

## Evidentiality in Turkic

Lars Johanson

### 1. Introduction

The present chapter aims at summarising the essential features of the grammatical categories of evidentiality found in Turkic languages. Other epistemic categories such as presumptives and dubitatives will not be included. The data will be dealt with along the principles suggested in Chapter 1, with special regard to the distinctive devices of each particular system type. Systems will be taken to be paradigmatic sets of evidential forms, fitting together in a contrastive way, systematically opposed to each other with respect to their functions.

Since the survey concerns a whole language family, numerous language-specific details will be omitted. Today's Turkic-speaking world extends from Turkey and its neighbours in the Southwest, to Eastern Turkistan and further into China in the Southeast. From here it stretches to the Northeast, via Southern and Northern Siberia up to the Arctic Ocean, and finally to the Northwest, across Western Siberia and Eastern Europe. Most Turkic languages may be classified as belonging to a Southwestern, a Northwestern, a Southeastern or a Northeastern branch. Khalaj in Central Iran and Chuvash in the Volga region constitute separate branches. Of the peripheral languages in the Southeast, Yellow Uyghur and Fu-yü are related to dialects of the Northeastern branch, and Salar to the Southwestern branch.

Turkish examples will be cited according to the official script of Turkey. Quotations from other languages will be given in traditional Turcological transcription. In the standardised morpheme notation, capital letters and segments in brackets indicate morphophonemic variation. Thus, *I* and *A* stand for harmonic variation of high and low vowels, respectively. In the examples, morphemes will be divided by hyphens, though this does not correspond to the orthographic practice in the languages concerned.

## 2. Indirectivity as an evidential category

Despite system differences, almost all known older and recent stages of Turkic possess the grammatical means of expressing *indirectivity*. This firmly integrated cognitive category covers various notions traditionally referred to as ‘hearsay’, ‘inferential’, etc. It implies that the statement is ‘indirect’ in the sense that the narrated event E<sup>n</sup> is not stated directly, but in an indirect way, by reference to its reception by a conscious subject, a recipient R. This core meaning may be paraphrased ‘as R becomes (became, etc.) or is (was, etc.) aware of E<sup>n</sup>’. The result is two-layered information: ‘it is stated that E<sup>n</sup> is acknowledged by R’. The recipient may be the speaker as a participant of the speech event, or a participant of the narrated event, e.g. a protagonist in a narrative.

Examples: Turkish *Eşek öl-üyor-muş*, Uyghur *Işek öl-üwèt-iptu* [donkey die-INTRA-1C] ‘The donkey is/was obviously dying’, Turkish *Eşek öl-müş*, Uyghur *Işek öl-üptu* [donkey die-IPAST] ‘The donkey has/had obviously died’.

The notion of indirectivity is in accordance with the crosslinguistic definition of evidentiality as ‘stating the existence of a source of evidence for some information’. The crucial element of indirectivity, the presentation of an event ‘by reference to its reception by a conscious subject’, is certainly not unique to Turkic. It may be basic to many other evidentiality systems, and even qualify as a crosslinguistic definition of evidentials (see Comrie 2000: 1).

## 3. Sources

Specification of the source of information – the way in which the event is acknowledged by R – is not criterial for indirectivity as such. The reception may be realised through (i) hearsay, (ii) inference, or (iii) perception.

- i. Reportive uses: ‘E<sup>n</sup> or its effect is reported to R’. The basis of knowledge is a foreign source, reported speech, hearsay, e.g. Turkish *Bakan hasta-ymış* (minister sick-1C) ‘The minister is reportedly sick’, said by somebody informed about the sickness. English translation equivalents include *reportedly*, *allegedly*, *as they say/said*, etc.
- ii. Inferential uses: ‘E<sup>n</sup> or its effect is inferred by R’. The basis of knowledge is pure reflection, logical conclusion, e.g. Turkish *Uyu-muş-um* (sleep-IPAST-1SG) ‘I have obviously slept’, said by somebody just waking up. English translation equivalents include *as far as R understands/understood*, etc.

