very wide distribution in modern languages. Its formal Yakut counterpart is -An turur, which has, however, retained a high degree of focality (Johanson 1993: 122; Buder 1989: 80–83).

A third and later type is represented by -(I)pılIr, which goes back to the periphrastic type -(V)p turur, e.g. Yazıp turur (lit. ‘stands having written’) ‘(S)he has written’, Ölüp turur (‘stands having died’) ‘(S)he has died’, Yatıp turur (‘stands having lain down’) ‘(S)he is lying’. This postterminal item (Johanson 1988, 1990, 1993) generally exhibits a higher degree of focality than -GAn(dur), being more closely oriented to the postterminal state. The formal type -(I)pılIr has vanished in Turkish, but it is present in more or less reduced shapes in almost all other modern Turkic languages.

The distribution and functions of these three markers in modern Turkic languages are rather different. Two basic types of synchronic situations may be distinguished:

(i) there are competing postterminals in the system;
(ii) there is only one postterminal in the system.

4.1. -GAn in competition with -(I)pılIr

Where the types -GAn turur and -(V)p turur occur together in one system, the former tends to be a pure postterminal, whereas the latter has indirective meanings. Chaghatai -GAndur is a perfect-like item covering both diagnostic and more historical functions and with possible contextual indirective shades of meaning, which do not belong to its pertinent properties (Schöning 1997: 255). Chaghatai -btur is a high-focal postterminal that does not envisage the events directly, but in a stative or complexive way (Schöning 1997: 175).

In modern languages, -GAn items are mostly pure postterminal pasts with perfect-like meanings, e.g. Kumyk Barynanman ‘I have gone’, Karachay Ayyansa ‘You have said’, Crimean Tatar Alyamniz ‘We have taken it’, Kumyk Barmaynanman ‘I have not gone’, Tuvan kelgen sen ‘You have come’. On the other hand, competing items of the type -(I)pılIr are relatively stable indirective and complexive pasts, e.g. Turkmen Gidipdir ‘(S)he has obviously gone’, Uyghur Yeziptu ‘(S)he has obviously written’, Salar Geldu ‘(S)he has evidently come’, Tuvan Kęptir bis ‘We have obviously arrived’. There are counterparts with similar uses in Kazakh, Kirghiz and several other languages. All these indirectives signal the reception of information on the basis of perceptive, inferential or reportive evidence. Typical English translation equivalents are perfects or preterites plus adsententials such as ‘apparently’, ‘evidently’, ‘obviously’, ‘as it turns out’, ‘as it looks’, ‘as it seems’, ‘as I guess’, ‘reportedly’, ‘as they say’.

4.2. The type -mlş without a competing item

Certain Turkic systems display only one finite postterminal. This item corresponds functionally to two items of more elaborated systems, and consequently occurs more frequently than they do.
Yakut -bit is in many respects similar to East Old Turkic -miš and to Turkish -miş. It is a past item capable of expressing indirectivity by virtue of its postterminality (Buder 1989: 68–79), e.g. Min manna kelbitim 'I have [obviously] come here', but it is not a non-testimonial item signalling that P was unaware of the event (Buder 1989: 69–70).

In Azerbaijani, -miş and -(ı)p(tır) mostly form a common mixed paradigm tending towards purely postterminal meanings, e.g. Yarımi itirmişem 'I have lost my beloved one'. This type is similar to the Persian perfect tense mentioned above (yapmiş = karte (ast) 'has done') and has probably developed due to Persian influence.

The Turkish finite item -miş is a past with rather stable indirective and complexive meanings. It is the marked member of an opposition whose asymmetry has often been misunderstood. It has thus been claimed that -DI signals that the speaker considers the event certain, whereas -miş expresses that the speaker has not witnessed the event directly. This incorrect definition of the relation has caused much confusion. The definition of -miş as 'parfait de non-constatation' expressing "le résultat acquis d'un proces non constaté" has the consequence that the frequent use of -DI for unseen events must be considered a stylistic device "pour rendre plus vivant un récit d'imagination" (Bazin 1966: 272–273; cf. Bazin—Feuillet 1980; Johanson 1971: 63, 281).

The Turkish finite postterminal -miş has developed into an indirective that may also be used historically, in an event-oriented way. It covers both perfect and preterite functions, e.g. Gitmiş '(S)he has gone / went' + 'apparently'. In narratives accounting for unwitnessed past events, it may serve as the propulsive ('plot-advancing') basic item of the discourse. Unlike item of higher frequency it can also combine freely with specific time expressions. The item -DI, lacking a pure postterminal competitor within the same system, has a correspondingly wide range of use, covering both perfect and preterite functions, e.g. Gitti '(S)he has gone / went'.

