

Some comments on interaction between temporal and information deixis

Florian Siegl

(University of Tartu)

The study of evidentiality has been a highly productive field of research in the course of the last two decades. While data from recently unknown languages offer new instances of evidentiality, several fundamental questions still wait for a more thorough approach. To my best knowledge, the deictic nature of evidentiality has been widely ignored and this paper offers several arguments, why evidentiality should be considered as another instance of deixis. The second part of the paper investigates several known instances of interaction between temporal and information deixis from a typologically orientated perspective.

1. The nature of deixis

The basic definition of deixis usually stresses the grounding of an event in time or space (Fillmore 1997; Anderson/Keenan 1985, XXX 2002):

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------|
| (1) | <i>'There is a tree behind the house'</i> | spatial deixis |
| (2) | <i>'This morning I did not read the newspaper'</i> | temporal deixis |
| (3) | <i>'He gave her flowers as a present'</i> | personal deixis |

Whereas it is possible to mark information, spatially, temporally and personally (e.g. 'Yesterday *they fell* the tree *behind* the house'), it is also possible to mark information according to its source e.g. Wanka Qechua (Floyd 1999: 30). This is a clear instance of deixis, though frequently ignored.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (4) | <i>ya'lla-kta-ña-m</i> | <i>suma-a</i> | <i>ima-yki-yupay-ta-si</i> | <i>jita-yka-a-ma-nki.</i> | |
| | I-LIM-ACC-now-DIR | really-TOP | what-2P-SIM-ACC-even | throw-ASP-ASP-1OBJ-2 | |
| | 'You just throw me away like one of your possessions.' | | | | Direct evidence - <i>m(i)</i> |
| (5) | <i>marya-si</i> | <i>illaki-sh-ari</i> | <i>ka-ya-n.</i> | | |
| | Mary-also | sad-REP-EMPH | be-IMPV-3 | | |
| | 'Mary is sad as well (I hear.)' | | | | 'Reported evidence' - <i>sh(i)</i> |
| (6) | <i>walmi ima-wan-si</i> | <i>pili-n-chra.</i> | | | |
| | woman what-with-INDEF | walk-3-CONJ | | | |
| | 'He's probably running around with some other woman.' | | | | 'Conjecture' - <i>chr(a)</i> |

Deictic categories can interact. This is obvious from the example: ‘*Yesterday they fell the tree behind the house*’ but there exists also more sophisticated interaction. An interesting example from Mokilese (Harrison 1976: 85-86) illustrates this.¹ The so called emphatic determiners in Mokilese are compounds of the definite determiners (-e,-en, and -o) and the indefinite determiners (-ew, etc)

Table 1: Emphatic determiners in Mokilese

	General	Animate	Long	Piece	Plural
this	<i>oawe</i>	<i>mene</i>	<i>pase</i>	<i>kije</i>	<i>pwiai, pwiak</i>
that (near you)	<i>oawen</i>	<i>menen</i>	<i>pasen</i>	<i>kijen</i>	<i>pwian</i>
that	<i>oawo</i>	<i>meno</i>	<i>paso</i>	<i>kijo</i>	<i>pwiok</i>

The function of the emphatic determiner is not entirely clear, primarily it seems to mark topic:

(7) *Inonangpase, daidel in inoangge injang in koaulpas nehn inoangge.*

‘This story, the title of this story comes from a song in this song’

Nevertheless, the determiners -e ‘this’, -oawe ‘this’, and -o’ can be used with nouns denoting time. The determiner -e refers to the future (8), -oawe to the present (9) and -o to the past (10)

(8) *Skuhl pirin sap mwerin wihkke lakapw.*

‘School will begin the week after next’

(9) *Joamo aio jeila loakjid rehnnoawe.*

‘My father went fishing today’

(10) *Mine melmel wihkko aio.*

‘There was a storm last week’

The purpose of this paper is to show the somehow forgotten deictic nature evidentiality. Grammaticalized evidentiality has been widely explored in typological linguistics (Aikhenvald & Dixon 1998, Johanson & Utas 2001, Aikhenvald 2003), although the study of dependencies between evidentiality and other deictic systems is rather infantile. This paper

¹ Mokilese has no grammaticalized tense system and compensates this lack with an elaborated aspect system.

intends to offer several impulses for future research, offering evidence from lesser studied languages.

2. A short characterization of evidentiality

Evidentiality is an information source concept which encodes the information a speaker relies on. This is the common sense definition of evidentiality which has been propagated in recent publications (See Aikhenvald 2003a for a summary). The fact that evidentiality overlaps with epistemic modality makes it hard to draw the line between modality and evidentiality and much confusion has arisen. Talmy Givón (2001: 326-329) treats evidentiality as being distinct from modality. “Rather than pertaining directly to subjective certainty, grammaticalized evidential systems code first and foremost the *source* of the evidence available to back up an assertion, and only then, implicitly, its *strength*. It is that implicit connection that, in turn, links evidentiality to subjective certainty” (Givón 2001: 326). Still his description is given in chapter on mood and modality. For practical reasons, a necessary distinction between modality and evidentiality must be drawn and I hereby follow Givón’s framework.