- iii. Perceptive uses: 'E' or its effect is perceived by R'. The basis is first-hand knowledge, direct sensory perception of the event or indirect perception on the basis of traces or results, e.g. Turkish *İyi çal-ıyor-muş* (good play-INTRA-IC) '(S)he is, as I hear, playing well', said by somebody just listening. English translation equivalents include *it appears/appeared that, it turns/turned out that, as R can/could see, hear, etc.*

All these readings can be translated by *evidently, obviously*, etc. If the Turkish sentence *Ali bu-nu bil-iyor-muş* [A. this-ACC know-INTRA-IC] is rendered as 'Ali evidently knows/knew this', *evidently* may be interpreted as judging from (i) hearsay, (ii) inference, or (iii) appearance.

In their perceptive uses, indirectives express that the event or its effect turns out to be the case, becomes manifest, visible, or apprehended through one of the senses and thus open to the recipient's mind. These uses cannot be derived from reportive or inferential meanings or be subsumed under 'non-first-hand knowledge'. Indirectivity markers thus do not fit into evidential schemes distinguishing between 'the speaker's non-firsthand and firsthand information'. Their primary task is not to express the foreign origin of the speaker's knowledge.

Some more elaborated Turkic systems distinguish between 'reported' and 'non-reported' (inferential/perceptive) indirectivity. There are, however, no systematic differences relating to other types of sources, e.g. visual versus other kinds of sensory information.

#### 4. Marked and unmarked terms

Turkic languages display basic contrasts between marked indirectives and their unmarked counterparts. Functionally marked terms, expressing the evidential notions explicitly, stand in paradigmatic contrast to non-evidentials. Thus, Turkish exhibits items signalling indirectivity, e.g. *gel-miş* [come-IPAST] 'has obviously come/obviously came' and *gel-iyor-muş* [come-INTRA-IC] 'is/was obviously coming, obviously comes'. It has corresponding unmarked items such as *gel-di* [come-DPAST] 'has come/came', *gel-iyor* [come-INTRA] 'is coming/comes'.

Although the relations between marked and unmarked terms vary across languages, the unmarked ones always exhibit neutral uses in cases where the speaker considers the evidential distinction unessential and thus chooses not to use it. The widespread opinion that unmarked items such as *gel-di* 'has

come/came' consistently signal 'direct experience' or 'visual evidence' is incorrect. Unmarked items simply do *not* signal that the event is stated in an indirect way, i.e. acknowledged by a recipient by means of report, inference or perception.

## 5. Formal types of markers

The coding of indirectivity in Turkic is 'scattered', morphologically realised by two types of markers:

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

## 6. Turkish examples

Turkish possesses the simple inflectional marker *-miş*, which is suffixed to verbal stems and marks main clauses. It is capable of carrying high pitch. It is a rather stable marker of indirectivity, mostly with past time reference, e.g. *gül-'müŝ* [laugh-IPAST] '(has) evidently laughed' (*gül*- 'to laugh' + *-miş*). It is homonymous with the postterminal participle suffix *-miş*, which does not, however, express indirectivity.

Turkish also possesses the copula particle *imiŝ*, which cannot be added to verbal stems, but may follow nominals, including nominal stems of the verb. It is not capable of carrying high pitch, a characteristic of enclitic particles. Like its equivalents in other Turkic languages, it is temporally indifferent, i.e. ambiguous between past and present time reference, and a stable marker of indirectivity. Since *imiŝ* normally exhibits suffixed allomorphs in the shape of *-(y)müş*, some of its written realisations coincide with those of the inflectional marker *-miş*, e.g. *'gülmüş* [rose-1C] 'it is/was evidently a rose' (*gül* 'rose' + *imiŝ*). In spoken language, the variants of the two morphemes are distinguished by different pitch patterns (cf. Csató 2000a).

This copula particle may, for example, form indirective intraterminals, i.e. presents and imperfects, e.g. *gel-iyor-muş* [come-INTRA-1C] 'is/was evidently arriving', prospectives such as *gel-ecek-miş* [come-PROSP-1C] 'will/would evi-

dently arrive' and unequivocally indirective postterminals such as *gel-miş-miş* [come-POST-IC] 'has/had reportedly arrived'.

