

Bibliothèque de l'Information Grammaticale

Collection fondée par Guy SERBAT†
Collection dirigée par Bernard BOSREDON

Bibliothèque de l'Information Grammaticale

— 63 —

ZLATKA GUENTCHÉVA ET JON LANDABURU (ÉDS)

L'ÉNONCIATION MÉDIATISÉE
II

Le traitement épistémologique de l'information
illustrations amérindiennes et caucasiennes



wol' a- uciw-q gel' a-n ati-n.
lover-ERG she-POSS hand-and touch-PSTUNW
Her lover touched her with his hand.

t'ok'aw šebi-non r-ō-nč'ey, ža xizzyor y-egir-si,
more nothing IV-do-NEG:PFVCVB she back II-send-PSTWIT
Without doing anything else he sent her back,

žā-n y-ik'i-s xedyo-de-r.
she-and II-go-PSTWIT husband-APUD-LAT
she went to her husband.

(45)

(46)

(47)

THE EXPRESSION OF SPEAKER SUBJECTIVITY IN LAK (DAGHESTAN)

Victor A. FRIEDMAN

1. INTRODUCTION

Lak is spoken by over 100,000 people in the central highlands of the Republic of Daghestan as well as elsewhere in that Republic, in Russia, and in Turkey. It belongs to the Daghestanian branch of the Northeast Caucasian language family. (The other branch, Nakh, comprises Chechen, Ingush, and Bac'bi [Tsova-Tush]). The closest relative to Lak is the Dargi group. Other related literary languages include Avar, Lezgi, Tabasaran (also Rutul and others since the 1990's). Lak is distinguished from the other Daghestanian languages, among other things, by the complexity of its verbal and nominal inflection. It has more nominal cases than any other Daghestanian language except Tabasaran (Friedman 1992), but it also has a complex set of finite verbal forms, both synthetic and analytic, that can agree in person, number, and/or in gender (i.e. noun class; see Friedman 1996) with various participants in the verb phrase depending on valency, tense, semantics, word order, etc.¹ This paper will discuss the grammaticalized means by which Lak expresses the speaker's evaluation of the narrative event.

While the grammatical terminology in Jakobson (1957/1971) was not original, it was Jakobson's choices and formulations that affected much subsequent work in linguistics. The grammatical category *evidential* was defined by Jakobson in terms of a reported speech event, but in many languages (including Bulgarian and Macedonian, which Jakobson used for his examples) the literal opposition is not

¹ That which in Lak corresponds to the subject in English can be in the genitive (which functions as ergative), nominative, dative, or ablative case (see § 3). In this paper, I shall use the terms *subject* and *object* to refer to the participants in the narrated event that correspond to those roles in the English translation. While not entirely satisfactory from a strictly Lak-internal point of view, such terminology will suffice for the purposes of this paper, since our focus here is on the verb form itself.

reported/witnessed – a conceptualization that is itself attested for Turkic at least as far back as the eleventh century (Dankoff 1982:412). Rather, it is the speaker's personal attitude toward the narrated event – an attitude often but not always shaped by the source or evidence for the event – that determines the choice of verb form, which expresses the grammatical category of *status* (cf. Aronson 1967, 1977, Friedman 1988, Fielder 1997, Guentchéva 1996, Lindstedt 1993).² I have presented extensive evidence for this from various Balkan and other languages elsewhere (e.g., Friedman 1988, 1994a) and will therefore not rehearse these arguments here but move directly to a consideration of status oppositions in Lak.

The Lak verb has at its disposal a variety of grammatical and grammaticalized means of indicating the degree to which the speaker is committed to the statement. Among those means are the choice of verbal paradigm, the choice of case of the participants of the verb phrase, the choice of agreement between verb and participants, and the use of verbal particles and lexical items. In this paper, I shall give a brief survey of these means. I shall examine the opposition assertive/ non-assertive, the use of heterogeneous paradigms, analytic constructions (especially nonconfirmative ones), agreement patterns and case choices that are used to withhold confirmation or volition, and emphatic and nonconfirmative (quotative and other) particles, clitics, and selected lexical items.

2. CHOICE OF PARADIGM

2.1. Synthetic paradigms

In the synthetic paradigms, the primary marked status category is what I have called *assertive* (Russian *utverditel'nyj*, *podtverditel'nyj*, or *kategoričeskoe*, Georgian *mt'k'icebiti*, see Friedman 1989 on terminology). Table 1 gives the assertive and nonassertive synthetic paradigms for those tenses in which the opposition exists. The *-w-* infix to the root is a class marker (here the marker for 1-3 PL and 1 and 3 SG) limited to certain past stems (for details on Lak noun classes see

² Insofar as the French *médiatif* (see Guentchéva 1996:13) is understood as denoting the grammatical mediation of the speaker in transmitting the information, it is much like the use of English *status* as explicitly redefined from Jakobson (1957/1971) by Aronson (1977), i.e. the relationship between the narrated event and the participant in the speech event. Aronson (1967) uses Jakobson's definition of status (the qualification of the narrated event) for both the so-called witnessed (confirmative) and emphatic reported (dubitative) of Bulgarian, comparing them with the affirmative status of the English auxiliary *do* as in *I do believe in ghosts!* It is not until Aronson (1977), however, that – following Goľab's (1964) definition of mood as the ontological evaluation of the narrated event, i.e. the qualification of the narrated event without reference to participants – Aronson redefines status as qualifying the participant's attitude to the narrated event; cf. also Aronson (1991:130).

Friedman 1996). The transitive and intransitive perfects and the intentional future are defective paradigms. In the transitive perfect, the first person is unique to that person, the second and third persons come from the nonassertive perfect paradigm. In the intransitive perfect, the first persons come from an archaic perfect which normally only survives here (although a third person form occurs in example 13), and the other two persons come from the nonassertive perfect, as in the case of the transitive perfect. The intentional future is limited to the first persons:

	IMPERFECT	ASSERTIVE IMPERFECT	
1/2SG	<i>čičajwaw</i>	<i>čičajs:ijaw</i>	
3SG/PL	<i>čičajwa</i>	<i>čičajs:ija</i>	
	AORIST	ASSERTIVE AORIST	
1/2SG	<i>čiwčunaw</i>	<i>čiwčus:ijaw</i>	
3SG/PL	<i>čiwčuna</i>	<i>čiwčus:ija</i>	
	PRESENT	ASSERTIVE PRESENT	ASSERTIVE PERFECT
1/2SG	<i>čičara</i>	<i>čičajs:ara</i>	<i>čiwčus:ara</i>
1/2PL	<i>čičaru</i>	<i>čičajs:aru</i>	<i>čiwčus:aru</i>
3SG/PL	<i>čičaj</i>	<i>čičajs:ar</i>	<i>čiwčus:ar</i>
	TRANSITIVE PERFECT	INTRANSITIVE PERFECT	INTENTIONAL FUTURE
1SG/PL	<i>čičaw/čičardu</i>	<i>lawgra/lawgru</i>	<i>čičinna/čičinnu</i>
2SG/PL	<i>čiwčunna/čiwčunnu</i>	<i>lawgunna/lawgunnu</i>	—
3SG/PL	<i>čiwčunni</i>	<i>lawgunni</i>	—
	FUTURE	ASSERTIVE FUTURE	
1/2SG	<i>čičins:ara</i>	<i>čičint'is:ara</i>	
1/2PL	<i>čičins:aru</i>	<i>čičint'is:aru</i>	
3SG/PL	<i>čičins:ar</i>	<i>čičint'is:ar</i>	

Table 1. Synthetic paradigms of *čičin* 'write' and *lagan* 'go'³

³ Etymologically, with the exception of the 1SG transitive perfect, the person markers in those paradigms with three distinctions (1/2SG, 1/2PL, and 3SG/PL) come from enclitic forms of the present tense of 'be' (class 1 *ura, uru, uri*, with loss of the initial *u-*). If the verb form in question ended in an *-n*, the *r-* assimilated to *n-*. If the verb form ended in *-r*, the clitic *r-* dissimilated to *d-*. In the third person, the *-i* was lost after *-r* relatively recently, and still appears in dialects, older texts, and when an interrogative particle is suffixed. In the present tense, which is based on the present gerund plus the present of 'be', the 3SG/PL is identical to the present gerund, i.e. the clitic *-r[i]* is completely lost. See Burčuladze (1979) and Kazenin (1999) for complete details. Transcription is a modified transliteration of Lak orthography. All translations are my own.

