

Turkic indirectives

Lars Johanson

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 'Eⁿ appears to P'. This means that a narrated event Eⁿ 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, P^s, but may also be a participant of the narrated event, Pⁿ. 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. *ölmüş* 'having died'. Initiotransformatives such as *oltur-* 'sit down' + 'sit' express the transgression of the crucial initial limit, e.g. *olturmuş* '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 re-

maining 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 *-miş* does not contain any subsequent confirmation of the postterminally envisaged event.

2.1.2. The functions of *-miş*

The functions of East Old Turkic *-miş* 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 (Kononov 1980: 188), etc. In spite of its indirect way of presentation, *-miş* 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 *-miş* is used both as a pure postterminal and as an indirective, the uses being very closely interconnected. Thus, *-miş* 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 perceptible.

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. *olturmiş* (i) 'has sat down' = (ii) 'is sitting' (simultaneously with the point of observation).

• Inferential uses: 'Eⁿ is inferred by P'. The basis of knowledge is pure reflection, logical conclusion.

• Reportive uses: 'Eⁿ 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 Uyghur examples:

- (1) *Élig ètmiš men*
 realm-ACC organize-Miš I
 'I have organized the realm.'
- (2) *Ïčünmiš men kenčimin*
 lose-Miš I young-POSS1SG-ACC
 'I have lost my child.'
- (3) *Bu yörügüg belgüüg qilyali*
 this explanation-ACC manifest make-CONV
tüzün yavaş éligler qanlar nom
 noble gentle king-PL ruler-PL doctrine
nomlayu yarliqamiš
 preach-CONV deign-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 *-Di* 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 *ermiš*

East Old Turkic also possesses a special indirective copula particle as a stable marker of indirectivity: *ermiš*, derived from *er-* 'be'. Unlike *-miš*, it is not a postterminal item but expresses indirectivity in the sense of 'Eⁿ 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 participles include indirective intraterminals (presents, imperfects) of the type *-(V)r ermiš* 'appeared/appears to be doing' and indirective postterminals (perfects, pluperfects) of the type *-miš ermiš* '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 copula *ermiš* 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 copula *ermiš* 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 'Eⁿ appears to P', three types of uses of *ermiš* may be distinguished:

- Perceptive: 'Eⁿ is perceived by P'.
- Inferential: 'Eⁿ is inferred by P'.
- Reportive: 'Eⁿ 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) *Süsi üč biḡ ermiš.*
 army-POSS3SG three thousand be-MİŞ
Biz iki biḡ erdimiz
 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 yēr emgeklig yēr ermiš*
 this earth painful earth be-MİŞ
 '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. *oltur-* (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. *olturmiš* 'has sat down' = 'is sitting'. The same situation is found with *tur-* (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 *turmiš* 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 particle *ermiš* must be carefully distinguished from the modal word *erinč*, 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 erinč* '(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 Turcological 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 Uyghur and Karakhanid *erki*, likewise derived from *er-*, is another modal particle which is commonly rendered as *wohl* in German, though it must be distinguished from both *ermiš* and *erinč*. It is mostly used in a detensive 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 kèlir mü erki* 'I wonder whether he will come?'. Compare the Tuvan politeness particle *irgi* used in questions, e.g. ... *bar irgi be?* 'I wonder if there is ...?' (Isxakov—Pal'mbax 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, in-

directives 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 criterial for Turkic indirectives that E^n 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^n 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 bakıyor ki eşek ölüyor muş / ölmüş* '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^s) or of the narrated event (P^n) on the one hand, and the narrated event (E^n) on the other hand, i.e. $P^s \sim P^n/E^n$. This establishment may be interpreted contextually in various ways. However, reference is not made to the way in which E^n is acknowledged.

Translation equivalents for this very broad notion include English *evidently*, *obviously*, *it appears that*; French *evidemment*, *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 *-mlš* is today preserved in the languages of the south-western group. It is also present in Yakut, namely as *-Bl̄t*.

In most languages, the type *-GAN(dur)* has come to be used instead of *-mlš*. 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 turar*, 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)ptlr*, 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)ptlr* 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)ptlr*

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. Chaghatay *-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 (Schönig 1997: 255). Chaghatay *-btur* is a high-focal postterminal that does not envisage the events directly, but in a stative or complexive way (Schönig 1997: 175).