## 7. Aspectual values

The deceptive similarity of certain allomorphs has led linguists to confuse the two markers *-miş* and *imiş*, referring to both as 'the suffix *-miş*', allegedly attachable to both verbal and nominal stems, or to speak of an 'evidential perfect' that would include both markers. In view of such misunderstandings, some comments on the aspectual values of the respective items may be appropriate. The perspectives of *intraterminality* and *postterminality* – two marked aspectual ways of envisaging events with respect to their limits – are grammaticalised in Turkic as well as in many other languages (Johanson 1996a, 2000).

The intraterminal perspective envisages, at a given aspectual vantage point, an event within its limits, e.g. Azerbaijani *gel-ir-em* [come-INTRA-1SG] 'I am coming, I come'. Intraterminals are marked 'imperfectives' with 'relative present' meanings of 'the state of verb-ing'.

The postterminal perspective implies that, at a given aspectual vantage point, the decisive limit of the event is already passed over, e.g. Azerbaijani *gel-miş-em* [come-PPAST-1SG] 'I have [already] arrived'. Postterminals express 'the state of having verb-ed' and can thus refer to preexisting events in an indirect way. The event is totally or partly absent from the view, depending on the actional content, but it is still relevant at the vantage point, possibly through observable results or traces.

In many languages, postterminals, e.g. 'perfects' expressing past events with present relevance, tend towards indirective readings (Johanson 1971: Chapter 8, 2000: 121–123). Even if the event is wholly or partly outside the range of vision, traces, results or other forms of present knowledge of it may obtain at the vantage point. Postterminals may thus suggest that information becomes available post factum, that a preexisting state is discovered, etc. These secondary meanings are pragmatic side effects that can be used as 'evidential strategies'. What indirectives share with 'perfects' as a common core meaning is not the notion of 'distance', but rather that of postterminality.

The functions of Turkic indirective markers such as *-miş* derive from the indirect postterminal perspective. However, they should not be equated with pure postterminals used as 'evidential strategies'. Although some of them may vacillate with respect to their semantics, they are, as a rule, more explicit and stable evidentials, whose indirect aspectual value has been reinterpreted as in-

directivity. On the other hand, copula particles such as *imiş* have, through grammaticalisation processes, completely lost their relationship to the post-terminal value and cannot possibly be considered 'perfect' markers, as some linguists have assumed.

## 8. Semantic types of inflectional markers

Two or more of the following semantic types of inflectional markers are generally found in Turkic languages:

- IPAST-1. Unequivocal indirective pasts, e.g. -IBDIR: Kazakh *-(I)ptI*, etc.
- IPAST-2. Less stable indirective pasts, e.g. -MIŞ, -GAN: Turkish *-mİş*, Tatar *-GAn*, etc.
- PPAST. Postterminal pasts with secondary indirective readings, e.g. -MIŞ, -GAN: Azerbaijani *-mİş*, Kazakh *-GAn*, etc.
- DPAST. Direct pasts, not signalling indirective meanings: -DI.

## 9. Semantic types of copula particles

The temporally indifferent indirective copula particles express indirectivity without any synchronic association with postterminality. In certain systems, two copula particles divide the area of indirectivity between themselves according to the pattern reportive versus non-reportive (inferential + perceptive) uses. We thus find the following semantic types of indirective items.

- IC-1. General indirectives, e.g. ERMIŞ: Turkish *-(y)mİş*, etc.
- IC-2. Indirectives with reportive meanings, e.g. ERMIŞ: Turkmen *-mİş*, etc.
- IC-3. Indirectives with non-reportive meanings, e.g. ERKEN: Kazakh *eken*, etc. A similar type, frequent in spoken registers, is BOLIBDIR 'evidently is/was': Kazakh, Noghay *bolipti*, Uzbek *bolip*, Altay *boluptir*, *boltir*, Khakas *poltir*, Tatar *bulyan*, etc.

## 10. System types

The types of evidentiality systems and their organisation vary considerably across the modern Turkic languages. Most systems possess clearly evidential

categories with indirectivity as the primary meaning. The following survey will begin with the more comprehensive systems and proceed to the simpler ones.

### 10.1 Three-term systems

The most comprehensive evidential systems are represented by modern languages such as Uyghur and Uzbek of the Southeastern branch, Kazakh of the Northwestern branch, and Turkmen of the Southwestern branch.

Languages of this type exhibit three-term subsystems of inflectional markers, consisting of an indirective past in *-IBDIR*, a postterminal in *-GAN*, and a direct past in *-DI*.