The distinction assertive/nonassertive has been compared to the English assertive in *do* versus its absence (Burč'uladze 1979:244). The following example contrasts the nonassertive (unmarked) present with the assertive present:

- (1) *Na čağar čiça-r-a / čiça-js:ar-a.*
 I letter write-PRES-1.SG. write-ASPRES-1.SG.

I write/do write a letter.

I have argued (Friedman 1984, 1994b) that the meaning of the category *assertive* is 'objective assertion'. The category *assertive* is closely related to the category *confirmative* (first used by Aronson 1967 for Bulgarian), insofar as both involve the speaker's positive (vouching) attitude toward the narrated event. The difference is that the category *confirmative* involves *subjective* confirmation and always applies to an event that the speaker can treat as witnessed (regardless of whether or not the event was literally witnessed) or as a part of general knowledge. The *confirmative* therefore always contains an element of pastness. Semantically, the *confirmative* overlaps with the *assertive* insofar as the *assertive*, too, is used for general knowledge, but the *assertive* involves the speaker's choice of objective assertion. Thus its basic meaning is a degree of speaker commitment that is compatible with present and future events as well as pastness (see examples 1-13). The difference can be compared to the distinction between the Turkish *di-past*, which is *confirmative*, and the particle *-dir*, which is *assertive* (Friedman 1989, cf. Lewis 1967:97).⁴ Thus, while the *assertive* involves the speaker's choice of how to present the event, there is a pragmatic differentiation that depends on context. The *confirmative* always involves a personal vouching, whereas in the *assertive* the

vouching can, in a sense, be personal (colloquial style) or impersonal, i.e. neutral (gnomic, formal, business, literary style, etc.).⁵ Thus, for example, the *assertive* is the normal choice in objective expository prose, bureaucratized, journalistic, and proverbs. In colloquial usage, however, this same categorical, objective quality gives a coloring of personal emphasis. Examples (2)-(4), taken from a Lak school grammar (Murqilinskij 1981:117-118), implicitly support this analysis. Example (2), using the *assertive* present, introduces the contrast between examples (3) and (4) and explains that (3) would be used in an official report and (4) in an informal conversation. The form in (3) is the *assertive* perfect, while (4) is the nonassertive aorist. Example (5) is a typical proverb illustrating the use of the present *assertive* for categorical, gnomic statements:

- (2) *Iš-ira-l stil'-danu-wu asar k'ic'-lag-an č'u'lu b-u-w-s:a*
 business-OBL-GEN style-OBL-INES effect call-go-INF decorated 3-do-3-PT
maq-ru, kalima-rtu-gu išla qa-d-a-js:ar.
 word-PL phrase-PL-and use NEG-4-do-ASPRES.3SG

In business style, emotive and decorative words and phrases are not used. (Murqilinskij 1981:117)

- (3) *A'rkín-s:a-ks:a mašina-rtu b-a-qa-šiw-ri-jn b-u-w-nu,*
 necessary-ADJi-as machine-PL 3-be-NEG-MAS-OBL-SupPR 3-do-3-PAST.GER
cila č'u-ma-l qus t'ajla qa-d-u-r-k-s:ar.
 its own time-OBL-GEN goods send NEG-4-go.out-4-§-AsPF.3SG

Due to the absence of necessary cars, the goods have not been sent in time. (Murqilinskij 1981:117)

- (4) *Ha'q'inu čan-s:a mašina-rtu b-i-ja. Qus t'ajla*
 today small-ADJi machine-PL 3-be-IMP.3SG goods send
d-ukr-an žu-š:a qa-r-šu-na.
 4-go.out-INF we-ABL NEG-4-become-AOR.3SG

There were too few cars today. We weren't able to send the goods. (Murqilinskij 1981:118)

⁵ I use *neutral* here as a pragmatic term for the ordinarily expected choice of grammatical category in a given context, regardless of whether the form in question is grammatically marked or unmarked for that category. Thus a form marked for a grammatical category can nonetheless be pragmatically neutral if its use is normally expected and its absence or avoidance would convey additional information. In the case of Lak, as noted in the main body of this article, the *assertive* is a marked grammatical category, but in the context of, e.g., proverbs or business letters, the *assertive* is pragmatically neutral.

⁴ Another difference between the two categories is that the nonassertive is always the unmarked category, whereas nonconfirmative can itself be a marked category. Here we must make clear the distinction between unmarked in the sense of 'non-specification for meaning A' as opposed to a marking of the type 'specified absence of meaning A'. The nonassertive is of the former type, i.e. it is unmarked in that it simply fails to say anything one way or the other about the category *assertive*. The nonconfirmative, however, which has the potential to be of this former type when opposed to a confirmative, can also be of the second type, i.e. it can specify the withholding of confirmation. This is the case, for example, of the Albanian admirative, which is limited to expressions of surprise, doubt, inference, report, etc. Although I first observed that surprise is a feeling which requires a state of mind in which the speaker would not have been willing to confirm something until the moment of its (unexpected) discovery (Friedman 1981), the notion was subsequently applied to Turkish using the term *unprepared mind* by Slobin & Aksu-Koç (1982) and to Japanese with the term *new information* by Akatsuka (1985). As I have made clear for Balkan Slavic (Friedman 1977, 1981) and as Slobin & Aksu (1982:193) have done for Turkish, in systems with marked confirmatives, nonconfirmatives cannot have true nonpast reference, i.e. they must always refer to some real or putative previous report or state of affairs. Even when used with apparent present meaning or an explicit future marker, the Balkan Slavic and Turkish nonconfirmatives always refer to something past, be it a statement or a pre-existing state of affairs. The Lak *assertive*, however, like the Albanian admirative, can have a true present (and future) meaning.

- (5) *Kiači-n us-ru d-a-rča, cila d-uka-js:ar.*
 dog-DAT shoe-PL 4-do-PRES.CD its.own 4-eat-ASPRES.3SG

If one makes shoes for a dog, it **eats** them. (Xajdakov 1961:117)

Example (6) contrasts a nonassertive with an assertive aorist. In this story, the narrator is explaining his suddenly running out of a mosque in the middle of leading communal prayer by claiming to have seen something through the wall of a mosque, which his interlocutors could not see, while his going out was witnessed by all.

- (6) *Čak b-ul-la-j una, tu-n ĉ'a-l-an kkačči. Allah-na-l*
 prayer 3-do-DUR-PRES.GER [I.be].DUR.GER me-DAT see-DUR-INF dog God-OBL-GEN
b-i-w-k'-una mizir-ta-l ĉ'ira ĉapal b-ul-la-l-is:a q:at:a ĉapur
 3-be-3- $\$$ -AOR.1SG mosque-OBL-GEN wall dirt 3-do-DUR- $\$$ -PTCP house infidel
ĉ-un q:a-b-it-an, na ta liq-an b-an la-w-g-s:ijaw.
 become-INF NEG-3-let-INF I it flee-INF 3-[do].INF go-3- $\$$ ASAOR.1SG
 [...] Allah's house be defiled, [...] I **went out** to make it run away. (Xalilov 1976:204)

In belles-lettres, stories frequently begin using past assertives to set the scene and then switch to simple pasts when the plot advancing action begins (Murqilinskij 1981:22, Friedman 1994b).