In modern languages, *-GAN* items are mostly pure postterminal pasts with perfect-like meanings, e.g. Kumyk *Baryanman* ‘I have gone’, Karachay *Aytyansa* ‘You have said’, Crimean Tatar *Alyanmiz* ‘We have taken it’, Kumyk *Barmayanman* ‘I have not gone’, Tuvan *kelgen sen* ‘You have come’. On the other hand, competing items of the type *-(I)pdI(r)* 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 *Kēptir 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 *-mlš* 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 *-(I)p(t)r* mostly form a common mixed paradigm tending towards purely postterminal meanings, e.g. *Yarimi itirmişem* ‘I have lost my beloved one’. This type is similar to the Persian perfect type mentioned above (*yapmış = karde (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 procès 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 items of higher focality 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 oppositions (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. *Yaşgünü toplantısını ne güzel anlatmışsın* ‘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 büyümüşsün* ‘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 tæze öylönön* ‘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 açiq* ‘(S)he has opened the door [as I see]’, *Sabah oluq* (‘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 *-mlš* or *-GAn* type may eliminate the meaning of indirectivity. In written Turkish, the addition of *-Dir* to *-mlš* creates an indicative past item in *-mlšDir*. The formal and functional relation between *Gitmiş* '(S)he has evidently gone, evidently went' and *Gitmiştir* '(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, *-mlšDir* is a presumptive item, e.g. *Gitmiştir* '(S)he has presumably gone, presumably went' vs. *Gitmiş* '(S)he has evidently gone, evidently went'. The same relation is observed in the opposition *-GAndIr* vs. *-GAn* in several modern Turkic languages. Presumptive presents expressing conjectures concerning unwitnessed on-going events may be formed with intraterminal stems + *-Dir*, e.g. Turkish *Şu anda okuyordur* with the stem *-(Ø)Iyor*, Turkmen *Ol häđdir oqoyännir* '(S)he is probably reading now' with the intraterminal participle in *-yÄn*.

5. Copula particles in later Turkic languages

Whereas East Old Turkic exhibits one indirective copula particle *er-miš*, 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 tilšunas iken* '(S)he is evidently a linguist'. Though both *ermiš* and *erken* are derived from *er-* 'be', they are not regular participles in *-mlš* and *-GAn*. Both are temporally indifferent, though formally looking like past items. Chaghatay *ékendur* may seem to signal anteriority (Schönig 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* (*éken* / *iken*) is not an indirective particle but a con-verb 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 *-mlš* < *ermiš* in *Gidipmişin* '(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 kilnĕ 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 *emiš* and *ékendu* in Chaghatay 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:

REPORTIVE	INFERENCE	PERCEPTIVE
(more reservation)		(less reservation)
<i>ermiš</i>	<i>ermiš, erken</i>	<i>erken</i>
P is informed that	P infers, concludes that	P perceives that
('as P is told')	('as far as P understands')	('as P sees, hears, etc.')

5.2. Perceptive uses of *erken*

The particle *erken* is thus 'evidential' in the etymological sense of the word (*ēvidens* ← *ēvidĕre* '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 šorpa yağšiken* '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 herausstellt(e)*, French *apparemment, il se montre / s'a montré que*, Russian *vyjasnaetsja / vyjasnilos', okazyvaetsja / okazalos'*.

Chaghatay *ékendur* is often used in a perceptive sense, e.g.

- (6) *Qavgunči yègirme yègirme beš kiši èkendur.*
 persecutor twenty twenty five person ÈKENDUR
Biz sekiz kiši èdik.
 we eight person be-PAST-1PL
 'The persecutors were [as we saw] 20 or 25 men. We were eight men.'

The first sentence may be compared to the East Old Turkic sentence cited above as (4): *Süsi üç biñ ermiş* 'Their army appeared to amount to three thousand'.

- (7) *Bir kuruh keldük.*
 one kuruh [linear measure] come-PAST-1PL
Ganim kişisi yangan èkendur
 plunderer person-POSS3SG return-PART ÈKENDUR
 'We advanced two miles [and saw]: the enemy had withdrawn.'

In the last example, *yangan èkendur* is not a simple pluperfect but adds a meaning of perceptive indirectivity (cf. Schönig 1997: 277, 293).