The marker *-IBDIR* is a stable indirectivity marker of the type *IPAST-1*: 'has evidently done, evidently did', e.g. Uyghur *yèz-iptu*, Uzbek *yâz-ibdi* [write-*IPAST*] 'has evidently written, evidently wrote', Kazakh *tüs-ipti* [fall-*IPAST*] 'has evidently fallen, evidently fell', Turkmen *gid-ipdir* [go-*IPAST*] 'has apparently gone'.

The marker *-GAN* is a postterminal of the type *PPAST*, displaying perfect-like meanings with occasional indirective readings, e.g. Uyghur *yaz-yan*, Uzbek *yâz-yan* [write-*PPAST*] 'has written', Kazakh *öltir-gen* [kill-*PPAST*] 'has killed', Turkmen *öylön-ön* [get.married-*PPAST*] 'has married', 'is married'.

In languages of this type, two indirective copula particles, *ERKEN* and *ERMIŞ*, combine with various predicates to express 'is/was obviously'. *ERMIŞ* tends towards reportive uses (type *IC-2*), and *ERKEN* towards non-reportive, i.e. inferential and perceptive, uses (*IC-3*).

*ERKEN* combines with intraterminals, i.e. presents and imperfects, prospectives, non-verbal predicates, etc, e.g. Uyghur *yèz-ivatqan iken* [write-*INTRA IC*] 'is/was evidently writing', Kazakh *kel-edi eken* [come-*INTRA IC*] 'is/was evidently writing', *üyde eken* [at.home *IC*] 'is/was obviously at home'. It combines with postterminals to express 'has/had obviously been or done', 'turns out/turned out to have been or done', e.g. Uyghur *tüget-ken iken* [finish-*POST IC*] 'has/had obviously finished', Uzbek *yâz-yan eken* [write-*POST IC*] 'has/had obviously written', Kazakh *tüs-ken eken* [fall-*POST IC*] 'has/had obviously fallen'.

*ERMIŞ* expresses corresponding reportive meanings, e.g. Uyghur *yèz-ivatqan-miş* [write-*INTRA-IC*] 'is/was evidently writing', Kazakh *kel-edi-miş* [come-*INTRA-IC*] 'is/was reportedly arriving'. With postterminals, it forms unequivocally indirective past items, e.g. Uyghur *yaz-yan-miş* [write-*POST-IC*] 'has/had allegedly written', Turkmen *gid-ip-miş-in* [go-*POST-IC-3SG*] 'has/had reportedly gone'.

There are also items of the structure *-IBDIR + ERMIŠ*, which apply reportive meaning to inferential or perceptive statements, ‘is/was reportedly evident’, e.g. Kazakh *kel-ipti-mis* [come-IPAST-IC]. Uyghur *yèz-ipti-miš* [write-IPAST-IC] ‘has/had allegedly written’ is thus interpretable as a more reliable statement than *yaz-yan-miš* [write-POST-IC], since it suggests the existence of something perceived or inferred.

The distribution discussed here allows three-term subsystems of copula particles of the type ‘indirective’ [‘reportive’ versus ‘non-reportive’] versus ‘unmarked’. However, the opposition ‘reportive’ versus ‘non-reportive’ is often limited to certain dialects or registers. Thus, *ERMIŠ* is not used in all varieties of Uyghur and Uzbek, and its role in Kazakh is also rather limited.

## 10.2 Split three-term/two-term systems

Some languages exhibit three inflectional markers, indirective, postterminal and direct past, but a simplified subsystem of copula particles: ‘indirective’ versus ‘unmarked’.

Noghay, of the Northwestern branch, has *IPAST-1*, *PPAST*, and *DPAST*, e.g. *kel-ipti* [come-IPAST] ‘evidently arrived’, *kel-gen* [come-PPAST] ‘has arrived’, *kel-di* [come-DPAST] ‘arrived’. Its copula particle *ERKEN* is a general indirective marker of the semantic type *IC-1*, thus covering both reportive and non-reportive meanings. It combines, for example, with intraterminals, e.g. *kel-e-di eken* [come-INTRA-3SG IC] ‘is/was obviously arriving’, and with postterminals and indirective pasts to form indirectives signalling relative anteriority, e.g. *kel-gen eken* [come-POST IC], *kel-ipti eken* [come-IPAST IC] ‘has/had obviously arrived’. *BOLIBDIR* has a similar function, e.g. *qal-yan bolipti* [remain-POST IC] ‘has/had obviously stayed’.