It is interesting to note that while in the past and present assertives are formed by means of the participial formant *-s:a* plus person marker (etymologically related to 'be', see note 3) and the nonassertive paradigms add the person marker to the appropriate present or past stem (the latter, as noted above, is usually distinguished from the former by means of an infix noun class marker), in the future the morphological expression is different: The nonassertive future adds the person marker to the future stem (the infinitive) while the assertive future adds the person marker to an extended stem (formed with what is etymologically the present gerund of the durative verb meaning 'say'), and the paradigm adding the person marker directly to the future stem is limited almost entirely to expressions of first person intent. Moreover, the future has a three-way opposition (assertive/nonassertive/intentional) as opposed to the binary opposition between assertive and nonassertive in the present and past tenses. Examples (7) through (12) are illustrative and are explained below:

- (7) *Na, uč-in muq:u-n, ra'zij-ra wi-l q:ama ha-i'n.*
 I say-INF word-OBL-DAT agree-am you.SG.OBL-GEN grain grind-INF
Tu-n ci b-ur! Amma, jarg-li-j b-a-w-c'u-s:a insan-tal
 me-DAT what 3-is but line-OBL-Supes 1-stand-I-S-PT person-PL

mu-ni-j ra'zij q:a-ĉ-un-s:ar
 this-OBL-Supes agree NEG-become-INF-FUT.3PL

I, of course, agree to grind your grain. What is it to me?! But, the people waiting in line **will not agree**. (Xalilov 1976:205)

- (8) *Āalif-lu-ĉ-gu k-unu b-ur: Agar na muq'-ilč'in wi-n*
 Caliph-OBL-POSS-and say-PAST.GER 3-is if I four-th you.SG.OBL-DAT
b-uc'i-rčan, ina ĉ-in-s:ar, ina-wa cuva idaws-ra, k-unu.
 3-pour-PRES.CD you say-INF-FUT you-EMPH self prophet-am say-PAST.GER
Ina uwč'u ĉ-unu-k:ar-a, — k-unu.
 you drunk become-PAST.GER-appear-2SG say-PAST.GER
 And to the Caliph he said: "If I pour you a fourth [cup of wine], you **will say** that you are the Prophet himself. You have apparently become drunk." (Xalilov 1976:213)

- (9) *Ci ba-n-s:ar, ha't:a hiwč-ru-guma lič'ilič'i-s:a sort-irda-l*
 what 3-do-INF-FUT.3SG even apple-PL-even various-ADJi sort-PL.OBL-GEN
b-ik'-aj-ĉ:a. Cawaj anawar-nu b-ija-j, gaj-mi
 3-be-PRES.GER-EMPH some.3 quick-ADV 3-arrive-PRES.GER those-ADJd
tak sut-i-ĉu-n-maj b-uc'a-j. Č'a-la-č'i-s:a-ks:a,
 only autumn-OBL-PODIR-3- $\$$ 3-mature-PRES.3SG see-DUR- $\$$ -PT-as
na ssut:i-l-mur sort uĉ-un-s:ar-a.
 I autumn-OBL-GEN-ADJd sort become-INF-FUT.1SG

So what, there are all kinds of apples. Some ripen quickly, some mature only in autumn. Probably I **will be** an autumn type. (Ha'mzatov 1972:129)

- (10) *T-i-ja čul-i-ja b-uč'-an-t'is:ari-w?*
 that-OBL-SupAB side-OBL-SupAB 3-come-ASF-IntFUT.3PL-Q
B-uč'-an-t'is:ar.
 3-come-INF-ASFUT.3PL
Wi-n q:a-k'ul-li-w, lodka č'a'ni d-uč'-awi-waw?
 you.SG.OBL-DAT NEG-know-is-Q boat soon 4-come-POT-Q
Ca-k'ra s:at-ra-wa d-uč'-an-s:ar.
 one-two hour-OBL-InAB 4-come-INF-FUT
 — Will they come from the other side?
 — They will come.
 — Do you know, might the boat arrive soon?
 — It will arrive in one or two hours. (Solořov 1960:3)

- (11) *U^x, na ina, kuč-lu-l o^rč', hič q:ā-it-an-na,*
 ugh I you bitch-OBL-GEN son not at all NEG-let-INF-IntFUT.1SG
wi-l-a komandir-na-n mu-kun-s:a xai-šiwu d-an!
 you.OBL-GEN-EMPH commander-OBL-DAT this-manner-ADJ1 betray-MAS 4-[do].INF
Ina tu-l ka-ni-š:a wa kilisa-lu-watu sağ-nu q:ā-uk-an-t'is:ara.
 you me-GEN hand-OBL-ABL this church-OBL-INEL health-ADV NEG-leave-INF-ASFUT.2SG
 Ugh, you son of a bitch, there's no way I'll let you betray your commander
 like that. With my own hands I'll see to it that you do not leave this church
 alive... (Šološov 1960:21)
- (12) *Ina xuluš-gu a-w-c'-unu, x:aržan-gu d-u-r-h-unu*
 you threshold-and stand-1- \bar{S} -PAST.GER dagger-and 4-grasp-4- \bar{S} -PAST.GER
da^r?wa-u^l, jala-mur na b-a-n-na.
 curse-evil then-ADJd.3 I 3-do-INF-IntFUT.1SG
 You, stand at the door holding a dagger and curse, I will do the rest.
 (Xalilov 1976:221)

In examples (7), (8), and (9), the speaker is making predictions without a sense of absolute certainty. Nonetheless, nonspecification for absolute certainty should not be confused with doubt. Each speaker has chosen to withhold his personal confirmation of the prediction, although it is clear from the context that he has some expectation that it will be fulfilled. In English, this sense is sometimes rendered lexically by the adverb *probably* (cf. Murkelinskij 1971:192-93). Example (7) is a miller's response to a mullah who is trying to cut ahead of other people in line waiting to have their grain ground. Example (8) is from a humorous tale, while in example (9), the author is comparing himself to an apple. Example (10) contrasts the nonassertive and assertive futures in referring to the same ontological event, viz. some people coming by boat to get some others stuck on the other side of a river. The assertive *Buč'ant'is:ar* 'they will come' expresses the speaker's conviction that the boat will arrive, whereas the nonassertive future *duč'ans:ar* 'it will come' is a speculation on when it will arrive. In the case of (11) and (12), the first person intentional futures *q:aitanna* 'I will not allow' and *banna* 'I will do' express the speakers' complete conviction and also intention concerning their own actions, while the assertive future *q:aukant'is:ara* 'you will not leave' in (11) expresses the speaker's convinced expectation concerning an action other than his own. Example (25) also contains the intentional future *bukinna* 'I will read'. Uslar (1890) and Murkelinskij (1971) use the terms *indefinite future* and *definite future* for what I call 'future' and 'assertive future', respectively, (for them the intentional future is a variant of the definite), while Žirkov (1955) uses 'categorical' where I use 'intentional' and 'intentional' where I use 'assertive'. From the data in Burč'uladze (1976:214-15) it is clear that what I call the intentional future was once a full

conjugation and functioned as the unmarked future. Aside from its use in the first person in modern Lak, it can also occur in some second person questions regarding the addressee's intent. It is clear that in modern Lak this paradigm expresses intention, which by its very nature is assertive. On the other hand, it is clear that what I call the assertive future does not always involve intent, as can be seen especially clearly from example (13), in which it is precisely unintentionality that is being categorically asserted:

- (13) *Č:ar-ča čima quž-ulu-x c'ux'-a, ca-l-a o^rrmu cukun*
 wanting-if any old.man-OBL-POES ask-IMPV self-GEN-EMPH life how
la-w-g-s:ari-w xawar x-uri-w? — k-unu. Mu-na-n
 go-3- \bar{S} -ASPF.3SG-Q news become-PERF.3SG-Q say.PAST.GER this-OBL-DAT
cukun-č'aw xawar x-unu q:ā-b-ik'-an-t'is:ar!
 how-NEG news become-PAST.GER NEG-3-be-INF-ASFUT.3SG
 Ask any old man if he has noticed how his life has passed. He will have no
 idea! (Šološov 1960:10).