The following examples from an Afghan Uzbek text demonstrate how *erken* may be used to mark the content of perception:

- (8) *Ušu toxtagan dzâjini kordi ki*
 that stop-PART place-POSS3SG-ACC see-PAST3SG that
bær masdzidni bær ujide turar ek'an,
 one mosque-GEN one house-POSS3SG-LOC stand-PRES ERKEN
ujini taginda bær jertola
 house-POSS3SG-GEN bottom-POSS3SG-LOC one cellar
ba:r ek'an,
 existing ERKEN
uša â:lip ba:ryan n'erselerni
 that take-CONV go-PART thing-PL-ACC
uša jerge qojar ek'en. l...l
 that place-DAT put- PRES ERKEN
Erte bilen l...l uša oyri
 morning with that thief
turgan dzâjge bardi.
 stay- PART place-DAT go-PAST3SG
Qarasa-ki uša oyri uša masdzitni
 Look-COND-that that thief that mosque-GEN
mullasi ek'an
 mullah-POSS3SG ERKEN (Jarring 1938: 76)

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. *qarasaki* in the passage just quoted, *qarasaq* (lit. 'if we look') in sentences such as Karakalpak *Qarasaq, olar qoqisi eken* 'They turn / turned out to be neighbours' and *köreme* (lit. 'I see') in Karachay-Balkar *Ol ketgen köreme* '(S)he has evidently left'.

The type *erken* should be distinguished from the presumptive-dubitative type *erkin*, e.g. Chaghatay *ekin*, Tuvan *irgin* and combinations with interrogative particles such as Uzbek *mikin, mikän*. 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 *Èndi nimä qilamiz 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 *emiş* is mainly used in the literary language and in dialects (Kononov 1960: 272). In standard Uyghur, *-miş* 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 Turki 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 *-Bit*) are often used to represent contents of perception, e.g. *Kelbit ebitter* 'They have evidently come', *Goša sulbu oyon turda. Tula körünne. Čugaš kura:nax buočuka turar ebit. Ol üöhe iñinna* 'Goša 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, *imiš* is an indirective copula particle of the East Old Turkic *ermiš* type, never used deverbally and not capable of carrying pitch accent. It is normally suffixed, e.g. Turkish *-(y)mış* in *Gülmüş* (← *gül* 'rose') 'It is apparently a rose'.

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

In spite of all these obvious differences, many linguists refer to both *-miş* and *-(y)mış* as "the suffix *-miş*", which makes a precise functional analysis impossible. The idea that "the suffix *-miş*" 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)mış* is often misunderstood, sometimes even referred to as a "dubitatif" (Bazin 1966: 281). It is important to realize that *-(y)mış* never conveys the post-terminal view which is typical of *-miş*. Thus, the combination of *-(y)mış* and the intraterminal stem in *-(Ø)iyor* allows an intraterminal view of the event, e.g. *Yazıyor* '(S)he is / was evidently writing'; cf. Azerbaijani *Yazmış*. Furthermore, *-(y)mış* combines with *-miş*

stems to signal indirective postterminality in an unequivocal way, e.g. Turkish *Yazmış* '(S)he has / had reportedly written'; cf. Azerbaijani *Yazmışmış*.

The uses are thus very similar to the uses of East Old Turkic *ermiš*, subsumable under the general notion of indirectivity based on various sources such as report, logical conclusion and direct perception, e.g. Turkish *Ali bunu biliyor* 'Obviously [judging from hearsay, inference or appearance] Ali knows / knew this', Azerbaijani *Dünyada neçe alçağ adamlar varmıš* '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:

East Old Turkic		<i>ermiš</i>	
Chaghatay	<i>erkendur</i>		<i>ermiš</i>
Many modern languages	<i>eken ~ eken ~ iken</i>		<i>emiš ~ emiš ~ imiš</i>
Yakut		<i>ebit</i>	
Turkish		<i>imiš</i>	

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', *geliyor* '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 *-miş* and *imiš* 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 şarkıyı iyi söylüyormuş* 'That girl sings [as it appears / turns out, as is evident] the song well', *-(y)mış* is used in the same way as Uyghur *(i)ken* in the corresponding sentence *U qiz naħşini yaħşı eytidiken*.

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 gelmiş* 'Ahmet has come' can even be based on direct perception of the event itself; compare the similar use of Uyghur *-(I)ptu* in *Eħmet keptu*.

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)mış*, 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)mış*. The use in compliments such as *Kızınız çok iyi piyano çalıyor* '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)mış* is not contrariness 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)mış*, 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.