An elaborated evidential system has been reported for Central Pomo (Hokan, Northern California) and this will serve as an introductory. According to Mithun (1999: 181) Central Pomo uses a set of 7 different evidential enclitics which are listed below:

= <i>ʔma</i>	general knowledge
= <i>ya</i>	firsthand personal experience (usually visual)
= <i>ʔdoma</i> /= <i>ʔdo</i> ·	hearsay evidence
= <i>nme</i> ·	auditory evidence
= <i>ʔka</i>	inference
= <i>la</i>	personal experience of own action
= <i>wiya</i>	personal affect

- (11) *čʰémul=ʔma* ‘it rained’ (That’s an established fact.)
 (12) *čʰémul=ya* ‘it rained’ (I know because I was there and saw it.)
 (13) *čʰémul=ʔdo*· ‘it rained’ (I was told.)
 (14) *čʰémul=nme*· ‘it rained’ (I heard the drops on the roof.)
 (15) *čʰémul=ʔka* ‘it rained’ (Everything is wet.)
 (16) *da-čé-w=la*
 pulling-seize-PRF-PERSONAL.AGENCY

- 'I caught it' (I know because I did it)
- (17) *da-čé-w=wiya*
 pulling-seize-PRF=PERSONAL.AFFECTEDNESS
- 'I got caught' (I know because it happened to me)

Although all languages have lexical means for expressing evidentiality, only languages which mark evidentiality overtly will be dealt with in the rest of the article.

2.1. Evidentiality and modality

Right from the first encounters with evidentiality (e.g. Jochelson 1905; 128, Boas 1911a: 43 & Boas 1911b: 496, Sapir 1921: 108-109, Sapir 1922: 158-159)² the close mutual dependence of evidentiality and modality has been recognized. Still, even more than half a century later, the same question waits for its solution – if there is any.

In the course of the last few years, two opposing opinions have arisen. F.R. Palmer (2001) argues for a modal interpretation of evidentials. His grouping of modality is based on his basic assumptions, that both epistemic modality and evidential modality are concerned with the speaker's attitude towards the truth-value or factual status of the proposition (Palmer 2001: 24).

Propositional modality

Epistemic

Speculative

Deductive

Assumptive

Evidential

Reported: Reported (2), Reported (3), Reported (Gen)

Sensory: Visual, non-Visual, Auditory

(Palmer 2001: 22)

A major problem in Palmer's argumentation is the status of deductive and assumptive in his overall argumentation. Here he offers several examples from English and Tuyuca (a tucano language of Colombia)

² According to Guentchéva (1996: 14) the concept of information marking has been discovered already in the end of the 19th century. I could not check the mentioned grammars, according to my knowledge, it has been Waldemar Jochelson who used the term „evidential“ first in 1905 and not Franz Boas 1911 which is usually stated.

- (18) John must be in his office now. (deductive)
 (19) John will be in his office. (assumptive)

Still, deductives and assumptives can be part of the evidential system of a language too. Tuyuca marks verbs for visual, auditory, inferential (20), reported and assumptive (21):

- (20) *dliiga apé-yi*.
 soccer play+3SG+PAST-APP
 ‘He played soccer’ (I have evidence, perhaps distinctive shoe prints)

- (21) *dliiga apé-hiyi*.
 soccer play+3SG+PAST-ASSUMP
 ‘He played soccer’ (It is reasonable to assume)

Palmer’s argumentation does not allow mixed systems. “It would be more reasonable to say that *Deductive* and *Assumptive* can be seen as both judgments and evidentials in that the relevant judgments are based on evidence – in the case of Tuyuca from visual evidence and from what is more generally known. As such these fit into systems that are primarily either epistemic or evidential” (Palmer 2001: 29). From a more sophisticated point of view, Palmer’s argumentation hides itself behind an undefined distinction between knowing by virtue and knowing by evidence. It should be obvious, that although this problem is more central to philosophy than linguistics, it is highly questionable, whether Palmer’s distinction can be maintained in natural languages.

2.2. Evidentiality from a typological perspective

In recent years, Alexandra Aikhenvald has investigated evidentiality from a typological perspective. Her interim typological classification from 2003 serves here as the starting point. According to her classification, two major kinds of evidentiality systems can be distinguished. Type I systems do not distinguish between the source of information and use one form for indicating the indirect origin of the information. Aikhenvald mentions that besides several Turkic and Iranian languages, also several Finno-Ugric languages use this strategy which is limited to past tenses. In my M.A. thesis I have shown, that at least for the Permic branch in Uralic (Komi and Udmurt) this classification is not accurate. Both Permic languages can use

the so called 2nd past as a means of expressing evidentiality. Examples (22) and (23) illustrate the inferential usage, (24) and (25) the hearsay usage of the 2nd past in Komi.

(22) *me ešš'a ad'd'ž'i lola kok-tuĵ. seti munemaš' lola keĵà-mĵs kĵ-mĵn.*

I then see-PSTI elk tracks. There go-PSTII3PL elk eight about
'Then I saw elk tracks. There, about eight elks ran.'