In a monograph on Turkish aspect opposition (Johanson 1971), some basic observations about -miş were made. First, there are significant differences between the finite and the nonfinite -miş, since only the former may have indirective functions. It was observed that the finite -miş may convey more or less clear inferential shades of meaning rooted in its postterminality ('apparently' 'evidently', etc.), while it does not express doubt or confirmation concerning the event (Johanson 1971: 282, 288). Various motives for choosing this indirect way of envisaging events were assumed. The speaker may not have experienced the event consciously, the interest may focus on postterminal effects of the event, or the indirect view may be motivated by surprise, caution, modesty, etc. -miş can be used to summarize events in a complexive way, without any evidential shades of meaning concerning the source or the nature of experience (Johanson 1971: 291).

In perceptive uses of -miş, the event is envisaged after the crucial limit, but it is unessential whether or not the speaker has experienced the very attainment of this limit, e.g. Yaşğünü toplantısına güzel anlatmışın 'How nicely you have described the birthday party [as I can just read]', Misafir baktı saatine. 'Benimki durmuş...' dedi 'The guest looked at his watch. Mine has [as I become aware of] stopped, he said', Ali gelmiş 'Ali has [as I see] come', Yemek çok güzel olmuş 'The food is (has turned out) very good [as I can taste]', Çok büyükmişsin 'You have grown a great deal [as I see]'...

Note, however, that -miş also covers high degrees of focality, including cases where a property of the subject is focussed on, e.g. in participial uses such as giyinmiş 'dressed', tutulmuş 'occupied'. Sentences such as Bu masa tutulmuş 'This table is occupied' or Çok güzel giyinmişsin 'You are very beautifully dressed' do not express more indirectivity than the corresponding English sentences. Whereas Turkmen may use the high-focal postterminal participle in -A(:)n in such cases, e.g. Oğlum teze öldönmü 'My son is newly married', Turkish just uses -miş, e.g. Oğlum yeni evlenmiş.

The situation in Turkish dialects often deviates considerably from the one observed in Standard Turkish. Some Anatolian dialects display a second postterminal in -(y)IK with clearcut indirective (perceptive, inferential, reportive) uses (Demir 1997). It is more focal than -miş and thus not used narratively. It focusses heavily on the postterminal state, referring to the second actant with transitives and to the first actant with intransitives, e.g. Qapıyı açmış '(S)he has opened the door [as I see]', Sabah oluş 'It has become morning') 'The day has dawned [as I see]'.


4.3. The role of turur

The addition of particles developed from turur ('is' < 'stands') to a simple postterminal of the -miš or -GAn type may eliminate the meaning of indirectivity. In written Turkish, the addition of -Dlr to -miš creates an indicative past item in -mišDlr. The formal and functional relation between Gitmiş '(S)he has evidently gone, evidently went' and GitmişDlr '(S)he went, has gone' is similar to the one obtaining between Bulgarian Xodil and Xodil e (Johanson 1971: 305).

However, the addition of turur may also create items expressing presumption, an epistemic, content different from that of indirectivity. In spoken varieties of Turkish, -mišDlr is a presumptive item, e.g. GitmişDlr '(S)he has presumably gone, presumably went' vs. Gitmiş '(S)he has evidently gone, evidently went'. The same relation is observed in the opposition -GAnDlr vs. -GAn in several modern Turkic languages. Presumptive presents expressing conjectures concerning unwitnessed on-going events may be formed with intraterminal stems +Dlr, e.g. Turkish Şu anda okeyordur with the stem -(Ø)lyor, Turkmen Ol hêdir oqaydınır '(S)he is probably reading now' with the intraterminal participle in -yAn.

5. Copula particles in later Turkic languages

Whereas East Old Turkic exhibits one indirective copula particle ermiš, many later Turkic languages—e.g. modern ones such as Turkmen, Kumyk, Tatar, Chuvash, Bashkir, Kazakh, Karakalpak, Uzbek, Uyghur—possess both this type and an additional type erken, e.g. Uyghur U tilinmas iken '(S)he is evidently a linguist'. Though both ermiš and erken are derived from er- 'be', they are not regular participles in -miš and -GAn. Both are temporally indifferent, though formally looking like past items. Chaghatai ekendur may seem to signal anteriority (Schöning 1997: 272), but this impression is probably due to its frequent occurrence in past tense narratives. Note that the ermiš type also occurs in languages lacking a simple postterminal -miš. In several Turkic languages, erken (ēken / iken) is not an indirective particle but a converb marker meaning ‘(while) being’.