Apparently what must originally have been the assertive future (infinitive + *-sa* + person marker) became bleached, while the nonassertive future became limited to expressions of personal intent, primarily in statements, but secondarily also in questions. A new assertive future arose inserting into the now bleached future what is etymologically the present gerund of 'say' (infinitive *t'un*, present gerund *t'ij*), i.e. 'I hereby assert that...' (see Burč'uladze 1976:214). The tendency of Lak to differentiate the first from other persons may have been responsible for the initial impetus of limiting the old nonassertive future to personal intent, while the existence of 'assertive' as a category in the present and past exerted pressure for its reinstatement as the nonassertive future became a first person intentional and the old assertive future became bleached to a nonassertive future.

Person and Synthetic Paradigm

The relationship between first person and speaker evaluation is intuitively obvious, but also affects paradigm formation in Lak. Of the twelve synthetic paradigms considered above, seven treat person in a distinctive fashion. In the aorist and imperfect paradigms, the morphological distinction is person (1st and 2nd)/non-person (3rd). In two of the three perfect paradigms, first person forms are drawn from morphological sources other than those of the remaining persons, whereas in the intentional future, the first person is almost all that remains of what was once, apparently, the unmarked paradigm. This special treatment of person, especially first person, is consistent with universal principles of the animacy hierarchy described in Silverstein (1976).

2.2. Analytic Paradigms

In addition to the extensive system of synthetic paradigmatic sets considered here, Lak also has a number of analytic paradigms, which are either neutral or nonconfirmative.⁶ Nonconfirmative readings encode meanings such as 'apparently, as it turns out, they say' while neutral meanings do not encode any nuance pertaining to status. Analytic paradigms are formed using a gerund or participle of the main verb plus a defective verb meaning 'be', which has the following finite paradigms (illustrated here by the third person with a class 3 marker): present (*bur*), past (*bija*), assertive present (*bus:ar*), and assertive past (*bus:ija*).

Thus, for example, the present progressive is a neutral analytic paradigm that combines the present gerund with the verb 'be' as in *na naj ura* 'I am coming' *ga naj ur* 'he is coming'. The analytic preterit comprised of the past gerund of the main verb plus the present tense of 'be' can have both neutral and nonconfirmative readings. As a nonconfirmative, it is the preferred tense of folk tales and can be used in connected narratives, as in example (14):⁷

- (14) *I-w-k'-un ur awadan-s:a Šamsu t'i-s:a jat-i-l zallu.*
 be-1-\$-PAST.GER [1].is rich-ADJi Šamsu say-PT sheep-OBL-GEN owner
Wa-na-l č'a'wu-s:a jat-u-ğat:ara b-i-w-k'-un b-ur.
 this-OBL-GEN much-ADJi sheep-cattle 3-be-3-\$-PAST.GER 3-is
Cal wa-na-n jala xira-mur kač'i b-i-w-k'-unu b-ur.
 Once he-OBL-DAT most dear-ADJd dog 3-die-3-\$-PAST.GER 3-is
Quma la-w-g-s:a Šamsu-l xukmu b-u-w-nu b-ur ga-ni-xa
 Sad go-1-\$-PT Šamsu-GEN decision 3-do-3-PAST.GER 3-is that-OBL-POAB
axirdanij-s:a xurmat b-an. Wa-na-l amru-l-in b-u-w-nu,
 last-ADJi respect 3-[do].INF this-OBL-GEN order-OBL-SupLA 3-do-3-PAST.GER
kač'i-l q'aq'ala suru-ra-wux d-i-r-q-unu d-ur, insan-na-l-s:a
 dog-GEN corpse shroud-OBL-INPR 4-put-4-\$-PAST.GER 4-is person-OBL-GEN-ADJi
kun-n-a, q'uran k:a-l-an b-i-w-k'-un b-ur, dua^f-rt:u d-ul-la-n
 like-4-\$ Koran read-DUR-INF 3-be-3-\$-PAST.GER 3-is prayer-PL 4-do-DUR-INF
b-i-w-k'-un b-ur wa xurmat-ra-š:al b-u-w-č'i-unu b-ur.
 3-be-3-\$-PAST.GER 3-is and respect-OBL-COM 3-bury-3-\$-PAST.GER 3-is
Ga-ni-l hata-j malla šanna xunu wa q'ini q'uran
 that-OBL-GEN grave-SupES mullah three night and day Koran

⁶ By *neutral* here I mean not markedly nonconfirmative.

⁷ In some of these examples, the complete verbal construction also includes an uninflected lexical element (e.g. *hu'kmu buwnu bur* 'decided'), infinitive (*ban buwnu bur* 'held, caused to be made'), or present gerund (*kalaj iw'k'un ur* 'read, was reading'). These modifications allow for flexibility of expression but do not alter the basic perfect tense construction (cf. Murkelinskij 1971:195-205 and examples 16a-c).

- k:a-la-j i-w-k'-un ur. Ga-ni-ja cadaq'a*
 read-DUR-PRES.GER be-1-\$-PAST.GER [1].is that-OBL-SupAB charity
b-ul-la-j, Šamsu-l wa'rajx-bukult, miškin-tal-paq'ir-tal
 3-do-DUR-PRES.GER Šamsu-GEN streets-wanderers poor-PL-helpless-PL
d-uk-an b-ul-la-j i-w-k'-un ur.
 4-eat-INF 3-do-DUR-PRES.GER be-1-\$-PAST.GER [1].is
Jala q'ulhu-gu b-an b-u-w-nu b-ur.
 then wake-and 3-[do].INF 3-do-3-PAST.GER 3-is.

There **was** a rich householder named Shamsu. He **had** lots of sheep and cattle. One [day] his favorite dog **died**. The grief-stricken Shamsu **decided** to pay him last respects. He **ordered** the dog's corpse **wrapped** in a shroud, as if it were a person, and **had** the Koran **read** over it and prayers **said** for it and **had** it **buried** with respect. A mullah **read** the Koran over its grave for three days and nights. Shamsu **gave out** charity and **fed** the homeless and the poor. Then he **held** a wake. (Xalilov 1976:203)

Although the analytic preterit illustrated in example (14) can have nonconfirmative nuances, it can also function as an unmarked resultative tense form, as in examples (17a and b), which are opposed to (18a and b). The present participle plus defective 'be' can also be used to render a nonconfirmative type of present, as in example (15)

- (15) *Burc'-i-l likura-l maj-ni-jar wi-n qin-s:a cič'aw*
 wolf-OBL-GEN bone-GEN marrow-OBL-*than* you.SG.OBL-DAT good-ADJi nothing
d-a-q:a-s:a d-ur
 4-be-NEG-PT 4-is.