(23) *mĵžĵ-k t'set't'sas dod'd'iš, boštas rut's kĵas, šu'ε: "ne važen ku'ema, ĵšš'ε šonĵt"*

man get_down-FUT3SG sledge-ELA, take-FUT3SG fox hand-ILL3PX, say-3SG: „not long-INSTR die-PSTII3SG, still warm.
'The man gets down from his sledge, takes the fox in his hand and says „He died recently, he is still warm.'

(24) *ĵt'ikiš sĵε izema mel'niĵ'sajĵ. a kodĵr sĵĵen izšĵis, seki vĵli jona pemĵd dai sĵε kol't't's'ema užni set't's'ε.*

once he grind-PSTII3SG mill-INESS. and as he-GEN grind-PSTI3SG be-PSTI3SG very dark and he stay-PSTII3SG sleep-INF there-ILL.
'Once he grounded (grain) in the mill. And as his grains were grounded it was very dark and he stayed there to sleep'

(25) *nĵε koššĵs'ε kĵk vun vaiš'. si berĵn tol'ko ad'd'žĵis'ε. ĵd'd'e-n voemaš' nošt'emeš', bĵd'εs pĵk'temeš'.*

they search-PSTI3PL two days water-ELA. This after-INST only find-PSTI3PL. very be-PSTII3PL ugly-PL, all became-swollen-PSTII3PL.
'For two days one was searching for them in the water. Then, they were found. They were very ugly and became swollen.'

This is also the case in Udmurt. (26) demonstrates the inferential usage, (27) the hearsay usage.

(26) *kema gine mon otĵn kĵl'l'skem. mame užantĵis' vuem no ažž'em, pe: gid ažĵn mon kĵl'l'isko. žo-gak pĵlatem no korka pĵrtem. noš kĵnmesam al'i ke no pusez vañ na.*

long I there lie-PSTII1SG. mother-PX1SG work-ELA return-PSTII3SG and see-PSTII3SG, EVI-particle: pen front-INESS I lie-PRES1SG. quickly splash-PSTII3SG and house bring-PSTII3SG. but forehead-INESS1SG now when but mark-DET exist-3SG still.

'I have been lying there for quite a while. My mother came back from work and saw: I lie in front of the pen. Quickly she splashed me with water and took me into the house. But on my forehead, there is still a mark.'

- (27) *gražda-nskoj vojna dirja gurjn ulišjos koškil'ʼam nuleskj. otjn vjlem jun kuž no paškjt nukez. gurtazj heno-kjče životez no eveh kel'til'ʼam, č'i-stozes šerazj nuil'ʼam.*

civil war time village inhabitant-PL go-PSTII3PL forest-ILL. There-INESS be-PSTII3SG very long and wide ravine-DET. Village-INESS3PL nothing cattle-DET and NEG-COP stay-PSTII3PL, clean-ACC strange-INESS3PL take-along-PSTII3PL.

'During the civil war, all villagers went to the forest. There was a very large and wide ravine. They did not leave any cattle in the village, they took everything along.'

Still, the 2nd past can still be used as a perfect, without any evidential shading, (28) demonstrates this for Komi (29) for Udmurt:

- (28) *no niļjs kulęma nin, oz lolav.*

but girl-PX3SG die-PSTII3SG already, NEGV-PAST3Sg breath-IMP

'But the girl was already dead, she did not breath any longer'

- (29) *niļme šotiško val. kaljk lač'ak šuldırjaško: šuan bere šuan ni. vañ rodhami l'ukaškemjn, stancijš pije gine bertjnte – jęl nusa mjniz val.*

girl-ACCPX3SG give-PRES1SG EXIST-PAST. people many amuse-PRES3SG: wedding once wedding PRT. EXIST-PRES family-PX1PL gather-PCT-INESS. station-ELA boy-PX1SG still return-PSTII3SG-NEG – milk bring-CONV go-PSTI3SG EXIST-PAST

'I married off my daughter. A lot of people, they all have a good time: when there is wedding, then there is a wedding. The whole family has gathered, only my boy has not returned from the station. He took in milk'

Also for the Turkic languages doubts have been presented (see contributions in Larsson & Utas)

The second type of evidentiality (Type II) codes different ways of sensory evidence. Earlier Central Pomo has been already mentioned (11)-(17), another system can be encountered in

Southeastern Tepehuan Willet (1991:161-166). Information source (visual, reported I, reported II, inference) is encoded by using one of the following particles:

<i>dyo</i>	percieved by speaker
<i>sap</i>	reported to speaker, unknown to hearer
<i>sac</i>	reported to speaker, previously known to hearer
<i>vac</i>	inferred

(29) *Jiñ-capiasa dyo gu cavay tacav na-ñ ca-’uhlis.*
 1s-kick PE ART horse yesterday SUB-1s TEM-unsaddle
 The horse kicked me yesterday while I unsaddled it.