5.1. Erken in competition with ermiš

When occurring together in one system, the two types ermiš and erken divide the area of indirectivity between themselves in specific ways. In many languages, the ermiš suggests non-first-hand indirectivity in the reportive sense: 'reportedly', 'P is / was told / informed that', 'they say / said that', e.g. Turkmen -miš < ermiš in Gidipmišin '(S)he has reportedly gone'. The type erken tends more towards first-hand indirectivity in the perceptive sense: 'P sees / saw that', 'it becomes / became clear, evident, obvious to P that', e.g. Chuvash Väl kilné ikken '(S)he appears / appeared to have come'. Both types can have more neutral or inferential uses: 'P infers / inferred that', 'P concludes / concluded that', 'it must be the case that', 'let's assume that'. A similar relation obtains between ēmiš and ēkenda in Chaghatai texts. On a scale with reportive uses at one extreme and perceptive uses at the other, ermiš and erken items may be claimed to roughly occupy the following positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reportive</th>
<th>Inferential</th>
<th>Perceptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(more reservation)</td>
<td>(less reservation)</td>
<td>(as P is told)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ermiš</td>
<td>ermiš, erken</td>
<td>erken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P is informed that</td>
<td>P infers, concludes that</td>
<td>P perceives that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>('as P is told')</td>
<td>('as far as P understands')</td>
<td>('as P sees, hears, etc.')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2. Perceptive uses of erken

The particle erken is thus ‘evidential’ in the etymological sense of the word (ēvidens ← ēvidere 'see clearly') signalling awareness of a revealed fact, indicating that an event is apprehended, perceived, noticed, discovered, recognized, e.g. Uyghur Öyide yoq iken '(S)he turns / turned out not to be at home', Bu šorpaya yaşşiken 'This soup is [as I taste] good'. It can also mean reception as a mental impression, implying that something is inferred, concluded, understood, mentally grasped. Translation equivalents include English obviously, evidently, it appears / appeared that, it turns / turned out that, it proves / proved to, it comes / came to light that, German offenbar, offensichtlich, wie sich herausstell(e), French apparemment, il se montre i s'a montré que, Russian vyjastraetsja / vyjasnilos', okazyvaetsja / okazaloš'.

Chaghatai ēkendur is often used in a perceptive sense, e.g.
The passage might be translated as follows: ‘He saw the place where he was staying [and established:] He was [as he saw] in a house belonging to a mosque. Under the mosque there was [as he saw] a cellar, where he [= the thief] used to put away the things he had taken.../. In the morning he... went to the place where the thief was staying. When he looked, [he saw that] the thief was the mullah of that mosque.’

Markers of the erken type may be reinforced by expressions meaning ‘evidently’, often based on verbs of perception such as ‘see’ and ‘look’, e.g. qarasak in the passage just quoted, qarasak (lit. ‘if we look’) in sentences such as Karakalpak Qarasak, olar gozisë eken ‘They turn / turned out to be neighbours’ and körme (lit. ‘I see’) in Karachay-Balkar Ol ketgen körme ‘(S)he has evidently left’.

The type erken should be distinguished from the presumptive-dutative type erkin, e.g. Chaghatay ökin, Tuvan irgin and combinations with interrogative particles such as Uzbek miki, mikan. These items—probably contaminated with and influenced by erken (‘while’ being) (Gabain 1945: 149)—are used in questions with the same meditative, sceptical, timid, rhetorical readings (‘I wonder’) as the East Old Turkic erki discussed above, e.g. Uzbek Endi nimä gilamız ekän? ‘I wonder what we shall do now’; see Kleinmichel (1997).

5.3. Absence of a competing item

However, the cooccurrence of the types erken and ermiš in one and the same system is sometimes limited. Thus, Uzbek emiš is mainly used in the literary language and in dialects (Konorov 1960: 272). In standard Uyghur, -miš is restricted to statements in the sense of ‘allegedly’, ‘it is claimed that’, often used ironically, whereas it is still used as a broader indirective item in certain Eastern Turkic dialects.

Some Turkic languages only possess one combined indirective copula particle in which the two semantic types coincide. The situation in Yakut (Buder 1989: 89–109) is analogous to the one in East Old Turkic. The particle ebit, which unlike -bit is not a past item, conveys the meaning ‘as it turns / turned out’ (Korkina 1958: 145). The combinations -Ar ebit (with the intraterminal stem in -Ar) and -bit ebit (with the
postterminal stem in -Blt) are often used to represent contents of perception, e.g. Kelbit ebitter 'They have evidently come', Goşa sulb oyon turdu. Tula körünne. Cügaš kura:na x buočka turar ebit. Ol ühöe itünna 'Goşa suddenly jumped up. He looked around. An empty barrel stood [as he saw] nearby. He climbed onto it' (Buder 1989: 99).