Certain other languages exhibit a simplified subsystem of inflectional markers, while maintaining a richer subsystem of copula particles, distinguishing between reportive and non-reportive.

In Tatar and Bashkir, of the Northwestern branch, *-GAN* is used without a competing *-IBDIR*, thus representing the type *IPAST-2*. It displays postterminal uses but may also suggest indirectivity, e.g. *yaz-yan* [write-IPAST] ‘has [evidently] written’. The neighbouring language Chuvash has a similar marker *-nĀ* with postterminal and indirective meanings, e.g. *kala-naĀ* [speak-IPAST] ‘has [evidently] spoken’.

Tatar, Bashkir, and Chuvash possess both *ERMIŠ* (reportive) and *ERKEN* (non-reportive), e.g. Chuvash *kil-nĕ imeš* [come-POST IC] ‘has reportedly arrived’, *kil-nĕ ikken* [come-POST IC] ‘has evidently arrived’. The Tatar parti-

cle *bulyan*, which belongs to the type BOLIBDIR, has functions similar to those of ERKEN, combining, for example, with intraterminals, postterminals, and prospectives: *bar-a bulyan* [go-INTRA IC] 'is/was evidently going', *bar-yan bulyan* [go-POST IC] 'has/had evidently gone', *bar-ačaaq bulyan* [go-PROSP IC] 'will/would evidently go'.

### 10.3 Two-term systems

A few systems just consist of one inflectional marker and one copula particle plus their unmarked opposition partners. An inflectional marker -MIŠ of the type IPAST-2 is used in the western subgroup of the Southwestern branch, e.g. Turkish *-miş*. The cognate item *-BIT* is used in Yakut, the northernmost language of the Northeastern branch, spoken at the opposite extreme of the Turkic world. The languages in question also possess ERMIŠ particles of the type IC-1, e.g. Turkish *imiş*, Yakut *ebit*.

Since -MIŠ lacks a competing -IBDIR, and ERMIŠ lacks a competing ERKEN, these languages display two-term subsystems of the type indirective versus non-indirective. The inflectional markers allow reportive, inferential and perceptive readings, thus corresponding to several items in more comprehensive systems, e.g. Kazakh *-(I)ptI*, *-(I)ptImIs*, *-GAn eken* and *-GAn*.

Turkish -MIŠ, which mainly displays indirective uses, is opposed to an unmarked simple direct past in -DI, which negates the notion of indirectivity but also displays neutral uses. Since Turkish lacks a competing pure postterminal, this item covers both 'perfect' and 'preterite' functions, e.g. *gel-di* [come-PPAST] 'has come/come'. The copula particle is a stable general indirectivity marker with reportive, inferential and perceptive uses. A complex item -MIŠ + ERMIŠ applies an explicitly indirective type of evidentiality to a postterminally envisaged event. It is often used for rumours, gossip, etc., e.g. *gel-miş-miş* [come-POST-IC] 'has/had reportedly arrived'.

Yakut has a similar system (see Buder 1989). The inflectional marker -BIT conveys reportive, inferential and perceptive nuances, e.g. *kel-bit* [come-IPAST] 'has [obviously] arrived'. The temporally indifferent indirective particle *ebit* is similar to Turkish *imiş* and allows similar combinations with intraterminals, postterminals, etc., e.g. *tur-ar ebit* [stand-INTRA IC] 'evidently stands/stood', *kel-bit ebit* [come-POST IC] 'has/had evidently arrived'.

There are still smaller evidentiality systems, in which the inflectional marker represents the type PPAST, i.e. a postterminal with secondary indirective readings. Thus, Azerbaijani possesses, like Turkish, an indirective copula particle ERMIŠ of the semantic type IC-1, *imiş*. However, the status of its inflec-

tional marker *-mİş*, which forms a common mixed paradigm with *-(I)b*, is different from that of Turkish *-mİş*. It represents an ambivalent type with postterminal meanings, e.g. *gel-miş-em* [come-PPAST-1SG] ‘I have arrived’, *yaz-ib-sin* [write-PPAST-2SG] ‘you have written’. The unmarked term *-DI* thus tends towards ‘preterite’ rather than ‘perfect’ functions, e.g. *gel-di* [come-DPAST] ‘came’ versus *gel-ib* [come-PPAST] ‘has come’. The type *-MIŞ + ERMIŞ* unambiguously applies indirectivity to postterminally envisaged events, e.g. *yaz-miş-miş* [write-POST-IC] ‘has/had reportedly written’.