(30) *Oidya-’-ap gum tat. Jimi-a’ sap para Vódamtam cavuimuc.*
 go-with-FUT-2s ART-2s father go-FUT REU to Mezquital tomorrow
 (You) should accompany your father. He says he’s going to Mezquital tomorrow.

(31) *Añ mi’-ñi dy/r ja’c jim na sac jir Járax Cham.*
 1s there-PRE from DIR come SUB REK EXS-crab place
 I’m coming from a place over there called “Crab Place”.

(32) *Dáman dara-t vac dyi turasno. Pui’ cu-t va’ ia’ray gu j/v/hl.*
 shallow sit-P1 INF ART peach. thus SO-PI then fell ART wind.
 These peach trees must have been planted shallowly. That’s why the wind blew them over.

A major merit of Aikhenvald’s typology is the result that the classic idea of markedness should be given up in the study of evidentiality. Several languages, e.g. Tariana have no unmarked category of evidence that means every proposition has to be marked according to the source of knowledge. This collides with the usual idea that categories qualified as the indicative should be unmarked. Therefore Aikhenvald proposes that evidentiality should be considered to be independent from tense-aspect-modality.

2.3. Evidentiality vs mirativity vs mediativity

A fair account of confusion in the discussion on evidentiality is the status of mirativity. The latter concept, although similar to evidentiality, has at least according to Scott DeLancey

(1997) a different status. Mirativity is the marking of unexpected information with means of evidential categories. Although both categories are linked semantically rather tightly, there are conceptual reasons, why both categories should be kept apart. In both Permic languages it is possible to use the 2nd past not only for expressing evidentiality (see 22-29), but also for expressing mirativity. Here an example from Komi:

(33) *no-pε, taj-ke-pε vijas, te-pε poliš vεlemjd.*

and-EVI-particle, this-when-EVI-PART kill-FUT3SG, you-Evi-particle coward be-PSTII2SG

'Well, he almost killed me and you were a coward'

This concept advocated by Scott DeLancey has been criticized severely in French linguistics, where the concept mediativity unites both ideas (Guentcheva 1996, Lazard 1999). Whether the concept of mediativity is more suitable remains unproven yet.

3. Why evidentiality is deictic

The point why I consider evidentiality as another instance of deixis integrates the same discourse factors which have been used in the study of other deictic manifestations. The basic definition of deixis usually stresses the grounding of an event in time or space. As it becomes obvious from the examples presented above, it is also possible to ground information in discourse according to its source. This is clear instance of deixis, although widely ignored in literature on deixis.

As far as I'm aware of Roman Jakobson has propagated the deictic nature of evidentiality as early as 1957. Still, the idea of a deictic interpretation of evidentiality has been largely overlooked and not more than a handful of studies have address the deictic function of evidentials so far (Schichter 1986; Woodbury 1986; Floyd 1999: 47-55; Mushin 2000³; *en passant* also Brian 2003: 309). To my best knowledge, evidentiality as a deictic phenomenon has not been advocated in XXX's recent overview on deixis (XXX 2002).

This brings us to the next question: hence evidentiality is deictic, how should it be called? Ilana Mushin offers "epistemological deixis" (Mushin 2000: 927) – in the heading of my paper I have chosen the somehow more neutral *information deixis*. Epistemology has been

³ Mushin's statement "Evidentiality, the linguistic coding of source and reliability of information, has long been characterized as a *deictic* phenomenon in language." (Mushin 2000: 927) is far to optimistic. I agree, that the idea has been known for quite a while, though it has never been explored in its whole dimension.

widely used in research on modality; therefore I think that the neutral term information deixis fits better.

4. Evidentials and interaction with other deictic categories

Complex evidential systems as reported for e.g. Tuyuca or Tariana are somehow rare phenomenon. In most of the languages I'm familiar with, there are clear dependencies between temporal and information deixis, in at least one case also between spatial and information deixis. The following discussion is partly based on an earlier attempt by Aikhenvald & Dixon (1998).

4.1. Evidentials and temporal deixis – evidence from Eurasia and elsewhere

Information marking in Eurasia is mostly found in past tense contexts. In the following languages, information marking is partly encoded in the usage of different past tenses. As has been mentioned earlier, these past tenses (usually anteriors) allow an evidential usage but strictly speaking are no proper evidentials; therefore I call them evidential strategies.⁴ Languages belonging to this type are Udmurt, Komi, Tadjik, Armenian, Turkish and several Nakh-Dagestanian languages, probably also Albanian, Macedonian and Bulgarian.

Evidential systems belonging to the second type are rather infrequent in Eurasia: Lithuanian, Latvian, Livonian, Estonian, Yukaghir and probably Ainu belong to this group. Nevertheless, the Estonian system has some peculiar features:

Estonian has an overtly marked tempus system; whereas future and present tense are not marked, Estonian distinguishes three marked past tenses.

The imperfect is marked with *-i* or *-si* + according Vx. In third singular, the endings are *-i*, *-si*, *-s*, the form for 3Pl is homonymic with 2Sg though does not allow *pro drop* and therefore can be distinguished.