References

- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan A.
1988 *The acquisition of aspect and modality. The case of past reference in Turkish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan A.—Dan Slobin
1986 "A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish", in: W. Chafe—J. Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. (Advances in Discourse Processes 20.) Norwood, N.J.: Ablex 159–167.
- Bazin, Louis
1966 "Les classes du verbe turc", *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 54: 265–285.
- Bazin, Louis—Jacques Feuillet
1980 "L'opposition constatation / non-constatation en turc et en bulgare", *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 16: 9–15.
- Buder, Anja
1989 *Aspekto-temporale Kategorien im Jakutischen*. (Turcologica 5.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Clauson, Sir Gerard
1972 *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard
1976 *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeLancey, Scott
1997 "Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information", *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33–52.
- Demir, Nurettin
1997 "Die Vergangenheitsform auf -(y)ik in anatolischen Dialekten", in: Á. Berta (ed.), *Historical and linguistic interaction between Inner Asia and Europe*. (Studia Uralo-Altaica 39.) Szeged, 65–79.
- Gabain, Annemarie von
1945 *Özbekische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis*. Leipzig—Wien: Otto Harrassowitz.
1950 *Altürkische Grammatik mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnis, auch neutürkisch*. (2nd edition.) Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Haugen, Einar
1972 "The inferential perfect in Scandinavian", *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 17: 132–139.
- Isxakov, Fazyl G.—Aleksandr A. Pal'mbax
1961 *Grammatika tuvinskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija* [Grammar of the Tuvan language]. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Vostočnoj Literatury.
- Jarring, Gunnar
1938 *Uzbek texts from Afghan Turkestan*. Lund: Gleerup, Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Johanson, Lars
1971 *Aspekt im Türkischen. Vorstudien zu einer Beschreibung des türkeitürkischen Aspektsystems*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.
1990 "Zur Postterminalität türkischer syndetischer Gerundien", *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* N. F. 9: 137–151.
1993 "Zur Entstehung historischer Präterita im Türkischen", *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları* 3: 119–127.
1994 "Türkeitürkische Aspektotempora", in: R. Thieroff—J. Ballweg (eds.), *Tense systems in European languages*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 247–266.

- 1995 "On Turkic converb clauses", in: M. Haspelmath—E. König (eds.), *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective. Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms — adverbial participles, gerunds*. (Empirical approaches to language typology 13.) Berlin—New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 313–347.
- 1996a "Terminality operators and their hierarchical status", in: B. Devriendt—L. Goossens—J. van der Auwera (eds.), *Complex structures: A functionalist perspective*. (Functional Grammar Series 17.) Berlin—New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 229–258.
- 1996b "On Bulgarian and Turkic indirectives", in: N. Boretzky—W. Enninger—Th. Stolz (eds.), *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte. Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen*. (Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 24.) Bochum: Brockmeyer, 84–94.
- 1996c "Altaische Postterminalia", *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 49: 257–276.
- 1998 "Zum Kontakteinfluß türkischer Indirektive", in: N. Demir—E. Taube (eds.), *Turkologie heute — Tradition und Perspektive*. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 48.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 141–150.
- 1999 "Grenzbezogenheit in Aspekt und Lexik am Beispiel türkischer Postverbalkonstruktionen", in: W. Breu (ed.), *Probleme der Interaktion von Lexik und Aspekt (ILA)*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 129–139.
- Kleinmichel, Sigrid
1997 "Zu *ékan* und *-kin* im Usbekischen", in B. Kellner—P. Zieme (eds.), *Studia Ottomanica. Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag*. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 47.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 103–126.
- Kononov, Andrej N.
1960 *Grammatika sovremennogo uzbekskogo literaturnogo jazyka* [Grammar of the modern Uzbek literary language]. Moskva—Leningrad: Nauka.
1980 *Grammatika jazyka tjurkskix runičeskix pamjatnikov (VII–IX vv.)* [Grammar of the Turkic runic documents (7th–9th centuries)]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Korkina, Evdokija I.
1958 "Formy prošedšego vremeni glagoli v jakutskom jazyke", in: *Trudy jakutskogo filiala. Vypusk I. Obščestvennye nauki*. Jakutsk, 118–161.
- Lazard, Gilbert
1985 "L'inférentiel ou passé distancié en persan", *Studia Iranica* 14: 27–42.
1996 "Le médiatif en persan", in: Z. Guentchéva (ed.), *L'énonciation médiatisée*. Louvain—Paris: Éditions Peeters, 22–30.

Schönig, Claus

1997 *Finite Prädikationen und Textstruktur im Babur-name (Haiderabad-Kodex)*. (Turcologica 31.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Slobin, Dan I.—Ayhan Aksu

1982 "Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential", in: P. J. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 185–200.

Windfuhr, Gernot L.

1982 "The verbal category of inference in Persian", in: *Monumentum Georg Morgenstierne 2*. (Acta Iranica 22.) Leiden: Brill, 263–279.

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, SG—singular. The transcription, particularly of older Turkic languages, is simplified and does not always mirror the author's opinion on the actual pronunciation.