## 11. Contextual interpretations and semantic extensions

The motives for using Turkic indirectives may vary. They may get various contextual interpretations and display various pragmatic extensions of their central meaning.

### 11.1 Testimony, involvement, control

Indirectives may evoke the impression that the recipient does not or did not witness the event, perceive it, or participate in it consciously; that (s)he is or was not present at the event, not in control of it, not directly involved in it. However, despite the indirect way of presentation, these meanings are not signalled explicitly. The indirectly marked event may indeed be apprehended by the recipient through the senses, consciously taken part in, etc. Lack of participation or control is limited to certain contexts and cannot be the common core meaning of indirectives. The source of information may be direct evidence, personal, even visually obtained knowledge. A sentence such as Turkish *Ahmet gel-miş* or Uyghur *Exmet ke-ptu* [A. come-IPAST] ‘Ahmed has [as I note] arrived’ can be felicitously uttered by a speaker who has witnessed the arrival in reality. The indirective statement just expresses the conscious reception. As is often the case with linguistic devices, it does not tell us how something is in reality, but rather how the speaker chooses to present it.

On the other hand, evidentially unmarked terms may suggest that the source of information is direct experience, that the speaker takes/has taken part in the event consciously, is/was in control of it, etc. Again, the unmarked terms do not signal these meanings explicitly, but may also be used for unwitnessed, uncontrolled, reported or inferred events, e.g. Turkish *Çok büyü-dün* [much grow-DPAST-2SG] ‘You have become very big’, *Kemal Paşa, Selânik’te doğdu* [Atatürk(Kemal Paşa) Salonika+LOC be.born+DPAST] ‘Atatürk was born

in Salonika'. They just lack the two-layered information typical of indirectives, and may thus be used whenever this specific information seems unessential.

## 11.2 Factuality

Turkic indirectives may also have epistemic connotations in the sense of reservations about the validity of the event as a fact. The indirect way of referring may create uncertainty concerning the realisation of the event and be interpreted as non-testimonial reference. Indirectives, in particular reportive items, can be used to disclaim direct responsibility for the truth of the statement, suggesting that the speaker is not the originator of the information or does not vouch for it. By contrast, unmarked terms may suggest that the speaker is certain of the truth of information and even responsible for it.

'Supposition' is sometimes claimed to be the main meaning of Turkic indirectives. The corresponding unmarked items are said to signal that the speaker regards the event as certain. However, indirectives are not presumptives or dubitatives reducing the factuality of the statement. Their task is not to express the speaker's attitude to the truth of the content, to signal doubt or conjecture concerning the information conveyed.

Turkic languages have other ways of expressing supposition or conjecture, e.g. the particle *-DIR*, added to postterminals, intraterminals and other forms, e.g. Turkish *yaz-mış-tır*, Uzbek *yâz-yan-dir*, Uyghur *yaz-yan-du* [write-POST-SUPP] 'has presumably written', Turkish *oku-yor-dur*, Turkmen *oqo-ya:n-nir* [read-INTRA-SUPP] 'is presumably reading', Uyghur *işle-vatqan-du* [work-INTRA-SUPP] 'is presumably working'.

## 11.3 Distance

'Distance' is another possible contextual realisation. It has sometimes even been suggested as the common core meaning of Turkic indirectives. Thus, Turkish *-MIŞ* and its counterparts, e.g. in Old East Turkic, have been referred to as 'preterites of distance'. It is true that some kind of distance is likely to be involved if one does not refer directly to the event itself, but rather to the reception of it. By virtue of their central value, indirectives may imply cognitive or emotional distance from the event. Speakers may use them in order to distance themselves from the event, to distinguish themselves from the responsibility for it, or as a way of being vague about sources that they do not want to lay open to view. The notion is, however, too vague to possess any explanatory force.