[**Apparently**] **there isn't** any better [medicine] for you than the marrow of a wolf's [shin]-bone. (Murkelinskij 1967:506)

Moreover the present gerund of durative verbs and the past gerund of nondurative verbs can be accompanied by the present participle of defective 'be' (*bus:a*) or the past gerund of the full verb 'be' (*biw'k'un*), or both, plus conjugated defective 'be' to form nonconfirmative expressions as illustrated with a present durative *lač'lan* 'to take hold' in (16) (based on Murkelinskij 1971:198-205):

- (16a) *Čaral lač'-la-j d-us:a d-ur*
 rain take.hold-DUR-PRES.GER 4-[be].Pr.Pt 4-[is]PRES.3SG
 It is raining [apparently].
- (16b) *Čaral lač'-la-j d-i-r-k'-un d-ur*
 rain take.hold-DUR-PRES.GER 4-be-4-\$-PAST.GER 4-[is]PRES.3SG
 It was raining [apparently].

- (16c) *Ġaral lač'-la-j* *d-i-r-k'-un* *d-us:a* *d-ur*
 rain take.hold-DUR-PRES.GER 4-be-4- $\text{\$}$ -PAST.GER 4-[be].Pr.Pt 4-[is]PRES.3SG
 It had been raining [apparently].

3. CHOICE OF CASE AND AGREEMENT PATTERNS

According to Kibrik (1978:9), different agreement patterns are used to signal degree of commitment to the statement. In an ordinary Lak transitive sentence, the participant corresponding to the English subject will be in the genitive case (functioning as an ergative) unless that participant is a first or second person pronoun, which will be in the nominative. The participant corresponding to the English direct object will ordinarily be in the nominative case, and the verb will agree with it. Analytic preterit constructions based on transitive verbs, however, are of a mixed type insofar as the past gerund that carries the lexical meaning is transitive while the auxiliary 'be' that makes it a finite construction is intransitive. If both the gerund and the auxiliary agree with the direct object (and the subject is genitive except for the first two persons), then the construction has a nonconfirmative nuance, as in (17a) and (17b), in which *čwu* 'horse' is class three, the initial *b-* and infix *-w-* of *bawčunu* 'having sold' mark class three agreement, as does the initial *b-* of *bur* 'is', while the zero ending of *bur* indicates third person, i.e. *čwu* governs both the gerund and the auxiliary:

- (17a) *Na b-a-w-č'-unu* *b-ur* *čwu*.
 I 3-sell-3- $\text{\$}$ -PAST.GER 3-is horse
 [Apparently] I sold the horse.
- (17b) *Ga-na-l b-a-w-č'-unu* *b-ur* *čwu*.
 he-OBL-GEN 3-sell-3- $\text{\$}$ -PAST.GER 3-is horse
 [Apparently] he sold the horse.

If, however, the construction is treated as if it were syntactic rather than analytic, i.e. if the verb 'be' is treated as an independent intransitive (which will take and agree with a nominative subject), so that only the gerund is governed by the direct object, then the construction is an ordinary perfect, as in (18a) and (18b) where the absence of an overt initial class marker in *ur* and *ura* signals class one agreement (the assumption being that the seller is a male human) and the ending *-a* is the first/second person singular marker.

- (18a) *Na b-a-w-č'-unu* *ur-a* *čwu*.
 I 3-sell-3- $\text{\$}$ -PAST.GER [1].am-1SG horse
 I have sold the horse.

- (18b) *Ga b-a-w-č'-unu* *ur* *čwu*.
 he 3-sell-3- $\text{\$}$ -PAST.GER [1].is horse
 He has sold the horse.

If the agent of an ordinary transitive sentence is put in the ablative case (*-š:a*), a sense of nonvolitionality is conveyed, as in (19a) and (19b) as well as (4) above:⁸

- (19a) *Tu-š:a b-a-w-č'-unu* *b-ur* *čwu*.
 me-ABL 3-sell-3- $\text{\$}$ -PAST.GER 3-is horse
 I [accidentally] sold the horse.
- (19b) *Ga-na-š:a b-a-w-č'-unu* *b-ur* *čwu*.
 he-OBL-ABL 3-sell-3- $\text{\$}$ -PAST.GER 3-is horse
 He [accidentally] sold the horse.

Some verbs, however, require an ablative agent, as is the case for *bučqlan* 'be able' (durative aspect) in (20a-b):

- (20a) *Tu-š:a wa čwu b-ač'-an b-učq-la-j* *b-ur*.
 me-ABL this horse 3-sell-INF 3-can-DUR-PRES.GER 3-is
 I can sell this horse.
- (20b) *Ga-na-š:a wa čwu b-ač'-an b-učq-la-j* *b-ur*.
 he-OBL-GEN this horse 3-sell-INF 3-can-DUR-PRES.GER 3-is
 He can sell this horse.

4. REPORTED SPEECH AND QUOTATIVITY

In general, reported speech in Lak is rendered by direct quotation with some form of the verb 'to say', some of whose forms function almost like particles, although in fact they can all be considered as parts of the verbal paradigm. The nondurative infinitive of this verb is *učin*, whose regular past gerund is *uwkunu* (*-w-* is the class 1 marker), pronounced [ükunu], but this gerund has a reduced form, *kunu* which is used both in forming analytic tenses and as a kind of past quotative particle. The progressive infinitive of *učin* is *t'un*, whose present gerund is *t'ij* and whose synthetic third singular present is *t'ar*. The form *t'ij* has been compared by Uslar (1890:184) to the Turkish quotative gerund *diye* 'saying' or the

⁸ The dative case is used for the "underlying" subject of certain verbs of sensation, desire, etc. (so-called 'affective verbs'),

- i. *Tu-n wa čwu b-ač'-an č'a-j* *b-ur*. I want to sell this horse.
 me-DAT this horse 3-sell-INF want-PRES.GEN 3-is
- ii. *Ga-na-n wa čwu b-ač'-an č'a-j* *b-ur*. He wants to sell this horse.
 he-OBL-DAT this horse 3-sell-INF want-PRES.GEN 3-is

Russian quotative particle *mol* (from *molvit'* 'to say'; cf. also the Bulgarian quotative particle *kaj* from *kaže* 'one says' or the Georgian quotative particle *-o* from the third singular aorist *tkva* 'one said it'). The following examples are illustrative. Example (21) repeats example (8), but this time with emphasis on the rendering of the report, which is quite typical. The quotation is introduced with a finite verb of reporting (often the analytic preterit *kunu bur* 'said', where the object of the verb is the quotation itself, which takes the unmarked agreement marker, class 3) and is closed by the past gerund *kunu*. In example (21), *kunu* marks the end of each quoted sentence. Example (22) shows the same use of the present gerund of *t'un*. Because this verb is of durative aspect, it does not have a past gerund. Rather, to form the analytic preterit the present gerund is combined with the analytic preterit of 'be'. The present gerund *t'ij* is then repeated to mark the end of the quotation.⁹

- (21) *Xalif-lu-š-gu k-unu b-ur: Agar na muq'-ilč'in wi-n*
 Caliph-OBL-POSS-and say-PAST.GER 3-is if I four-th you.SG.OBL-DAT
b-uc'i-rčan, ina č-in-s:ar, ina-wa cuva idaws-ra, k-unu.
 3-pour-PRES.CD you say-INF-FUT you-EMPH self prophet-am say-PAST.GER

Ina uwču š-unu-kar-a, — k-unu.
 you drunk become-PAST.GER-appear-2SG say-PAST.GER

And to the Caliph he said: "If I pour you a fourth [cup of wine], you will say that you are the Prophet himself. You have apparently become drunk."
 (Xalilov 1976:213)