(34) *Elasin kunagi Soomes.*

live-IMP1Sg sometimes Finland-INES

'I once lived in Finland'

⁴ This termed has been coined by Aikhenvald 2003. Although I see the merits of Aikhenvald's classification in two evidentiality systems, I have strong doubts, whether type (I) is really as evidential as Aikhenvald claims. All Eurasian languages of the type (I) look rather like instances of evidential strategies.

The perfect is formed periphrastically with an inflected copula *olema* (present tense) and the past participle (active).

- (35) *Oleme täna juba kaks korda söönud.*
be-2PL today already two time-PART eat-PTC
'We have already eaten two times today'

The pluperfect is formed periphrastically too. It differs from the perfect in one respect; the copula *olema* is then marked for tense and person.

- (36) *Olin oma toa juba koristanud, kui ema kutsus mind seda tegema.*
be-IMP1Sg own room-Gen already clean-PTC when mother call-IMP3Sg I-PART this-PART do-INF
'I had already cleaned my room, when mother told me to do so.'

When combining the Estonian evidential with tenses, one gets a different picture. Both, in present and past tense, the Estonian evidential is not marked for person and therefore *pro drop* is not allowed. The marker for evidentiality in the present tense is the suffix *-vat*.

- (38) *Tema töötavat nüüd Tallinnas*
he work-EVIPRE now Tallinn-INNESS
'He works in Tallinn nowadays.' (as I was told)

When using the evidential in past tense contexts, tense is completely neutralized. The past tense evidential is based on the same participle in *-nud*, which could be encountered in (36) and (37). As an evidential, the participle is used without the copula (38). In written standard Estonian a second variant exists, where the participle is accompanied with the copula *olema* in the present tense evidential form. Also in this case, *pro drop* is not possible. A theoretical problem not solved is the status of the participle in (39) is the question, whether this is the "usual participle" or whether this is an instance of double marking evidentiality. In case of meaning, there is no difference attestable.

- (38) *Sina käinud Helsingis.*
you go-EVIPST Helsinki-INNESS
'You have been to Helsinki' (as I was told)

- (39) *Sina olevat käinud Helsingis.*
you be-EVI go-EVIPST/go-PTC Helsinki-INNESS

‘You have been to Helsinki’ (as I was told)

With respect to tempus neutralization Estonian differs from other Eurasian languages. In Komi and Udmurt, evidential pluperfects are possible, though this needs some clarification. Pluperfects are usually perfect candidates for “evidential strategies”. This is not surprising, because the notion of distant past allows an interpretation of non-witnessed, reported etc. This is the case in Estonian but has been reported for Yimas also (Foley 1991: 242). In Komi, in such a case one would accept both, main verb and the copula in 2nd past, but in my corpus I could not encounter a single instance for this. For Udmurt it is hard to find instances of evidential pluperfects (main verb 2nd past + copula 2nd past) too. Even the so-called resultative pluperfects, which formally are not marked for evidentiality easily allow an evidential interpretation. Example (40) is an instance of an evidential pluperfect in Udmurt.

(40) *ta nuk dorjn kjk-kuñ korkan porjos ulo val. udmurtjosleś l’ukiškisa, soosjn teritek,
oč’č’j nuk dorj **koškil’l’am**. noš bjdes gurt **kjlijnte** ni, leša. ozi ik **bjril’l’am-a**,
koškil’l’am-a, uk to·škj ni. korkossj **kjlem vjlem** no, soini vužkorkaňuk **šuil’l’am**.*

‘This ravine near-INESS two-three house Mari-PL life-PRES3SG EXIST-PAST. Udmurt-PL-ABL separate-CONV they-INESS fit-CONV-NEG, there-ILL ravine near-ILL leave-PSTII3PL. but all village stay-PSTII3SG-NEG so, build-CONV. So end-PSTII3PL-QUESTPART, leave- PSTII3PL-QUESTPART, NEGVER-PRES-1SG know-IMP. house-PX3PL stay-PSTII3PL be-PSTII3SG and, that _why *vužkorkaňuk* call-PSTII3PL.

‘Nearby the ravine, there (once) lived some Maris (lit. two-three houses full of Maris). They separated from the Udmurts, because they did not get along and left to this ravine. Seemingly, they did not found a village there. I don’t know whether they died or whether they left. Their houses were left and that’s why this place is called *vužkorkaňuk* (the ravine of old houses).’

Also Tajik, which has been reported to have an evidential perfect (Tajik belongs to the type I according to Aikhenvald’s interpretation), allows evidential pluperfects. (Rastorgueva 1963 [1954]: 64-68).

The only Eurasian language following the Estonian type I’m aware of is Eastern Armenian (Indo-European). According to Kozintseva’s account (also type I), the Eastern Armenian evidential, which is formed by a perfect participle, too, has no pluperfect counterpart (Kozintseva 2001).