In the West Oghuz languages Azerbaijani and Turkish, imiş is an indirective copula particle of the East Old Turkic ermiş type, never used deverbally and not capable of carrying pitch accent. It is normally suffixed, e.g. Turkish -(y)mlş in Gümüş (← gül 'rose') 'It is apparently a rose'.

The copula particle is often confused, sometimes even in Turkological literature, with the simple indirective finite suffix -mlş, which is a deverbal suffix, capable of carrying pitch accent, formally identical with the participle suffix -mlş, e.g. Turkish Gümüş (← gül- 'laugh') 'He apparently laughed'. While -mlş vacillates a good deal with respect to indirectivity, the copula particle imiş is a semantically stable indirectivity marker. Finally, imiş is, like its equivalents in other Turkic languages, temporally indifferent, while -mlş is not. In the monograph mentioned above, the notion of indirectivity was said to be signalled in a consistent way by the atemporal -(y)mlş, whereas it appears less consistently with the temporal item -mlş: "Das nichttemporale imiş des Türkentürkischen signalisiert in pertinenter Weise die modale inferentielle Idee, die beim temporalen mlş als nichtpertinentene Nuance auftritt" (Johanson 1971: 64).

In spite of all these obvious differences, many linguists refer to both -mlş and -(y)mlş as "the suffix -mlş", which makes a precise functional analysis impossible. The idea that "the suffix -mlş may be added to both verbal and nominal stems is often repeated even in modern typological literature.

The semantics of the Turkish copula particle -(y)mlş is often misunderstood, sometimes even referred to as a "dubitatī" (Bazin 1966: 281). It is important to realize that -(y)mlş never conveys the postterminal view which is typical of -mlş. Thus, the combination of -(y)mlş and the intraterminal stem in -(Ø)yor allows an intraterminal view of the event, e.g. Yaziyorimus 'he is / was evidently writing', cf. Azerbaijani Yazırmiş. Furthermore, -(y)mlş combines with -mlş stems to signal indirective postterminality in an unequivocal way, e.g. Turkish Yazmışmış 'he has / had reportedly written'; cf. Azerbaijani Yazmişmiş.

The uses are thus very similar to the uses of East Old Turkic ermiş, subsumable under the general notion of indirectivity based on various sources such as report, logical conclusion and direct perception, e.g. Turkish Ali bunu bitiyormuş 'Obviously [judging from hearsay, inference or appearance] Ali knows / knew this', Azerbaijani Düneda néfe altçaq adamlar varmiş 'There are [obviously] so many scoundrels in the world'.

5.4. Distribution of Turkic indirective copula particles

A rough comparison of the distribution of indirective copula particles yields the following picture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Old Turkic</th>
<th>Chaghatay</th>
<th>Many modern languages</th>
<th>Yakut</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>erkendur</td>
<td>eken ~ eken ~ iken</td>
<td>ebit</td>
<td>imiş</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Turkish indirectives

Trying to sum up the situation in Turkish, we may first state that a basic opposition obtains between items signalling indirectivity, e.g. gelmiş 'has obviously come / obviously came', geliyormuş 'is obviously coming / obviously comes', etc., and unmarked items such as geldi 'has come / came', geliyor 'is coming / comes'. As demonstrated in Johanson (1971), grammarians have had serious problems when trying to pinpoint the semantics of -mlş and imiş with respect to epistemic modality. The markers are certainly epistemic in the sense that they concern the dimension of experience, but their task is not to express the speaker's attitude to the truth of the propositional content or the foreign origin of the speaker's knowledge. The source of knowledge is not criterial for their use.
The indirective items can also mark statements based on direct experience, perception of an event or its effects, of a fact which shows itself, turns out or proves to be the case, which becomes evident, obvious, manifest, visible, clear, open to a conscious subject's senses and/or mind. This meaning of -miş and imiş cannot be derived from their reportive or inferential meanings.

This use of imiş is found in sentences conveying a perceptual content, e.g. Ali pencereden baktı: misafir geliyormuş 'Ali looked through the window [and saw that]: a visitor was coming', Şu tablo ne güzelmiş 'How beautiful that picture is!' In a Turkish sentence such as O kız şarkıyi iyi söylüyor 'That girl sings [as it appears / turns out, as is evident] the song well', -(y)mlı is used in the same way as Uyghur (i)ken in the corresponding sentence U qız nağşini yağışı etidiken.