- (22) *Wa šawar b-a-w-nu b-ur qun-ma malla-na-n. [...]*
 This news 3-hear-3-PAST.GER 3-is big-ADJD mullah-OBL-DAT.
Ga t'-ij i-w-k'-un ur: "Wa ci ha'ja d-a-q:a-šiwu-r!
 this say-DUR-PRES.GER be-1-\$.PAST.GER [1]is this what shame 4-be-NEG-MAS-is
Wa-na-l cina^fw din-dalu-l inšan-tal q'a'rq'-ara-wun
 He-OBL-GEN all faith-OBL-GEN person-PL filth-OBL-INLA
b-i-w-č-unn-i-š:a! [...] — t'-ij
 1-hurl-1-\$.PERF-3SG-EMPH say-DUR-PRES.GER

The chief mullah heard this news. [...] He exclaimed: "What shamelessness is this! He has polluted all the faithful!" (Xalilov 1976:203)

⁹ The difference between these two forms is aspectual, and their use in narrative appears to be one of style similar to the alternation of past and historical present tenses for the sake of rendering parts of the narrative more vivid. Other tenses and aspects of these verbs are also used: For example, in Šoloxov (1960:7), a quoted dedication embroidered on a silk pouch is introduced with the analytic imperfect *čiwčunu bija* 'it was written' and closed with *t'ij* 'saying'. The effect is a neutral past stative one. However, the details of such questions of tense-aspect usage are beyond the scope of this paper.

According to Murkelinskij (1971:197), the quotative *t'ar* is used when the speaker is not willing to vouch for the report. To illustrate his analysis, he adduces the following examples:

- (23a) *Ta šawa ur* He is at home.
 he at.home [1].is
 (23b) *Ta šawa us:ar* He definitely is at home.
 he at.home is. ASPRES.3SG
 (23c) *Ta šawa us:a ur* He [apparently] is at home.
 he at.home is.PT [1].is
 (23d) *Ta šawa ur t'ar.* He is at home, they say.
 he at.home.1 [1].is QUOT
 (23e) *Ta šawa us:ar t'ar.* He definitely is at home, they say.
 he at.home is. ASPRES.3SG QUOT

According to Murkelinskij (1971:197), examples (23c-e) are all 'unwitnessed' (*zaglaznoe*), but the particle *t'ar* is used to emphasize uncertainty. The following example, however, shows *t'ar* as a simple quotative particle:

- (24) *Ina — t'ar — awlija š-unu ur-a-w, wa k'irišiw-ri-j*
 you QUOT crazy become-PAST.GER 1.be-1SG-Q this heat-OBL-SupES
o'rč'-a-j sukno-ra-l ha'žak laš-l-an!
 boy-OBL-SupES homespun-OBL-GEN trousers dress-DUR-INF

You — she says — have you gone crazy, dressing a boy in heavy clothes in this heat?! (Šoloxov 1960:40).

In example (24), the speaker is quoting something his landlady said to him, and so it is clear that *t'ar* is being used as a quotative particle and not as a marker of evidentiality or status.

In Xalilov (1976), the form *t'ar* occurs eleven times in a corpus of approximately 7,500 words, but the usage is identical on all occasions. The particle is suffixed to the third singular imperfect of *učin* 'to say' at the end of a tale when one of the characters delivers the closing quotation which is always a reply to some previous statement and constitutes the climax or punch line of the tale. Although the form closes the quotation in three tales, in seven the form introduces the final quotation, which is then closed with *kunu* as in example (25) below.

- (25) *Wa čurtal š-un q:a-it-la-j malla-na-l č-ajwa-t'ar:*
 this finish become-INF NEG-let-DUR-PRES.GER mullah-OBL-GEN say-3SG.IMPV-QUOT
 — *Ha'jp! Ga-ni-jn kačči ma-č-a-ra! ... Žu-l-a dus uč-a,*
 pity that-OBL-SupLA dog NEG-say-IMPV-PL we-GEN-EMPH friend say-IMPV

žu-l-a us:u uč-a! Tu-n kak-an d-a ga-ni-l haw.
 we-GEN-EMPH brother say-IMPV me-DAT show-INF 4-[do].IMPV that-OBL-GEN grave.
Na ga-ni-l ha-t:a-j ga-ni-l ruh-i'ra-ja q'uran
 I that-OBL-GEN grave-OBL-Supes that-OBL-GEN soul-OBL-SupAB Koran
b-uk-in-na! — k-unu.
 3-read-INF-INTFUT.1SG say-PAST.GER

Without letting him finish, the mullah said: "For shame! Do not say 'dog' of him! Say 'our friend, our brother'! Show me his grave! I shall read the Koran over his grave for the sake of his soul!" (Xalilov 1976:204)

The tales in Xalilov (1976) are all related in the analytic preterit, which is the tense form used in nonconfirmative narration (example [14] is typical). The form *čajwa*, however, is a synthetic imperfect, and thus the quotative particle is added to maintain the nonconfirmative distance while increasing the stylistic intensity appropriate for a climactic moment. This same device is used in all the folk in tales in Xalilov and Xajdakov (1989) that end in a quoted punch line, including all the Nasreddin Hodja tales, for which the characteristic riposte is a typical ending.

Kozinceva (1994:99) cites the use of *t'ar* with reported imperatives as if it were an evidential marker, but if we examine the original corpus of epic songs from which her example is taken (Xalilov 1969), it becomes clear that *t'ar* is being used to mark quotation. In this corpus of approximately 11,500 words, *t'ar* occurs fourteen times, of these, four times with the hortative *nanu* 'let's go', twice with the imperative *lasi* 'bring', and eight times with other verb forms. Moreover, the form itself is written sometimes as a separate word and sometimes as a suffixed clitic, as can be seen in example (26), in which a dying youth's mother comes to his beloved and delivers the following speech:

(26) *Na-nu t'ar, na-nu t'ar, Cač'an na-nu-t'ar, I-w-č'-awa-j,*
 go-HRT QUOT go-HRT QUOT quickly go-HRT-QUOT die-1-\$-ITER-PRES.GER
wi-š ma'q'-nu, kak-an č-i-aj b-ur t'ar.
 you.OBL-POES thirst-ADV see-INF want-PRES.GER 3-is QUOT

Let's go, **she says**, let's go, **she says**, quickly, let's go, **she says**, [your] dying [beloved] is burning with desire to see you, **she says**. (Xalilov 1969:2)

In this example, it is clear from the hortative that the mother is not quoting her son, but rather the girl is quoting what the mother is saying to her in the context of the ballad. Moreover, imperatives are reported using *kunu* as in example (27):

(27) *Šamsu-l amru b-u-w-nu b-ur, jat-i-l turzan-dali-wa jala*
 Šamsu-GEN order 3-do-3-PAST.GER 3-is sheep-OBL-GEN pen-OBL-INAB most
buč-mi š'u'c'al-va t:a liq'ij b-a-ra, k-unu.
 fat-ADJD fifty-3 ewe separate 3-[do].IMPV-PL say-PAST.GER
 Šamsu gave an order to select [*lit.* select! saying] the fifty fattest ewes in his fold. (Xalilov 1976:209)

5. DEDUCTION AND INFERENCE

The use of the present gerund *čaj* 'appearing' is included by Murkelinskij (1971:199) as a kind of "unwitnessed" (*zaglaznoe*). It is clear from example (28), however, that the meaning is that of deduction or inference, and the evidence can be witnessed. The context for example (28) is the following: A guest is sitting on the verandah with his host and hostess. The hostess cuts off a piece of dried meat hanging from the rafter, throws it in the soup pot, and goes into the house. When the kettle starts to boil, the host cuts off another piece of meat, throws it in, and then is called away by a neighbor. The guest then cuts off and throws in a third piece of meat. When the mistress of the house comes to make the dumplings and sees three pieces of meat in the pot she expresses surprise. Example (28) is the end of the story:

(28) *Las-na-l k-unu b-ur: Dik' čan-s:a xı-aj, k'ilčin-mur*
 husband-OBL-GEN say-PAST.GER 3-is meat small-ADJD seem-PRES.GER second-ADJD
kasak na b-ut-aw. Jala qamaliču-na-l-gu k-unu b-ur:
 piece I 3-threw-TYPF.1SG then guest-OBL-GEN-and say-PAST.GER 3-is
Harca-nna-l canma canmas:a kasak b-ut-an a'arkin-s:a š-aj,
 each-OBL-GEN to.self for.self piece 3-throw-INF need-ADJD seem-PRES.GER
na-gu ca kasak b-ut-aw.
 I-too one piece 3-throw-TYPF.1SG

The husband said: "It seemed [to me that] there was too little meat, [so] I threw in the second piece." Then the guest said: "It seemed that each person was supposed to put in a piece for himself, so I have thrown in a piece, too." (Xalilov 1976:210)

The verb *šan* can also be used where English would use 'think' in the sense of 'speculate' as in the following example:

- (29) *Jaltu huqa lik-aw-ri-jnu ina-wa rjadowoj-na-ža*
 upper shirt take off-MAS-OBL-INST you-EMPH infantryman-OBL-POAB
laš-an-s:a ž-aj ura-w?
 resemble-INF-ADJi seem-PRES.GER 1.be.2SG-Q

Do you **think** that if you take off your military shirt you will pass for an common soldier? (Šološov 1960:20)

According to Murkelinskij (1971: 177, 199, 205) the suffix, *-kar* expresses uncertainty and doubt (*neuverenost', somnenie*) and corresponds to the Russian *kažetsja* 'it seems' (Georgian *turme*; cf. also Xajdakov 1966: 191). This suffix is actually a cliticized finite verb form, however, as can be seen from example (8) – repeated here as (30) – and (31), which both show agreement with singular and plural second person subjects, while (32) shows agreement with the class three direct object *čağar*.

- (30) *Agar na muq'-ilč'in wi-n b-uc'i-rčan, ina č-in-s:ar, ina-wa*
 if I four-th you.SG.OBL-DAT 3-pour-CD you say-INF-FUT you-EMPH
cuwa idaws-ra, k-unu. Ina uwču ž-unu-kar-a.
 self prophet-am say-PAST.GER you drunk become-PAST.GER-appear-2SG

If I pour you a fourth [cup of wine], you will say that you are the Prophet himself, he said. You **have apparently become** drunk. (Xalilov 1976:213)

- (31) *Zu zana-j b-unu-kar-u.*
 you.PL walk-DUR.PRES.GER 1-[be].PRES.GER-appear-1PL

You (plural) **apparently are walking**. (Murkelinskij 1971:199)

- (32) *Ta-na-l čağar č-i-w-č-unu-kar.*
 he-OBL-GEN letter write-3-Š-PAST.GER-appear

He **apparently wrote** a letter. (Murkelinskij 1971:199)

6. ADMIRATIVITY AND DUBITATIVITY

In previous work (Friedman 1981, 1982, 1988) I have shown that the Albanian admirative differs significantly from admirative usage in Balkan Slavic, Turkish, and Georgian. The Albanian admirative is a special set of paradigms, including a true present tense, all marked for nonconfirmativity and used to express the speaker's surprise at an unexpected fact or event as well as for doubt, disbelief, reportedness, etc. (cf. Friedman 1988, 1994). Admirative usage is an emotive use of the unmarked (nonconfirmative only in its opposition to the confirmative) past or perfect to express surprise at the present discovery of the existence of a pre-

existing state.¹⁰ In this respect, Lak is like Balkan Slavic, Turkish and Georgian insofar as admirativity is expressed by usage, not by paradigm. Although in previous work (Friedman 1988) I stated that Lak did not use the analytic preterit admiratively, based on the fact that I was unable to elicit suitable examples and was told by Lak linguists that such usage did not occur, I have since discovered that the analytic preterit can be used admiratively to express surprise at the present discovery of a pre-existing state. The one example that I have so far is particularly interesting, since it demonstrates, among other things, the facultativity of admirative usage. In the original Russian, the meaning 'you are' is rendered by a normal zero copula, and the surprise is rendered lexically by 'it turns out'. In Albanian, however, a present admirative is used without any additional lexical specification. The Lak, Turkish, and Bulgarian translators all used preterit/perfect forms (the analytic preterit in Lak, the *miş*-past in Turkish, and the indefinite past in Bulgarian) which in this context have precisely the emotive effect of the Albanian present admirative. The Macedonian and Georgian translators, however, who had exactly the same type of option available (the Macedonian could have been *si bil* as in Bulgarian, whereas the Georgian could have used the second person present perfect *q'opilxar*), chose a present tense form with a lexical verb, i.e. a more literal rendition of the Russian.

- (33a) *Dumal, čto ty menja udariš' s pravoj, no ty, okazyvaetsja,*
 thought that you me will hit with right but you it turns out
smirnyj paren'. [Russian, Šološov1982:14]
 peaceful lad

- (33b) *Qën-k-e djalë i urtë. Pandeha se do të më jepje*
 be-ADM-2SG boy PartC quiet I thought that FUT SUBJ me give.IMP.F.2SG
ndonjë grusht me dorën e djathtë. [Albanian, Shollohov 1978:22]
 some fist with hand.ACC PartC right

- (33c) *Tu-n ina urč'a-mur ka-ni-ž tu-jž-ra riš'un-s:a x-i-wa,*
 me-DAT you right-ADJd hand-OBL-POES me-SupPR-am hit-INF-PTCP seem-IMP.F.3SG
ina t'urča imin-s:a insan i-w-k'-un ur-a.
 you as for peaceful-ADJi person [1].be-1-Š-PAST.GER [1].are-2SG
 [Lak, Šološov 1960:19]

¹⁰ In Friedman (1977, 1981, 1982, 1988, 1994a, 1998) I discuss in detail my arguments concerning the Balkan Slavic, Turkish, and Georgian preterit systems. These details need not concern us here, however, the point is that a preterit or perfect can be used with apparent present meaning.

(33d) *Sen yine dayanıklı oğlan-mış-sın, dedi, ben bunu yapar-ken*
 you then peaceful boy-mış.PAST-2SG he.said I this.ACC doing-while
sen-in sağlam el-in-le bana yumruk-lar ekley-eceğ-in-i
 you-GEN right hand-your-with me.DAT fist-PL bash-FUT-2SG-ACC
san-mış-ti-m. [Turkish, Şolohov 1969:21]
 think-mış.PAST-di.PAST-1SG

(33e) *Misl-e-h, će šte me udariš s djasna-ta, no ti*
 thought-IMPF-1SG that FUT me you.hit with right-the but you
si bi-l krotko momče. [Bulgarian, Šolohov 1981:24]
 are be-L.PTCP mild lad

(33f) *Misl-e-v deka ke me tresneš so desna-ta, no ti,*
 thought-IMPF-1SG that FUT me you hit with right-the but you
izgleda, si miren čovek. [Macedonian, Šolohov 1970:16]
 it appears are mild person

(33g) *megona mardžvenit gamart'q'amdi, magram čans, momtmeni*
 I.thought with.right you.would.hit.me but it.seems peaceful
bič'i xar. [Georgian, Šoloxovi 1966:23]
 boy you.are
 I thought you were going to hit me with your right [hand], but apparently
 [as it turns out to my surprise] you are a peaceful lad.