Southeastern Tepehuan (Uto-Aztecan) has no further tempus division in the past but operates with perfective and imperfective aspect. Interestingly, at least two evidential particles *dyo* (perceived by speaker) and *sap* (reported evidence) did occur with grammatical future tense reference in Willet's description, the rest of the markers did occur only in past tense. (Willet 1991: 162-163)

5. How evidentials grammaticalize

In a first cross-linguistic study of evidential morphology, Bybee (1985: xxx) could show, that evidentials are usually highly infinite. In a later survey Bybee (Bybee et al 1994) several findings (secondary perfects) already reported by Comrie (1976) and Dahl (1985) were repeated once again. Further, two case studies on the grammaticalization of evidentials (Anderson 1986, Willet 1988) exist. In many cases, verbs of perception, cognition and utterance have eroded giving rise to an evidential system whose meaning is fairly transparent. Three examples (Willet 1988:79) demonstrate the origin of evidential markers from verbs of speech or perception:

- Wintu (Penutian - California) marks non-visual evidentials with *-nthEr* which derives from proto-Wintun **mut-* 'hear, sense, feel' plus **-hEr* passive.
- The Makah (Wakashan - Washington, USA) non-visual evidential *-q vad* comes from a verb-like formative suffix description of noises.
- For reported evidence (third-hand), Makah uses *-waad* which derives from *waa* 'say' plus the passive suffix *-vit*.

Still, it has been reported, that evidential markers can be loaned. Of Wanka Quechua's three different evidentials (*-mi* 'direct', *-shi* 'reportative' and *-chri* 'inference', only *-mi* seems to be an autochthonous development, both 'reportative' and 'inference' markers are said to be loaned from the neighboring language Aymara. (Floyd 1999: 37-39)

5.1. Evidence from Ainu

A fairly transparent system has been reported for Ainu (isolate – Sakhalin and Northern Japan). This is interesting both from a diachronic and from an areal point of view. Besides Yukaghir all other Paleoasian languages have been classified as languages without a grammaticalized evidential system. Whereas the history of the Yukaghir evidentials is not known, it is another instance of a language having an evidential system and having been in long-lasting contact with a Turkic language. Besides the Baltic languages and the Finnic

Estonian and Livonian, all other languages having attested evidential systems cluster around Turkic languages or have been under long Turkic influence. (Macedonian, Bulgarian, Armenian, Tajik, Mari, Udmurt, Komi (to a lesser degree), Yukaghir). This is not the case for Ainu, which has been spoken in an area, where grammaticalized evidentials in neighboring or influencing languages have been absent. (Chinese, Japanese, Nivkh, Russian)

The manifestation of evidentiality in Ainu, or expressive nominalizer as it is called by Tamura (2000: 227-228) is based on nominalization. In all the examples, the expressive nominalizers are placed after the verb. The whole sentence becomes nominalized which is followed by the copula *ne*.

a) *ruwe ne* - eyewitnessed

Etymologically, *ruwe* derives from *ru* 'tracks, footprints, trail'. Whereas this form is not frequent in ordinary language, it can be encountered in old tales and traditional stories.

(41) *núman húci ek ruwe ne*
yesterday grandmother come eEVD COP
'Grandmother came yesterday.'

(42) *kam k-e rusy ruwe ne*
meat 1P-SING-NOM-eat want eEVD COP
'I want to eat meat.'

b) *hawe ne* – reported

Etymologically, *hawe* is the affiliative form of *haw* 'voice' and is used when making statements based on what has been said.

(43) *núman húci ek hawe ne*
yesterday grandmother come eSAID COP
'(I/you/he said that) Grandmother came yesterday.'

(44) *kam k-e rusuy hawe ne*
meat 1P-SING-NOM-eat want eSAID COP
'(I/you/he said that) I want to eat meat' but also
'I (you/he) meant that I (you/he) wanted to eat meat.'

c) *humi ne* – sensory evidence

Etymologically, *humi* is the affiliative form of *hum* ‘sound’ and expresses sensory evidence, most often in exclamations.

(45) *eytasa tópen humi ne pekor kuyaynu.*

too-much be-sweet eFELT COP in-that-way 1P-SING-NOM-think

‘I think it’s a bit too sweet’

d) *siri ne* – visual evidence

Etymologically, *siri* is the affiliative form of *sir* ‘ambience, conditions of a scene’. The description is not entirely clear, the explanation given collides with both sensory and eye witnessed. It is often used to report something.

(46) *húci ek kor an siri ne*

grandmother come while to-be eSEEN COP

‘The elderly woman is here (visible) / (I see that) Grandmother is coming.’

e) *kusu ne* – desiderative/general knowledge?

In this case, the lexical item *kusu* ‘intention’ accompanied with the copula is used with future reference.

(47) *sitohu enka ta a-satke yakun pirkano sat kusu ne*

heater above at/in INDEFP-NOM-dry if well dry supposition COP

‘If you dry it above the heater, it will dry nicely’

Whereas the status of e) is somehow troubling all other instances are clear forms of evidentiality. The fact, that examples a) and b) show up once again under instances of reported speech (Tamura 2000: 230-231), stresses an evidential interpretation.