As for the simple -miş, the content it marks is not necessarily based on a foreign source or logical conclusion. The use of -miş in Çorba çok güzel olmuş 'The soup is [as I perceive by tasting] very good' is based on an indirective meaning of 'as I perceive' or 'as is evident to me'. It may be interpreted as a normal postterminal use, i.e. as based on perception of effects after the transgression of the relevant limit of ol- 'become / come into being / turn out'. The use in a sentence such as Ahmet geliyor 'Ahmet has come' can even be based on direct perception of the event itself; compare the similar use of Uyghur -(i)ptu in Exm eptu.

The use of indirectives can, as we have seen, often be interpreted in terms of sudden discovery, unexpectedness, surprise, new knowledge, perception contrary to one's expectations, etc. In the current discussions concerning the 'suffix -miş' it is often claimed that the 'admirative' or 'surprise' use, in which the speaker expresses surprise vis-à-vis an unexpected situation, represents the main or central value from which all other values (reportive, inferential, ironical, etc.) derive.

This trend started with some highly valuable contributions by Aksu-Koç and Slobin, dealing with Turkish indirectivity as a cognitive phenomenon. The indirectives were taken to emphasize the "externality of the process to the speaker's awareness", to allow to narrate "indirectly and nonconsciously experienced events" (Aksu-Koç—Slobin 1982: 182) and to mark that the speaker's mind is not prepared for the information in question, i.e. to convey new information which is not yet part of the speaker's integrated picture of the world (Aksu-Koç—Slobin 1986: 160).

These fine observations on particular uses of Turkish indirectives are basically in keeping with the suggestions offered in Johanson 1971. It is, however, not possible to interpret the reportive and inferential uses as deriving from a central notion such as 'surprise'. DeLancey (1997) claims that the Turkish "evidential perfect", in which he incorrectly includes -(y)mlı, constitutes an obligatory grammatical category, with 'mirative' and unmarked forms in paradigmatic contrast. The decisive factor is allegedly that the information conveyed is new or surprising to the speaker. This is obviously at variance with the fact that so-called 'hot news' is typically expressed by the past marker -DI, not by -miş or -(y)mlı. The use in compliments such as Kızınız çok iyi piyano çalıyormus 'Your daughter plays the piano very well' is claimed to follow directly from the alleged 'new knowledge' interpretation, the implication being something like 'No matter how high my expectations might have been, what I just heard exceeded them'. It rather seems that the additional information offered by -(y)mlı is not contraindicated to the speaker's expectation, but simply 'as I hear', which follows from the notion of indirectivity.

If we want to establish a relatively stable common "central meaning" for both -miş and -(y)mlı, we should focus on notions from which a certain range of particular meanings can be derived. Features such as 'surprise', 'relative novelty', and 'discovery contrary to expectation' are not necessary elements of indirectives in Turkish or other Turkic languages.

7. Areal distribution

According to DeLancey, "Turkish is part of a recognized Old World evidential belt which also includes Albanian, Bulgarian-Macedonian, and Georgian" (1997: 36). This is a statement that stands the facts on their heads. In reality, Turkish is part of a Turkic "indirective belt", which has exerted influence on many neighbouring languages as a result of intensive contacts. There is thus indeed "some areal effect in the
distribution”. Stable indirectives play central parts in all Turkic languages, but are marginal in Indo-European. If they nevertheless appear in certain contact areas such as the Balkan, Caucasian and Central Asian areas, we certainly have reasons to look for Turkic models for them. See, for example, Johanson (1996b) and (1998).

Though these problems will not be discussed here, it should be stressed that several languages of the Balkan area, particularly Bulgarian and Macedonian, display indirectivity systems very similar to the Turkic ones. Former perfects have acquired markedly indirective functions, and there are temporally indifferent markers of indirectivity such as Bulgarian bil, which exhibits close functional similarity to Turkic erken and ermiş. The complex Bulgarian system is, as DeLancey admits, not easily analysed as a straightforward evidential or ‘mirative’ pattern. The Albanian so-called admirative, which goes back to a post-terminal but is now also used narratively, displays the typically indirective nuances of emotional distance found in Turkic indirectives.

The indirectivity system of northern Tajik varieties is much more developed than those of western varieties of Persian, certainly due to influence from Uzbek. Similar tendencies are found in the use of the perfect of some Kurdish varieties spoken in Turkish surroundings.
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**Abbreviations**

The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: ACC—accusative,  
COND—conditional, CONV—converb, DAT—dative, GEN—genitive, PAST—simple past, PART—  
participle, PL—plural, POSS—possessive, PRES—present tense, SO—singular. The  
transcription, particularly of older Turkic languages, is simplified and does not al-
ways mirror the author’s opinion on the actual pronunciation.