5.2. Evidence from Estonian

As already demonstrated, Estonian has an overtly marked evidential for present tense and past tense. Nevertheless the diachronic development shows clearly, that both evidentials are of different origin.⁵

The present tense evidential is based on the active participle in *-v* (e.g. *sööv* = eating ← *sööma* ‘to eat’) which is followed by the historical stem vowel and the ending of the partitive case *-t*. It is assumed, that this infinitive construction was part of an impersonal PCU-complement.

- (48) *Ta öeldakse olevat haige*
he said-IMP be-PTC-PART ill
‘He is said to be ill’ (lit. He one is saying being ill)

In a later phase, the impersonal was dropped and the infinite PCU-complement was reanalyzed and filled the verbal slot.

- (49) *Ta olevat haige*
He be-EVID ill
‘He is said to be ill’

Whereas the rise of the present tense evidential is fairly transparent, the development of the past tense evidential is unsolved. The usage of the participle without the copula is indeed a criterion for rather old age⁶ but against Finno-Ugric background, this argument loses strength. The distinction of two tenses, one being optionally used as an evidential strategy can be encountered in more distant related languages as e.g. Mari, Udmurt, Komi, and probably Ob-Ugric as well. Still, although all those languages use the 2nd past as an evidential strategy, the grammatical means are no cognates! Besides Livonian, neither the other Finnic language nor the closely related Saami and Mordvinian languages have a grammaticalized evidential.⁷ This points to the well-known Baltic Sprachbund..

⁵ In several Estonian dialects, evidentiality is expressed by different means and does not follow the patterns encountered in standard written Estonian. This will not be discussed here, for a survey see e.g. Metslang & Pajusalu 2002

⁶ The introduction of the copula is generally accepted as either Baltic or Germanic influence on Finnic. (Korhonen 1981)

⁷ The Livonian evidential has cognates in Western Estonian dialects. As its Estonian cognates, the Livonian evidential is infinite.

6. Why evidentials are less frequently grammaticalized?

When recapitulating the history of the study of evidentiality, a probable solution for the less frequent prominence of evidentials is already implicit. Evidentiality has been known for at least a 100 years, though only the return of lesser studied languages and the pragmatic turn in linguistic itself created the climate, which led to the rediscovery of evidentiality. The fact, that e.g. German, French, English, Spanish, Russian, Indonesian, Chinese and other major languages of the world do not have a grammaticalized system of evidentiality clearly show the fact that grammaticalized information marking is not something really necessary. Lexical means clearly can close this functional gap. Takaelma, Udmurt, Komi and probably Mari show, that evidentiality can be expressed within temporal deixis. Languages as Chinese, Indonesian and Russian clearly demonstrate, that even a concept as central as tense (at least for the majority of SAE languages) can be neatly avoided by using aspect and lexical means. I wanted to avoid any cognitive explanation for evidentiality, but perhaps the missing of grammaticalized evidentiality in SAE is indeed better explained cognitively – from an anthropological point of view the missing of evidentiality could be interpreted as cognitive poverty of speakers of SAE languages. With this challenging hypothesis I end my presentation.

Language index⁸

Central Pomo	(Hakon)	Southern Tepechuan	(Uto-Aztecian)
Nootka	(Wakashan)	Udmurt	(Uralic)
Komi	(Uralic)	Estonian	(Uralic)
Khanty	(Uralic)	Yimas	(Lower Sepik)
Armenian	(Indo-European)	Chukchi	(isolated)
Yukagir	(isolated)	Turkish	(Turkic)
Ainu	(isolated)	Mokilese	(Austronesian)
Quechua	(???)	Tadjik	(Indo-European)

⁸ Glossing and translations other than for Estonian, Udmurt and Komi have not been rendered.

Literature

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R.M.W. 1998. Dependencies between grammatical systems. *Language* 68. pp. 56-80.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2003. Evidentiality in typological perspective. In: Aikhenvald & Dixon (eds.) 2003. pp. 1-31.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. Y. & Dixon. R. M W. (eds.) 2003. *Studies in Evidentiality*. TSL 54. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Anderson Stephen R. & Keenan Edward L. 1985. Deixis. In: Shopen (ed). pp. 259-308.
- Anderson, Lloyd 1986. Evidentials, paths of change, and mental maps: typologically regular asymmetries. In: Chafe & Nichols (eds.) pp. 273-312.
- Boas, Franz (ed.) 1911. *Handbook of the American Indian Languages*, Part I. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40.
- Boas, Franz (ed.) 1922. *Handbook of the American Indian Languages*, Part II. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40.
- Boas, Franz. 1911a. Introduction. In: Boas 1911. pp. 1-83.
- Boas, Franz. 1911b. Kwakiutl. In: Boas 1911. pp. 423-557.
- Brian, Joseph D. 2003. Evidential. In: Aikhenvald & Dixon (ed) pp. 307- 327
- Bybee J. & Pagliucia, W. & Perkins R. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bybee J. 1985. *Morphology*. TSL 9. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chafe, Wallace & Nichols, Johanna. (eds.) 1986. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood. Nj: Ablex.
- Comrie, Bernard 1976. *Aspect*. CTL. Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Östen (ed.) 2000. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology. Eurotyp 20-6. Berlin/New York. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Östen 1985. *Tense and Aspect systems*. Oxford/New York: Basil Blackwell.
- DeLancey, Scott 1997. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *LT* 1. pp. 33-52.
- Dendale, Patrick. & Tasmowski, Liliane. 2001. Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions. *JoP* 33. pp. 339-348.
- Erelt (ed) 2003. *Estonian Language*. Linguistica Uralica Supplementary Series Volume I. Tallinn: Estonian Academy Publishers.
- Erelt, Mati 2003. Syntax. In: Erelt (ed). pp. 93-129
- Fillmore, Charles 1997 [1971]. *Lectures on Deixis*. CSLI Lecture Notes 65. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Floyd, Rick 1999. *The structure of evidential categories in Wanka Quechua*. SIL & UTA 131.
- Foley, William A. 1992. *The Yimas Language of New Guinea*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Givón, Talmy 2001. *Syntax I. revised edition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka (ed.) 1996. *L'énonciation médiatisée*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka 1996. Introduction. In: Guentchéva. pp.11-18

- Harrison, Sheldon P. & Salich Y. Albert 1976. *Mokilese reference grammar*. Pali Language Texts: Micronesia. Honolulu: The University of Hawai Press.
- Jakobson, Roman 1971(1957). Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb. In: *Selected writings vol. 2*. The Hague: Mouton. pp. 130-147.
- Jochelson, Waldemar 1905. Essay on the grammar of the Yukaghir language. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science Vol. XVI No5, part II*. pp. 97-152.
- Johanson, Lars & Utas, Bo 2000 (eds.). Evidentials – *Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 24. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Johanson, Lars 2003. Evidentiality in Turkic. In: Aikhenvald & Dixon (eds.) 2003. pp. 273-290.
- Klein, Wolfgang (2001): Deiktische Orientierung. In: Haspelmath, Martin et al. (ed.): Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien. Ein internationales Handbuch. 1. Halbband. Berlin - New York. pp. 575-589.
- Kozintseva, Natalia (2000). Perfect forms as a means of expressing evidentiality in Modern Eastern Armenian. In: Johanson & Utas (eds.). pp. 401-18.
- Lazard, Gilbert 1999. Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other? *LT 3*. pp. 91-109.
- Leinonen Marja & Viikuna Maria 2000. Past tenses in Permic languages In: Dahl (ed.) pp. 495-514.
- Metslang, Helle & Pajusalu, Karl 2002. Evidentiality in South Estonian. *LU XXXVIII*. pp. 98-109
- Mithun, Marianne 1999. *The Languages of Native North America*. CLS: Cambridge University Press.
- Mushin, Ilana 2000. Evidentiality and deixis in narrative retelling. *JoP 32*. pp. 927-957.
- Palmer, F.R. 2001. *Mood and modality. 2nd edition*. CTL: Cambridge Universtiy Press.
- Rastorgueva, V.S. 1953. *K voprosu u neočevidnykh ili novestvovatel'nykh formax tadžikskogo glagola*. Očerki po grammatike tadžikskogo jazyka – Vypusk 3-j. Akadamia nauk tadžikskoi SSR – Institut jazyka i literatury. Stalinabad: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk tadžikskoi SSR.
- Rastorgueva, V.S. 1963 [1954]. *A short sketch of Tajik grammar*. Publications of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics 28 = International Journal of American Linguistics 29 (4).
- Sapir, Edward 1921. *Language – an introduction to the study of speech*. San Diego/New York - London: Harvest.
- Sapir, Edward. 1922. The Takelma Language of Southwestern Oregon. In: Boas, Franz (ed.). pp 1-296.
- Schlichter, Alice 1986. The origin and deictic nature of Wintu evidentials. In: Chafe & Nichols. pp. 46-59.
- Shopen, Timothy (ed.) 1985. *Language typology and syntactic description*. I-III. Cambridge University Press.
- Siegl, Florian 2004. *The 2nd past in the Permic languages – form, function and a comparative analysis from a typological perspective*. Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Tartu – Chair of Finnic Languages. accesible via <http://www.utlib.ee/ekollekt/diss/mag/2004/b16700053/Siegl.pdf>
- Tamura, Suzuko 2000. *The Ainu Language*. ICHEL Linguistic studies 2. Tokyo: Sanseido.
- Tatevosov, Sergei 2001. From resultatives to evidentials: multiple uses of the perfect in Nahk-Daghestanian languages. *JoP 33*. pp. 443-464.

Viitso, Tiit-Rein 2003a. Structure of the Estonian language – phonology, morphology and word formation. In: Erelt (ed). pp. 9-93.

Viitso, Tiit-Rein 2003b. Rise and development of the Estonian language. In: Erelt (ed). pp. 130-230.

Willet, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12. pp. 51-97

Willet, Thomas 1991. *A reference grammar of Southeastern Tepehuan*. SIL & UTA 100.

Woodbury, Anthony 1986. Interactions of tense and evidentiality: a study of Sherpa and English. In: Chafe & Nichols. pp. 188-202.