The nonconfirmative clitic *-kar* and the emphatic particle *-xa* are used to render similar admirative effects, as seen in example (34c), which is a Lak translation of the original Russian (34a) and is given together with the Albanian translation in (34b) for comparison:¹¹

(34a) *A ty bogato žive-š', papiros-k-i kuri-š'.*
 and/but you richly live-PRES.2SG cigarette-DIM-PL smoke-PRES.2SG
 But you live richly, you smoke [store-bought] cigarettes.
 (Šoloxov 1982:593)

(34b) *Po ti qën-k-e pasanik, pi-k-e cigare ië hekurosura!*
 but you be-ADM-2SG rich.person drink-ADM-2SG cigarettes PartC rolled
 But you are [to my surprise] rich, you smoke [as I discover] rolled
 cigarettes. (Shollohov 1978:9)

¹¹ In the Balkan Slavic and Turkish translations, ordinary present tenses are used (cf. Friedman 1982).

(34c) *Ina-ri-w avadanu unu-k:ar-a, p'ap'rusu*
 you-are.2SR-EMPH rich [1.be].PRES.GER-appear-2SG cigarette
t'-ij ur-a-x:a.
 say-PRES.GER [1]be-2SG-EMPH
 Indeed you are rich [apparently], you smoke [store-bought] cigarettes.
 (Sološov 1960:6)

In the Russian original (34a), the two verbs are simple present tenses in which the speaker is expressing surprise at the discovery that his interlocutor smokes something better than home-grown tobacco, based on the cigarettes that he sees drying on a rock. In Albanian (34b), the two verbs are present admiratives, i.e. both the surprised inference and the description of the surprising, newly discovered evidence. In Lak (34c), the first verb is the present gerund of defective 'be' followed by the clitic *-kar* (with second singular agreement) expressing the inference. The second verb is a compound expression ending in a second singular present tense copula followed by the emphatic particle *-xa*, which is emphasizing the newly discovered fact. This particle can be added to any verb form. Consider in this connection the end of example (22), which is repeated here as (35):

(35) *Wa xawar b-a-w-nu b-ur qun-ma malla-na-n. [...]*
 This news 3-hear-3-PAST.GER 3-is big-ADJD mullah-OBL-DAT.
Ga t'-ij i-w-k'-un ur: "Wa ci ha'ja d-a-q:a-šiwu-r!
 this say.DUR-PRES.GER be-1-\$-PAST.GER [1]is: this what shame 4-be-NEG-MAS-is
Wa-na-l cina^v din-dalu-l inšan-tal q'a'rq'-ara-wun
 He-OBL-GEN all faith-OBL-GEN person-PL filth-OBL-INLA
b-i-w-č-unn-i-x:a!
 1-hurl-1-\$-PERF-3SG-EMPH
 The chief mullah heard this news. [...] "What shamelessness is this! He has
 polluted all the faithful!" (Xalilov 1976:203)

Example (35) is exclaimed by a mullah upon hearing a report that a rich man has buried his favorite dog as if it were a human being. The form *biwčunni-xa* is a transitive perfect with the emphatic *-xa*. Among other things, this form demonstrates that while the nonassertive perfect is used confirmatively (cf. note 5), the information on which the usage is based can be a report.

Dubitativity is the ironic or sarcastic use of a marked nonconfirmative or a preterit or perfect in the repetition of a real or putative previous statement. I have not encountered or been able to elicit such usage in Lak, nor was I able to in Georgian (Friedman 1988). Boeder (2000:289), however, was able to elicit Georgian translations of my Balkan Slavic dubitative examples using perfects, and so apparently such usage is possible. Example (36) is typical of this type of usage. Two people are arguing with one another:

- (36a) —*Toj znae poveke od tebe.* — *Toj poveke znael!*
 he knows more from you he more knew
 [Macedonian, Friedman 1977:78]
- (36b) —*man šen-ze meti icis.* — *Namdivlad meti scodnia.*
 he you-on more knows of course more he has known
 [Georgian, Boeder 2000:289]
- He knows more than you do. — [Oh sure] he knows more [indeed!]

It may also be the case that Lak can use an analytic preterit in such a way, but further research is required.

7. CONCLUSION.

Lak shows a combination of important typological similarities with – and structural differences from – the Indo-European, Altaic, and Kartvelian types of status oppositions. As I have argued elsewhere (e.g. Friedman 1988, 1998), Balkan Slavic, Turkish, and Georgian all have markedly confirmative preterits to which perfect-derived pasts are opposed as not marked for confirmativity. This opposition leads to these perfect-derived unmarked pasts having chief contextual variant meanings of nonconfirmative (unwitnessed, reported, inferred, admirative, dubitative) and, moreover, new past tenses using old perfects as auxiliaries (Bulgarian *bil* + *l*-participle, Macedonian *imal* + neuter verbal adjective, Turkish *-miş* + *-miş*) are markedly nonconfirmative. In Georgian the situation is a little less clear than Turkish and Balkan Slavic (see especially Boeder 2000), but close enough for typological comparative purposes. Albanian has no marking for confirmativity but does have a perfect-derived marked nonconfirmative (the admirative paradigms). The Lak assertive, while similar to a confirmative, is nonetheless different in its semantics and therefore in its occurrence. The grammaticalization of markedness for assertion seems to carry the semantics of the Turkish copulative *-dir* or English *do* one step further. As a statement of assertive rather than confirmative judgment, the assertive can occur with presents and futures as well as pasts, although the nature of presentness and futurity is such that while a past assertive will be very much like a confirmative, present and future assertives are of a more gnomic or neutral type. In the case of the future, it appears that the original nonassertive future became limited to statements of first person intent, which resulted in the bleaching of the older assertive future into an unmarked future and the creation of a new assertive future. This in turn is connected with the phenomenon of heterogeneous conjugation, which is a peculiarity of Lak (and perhaps other Daghestanian languages) in its reinforcement of the fact that first person speech is normally vouched-for. The association of the analytic preterits with nonconfirm-

ativity is very much like that found in Balkan Slavic, Albanian, Turkish, and Georgian, where even those nonconfirmative forms which are now synthetic are all ultimately of analytic, perfect origin. This same type of nonconfirmative is found in Avar and other Daghestanian languages. In the case of Balkan Slavic, we know this development post-dates contact with Turkish, and the available evidence favors this view for Albanian as well. Moreover, the feature can be reanalyzed and borrowed, as was the case in Vlah (Frasheriote Aromanian dialect of Bela di Suprã), which reanalyzed the Albanian third person singular present admirative marker as a particle marking nonconfirmativity and added it to a native participial base. For example, the Albanian perfect *ka punuar* '[s/he] has worked' is the historical source of the present admirative *punuaka* 's/he works [to my surprise, etc.]', which in turn serves as the model for the Vlah *lukracka*, which is a present tense marked nonconfirmative used for all persons and numbers and is derived from the native past participle *lukrat* 'worked' plus the re-interpreted Albanian *-ka* (see Friedman 1994a for details). The manipulation of subject and agreement marking, while reminiscent of the manipulation of person and case marking in Georgian, where the case of the subject depends on both the tense of the verb and the class to which it belongs, is nonetheless specifically Daghestanian in nature insofar as the noun classes typical of Northeast Caucasian play a crucial role in the marking (Kartvelian languages lack grammatical gender).¹² Although emphatic, nonconfirmative, and reportative particles occur in other languages (e.g. reportative *de* and *mol* in Russian, *kaj* in Bulgarian, *-o*, *-tko*, *-metki* in Georgian, *cică* in Romanian, dubitative *gjoja* in Albanian, *už* in Bulgarian, etc.), the emphatic and nonconfirmative clitics of Lak seem to function in such a way that they are used pragmatically to enrich the expression of markedly nonconfirmative admirative and dubitative meanings as well as reported speech. The Lak quotative particle functions as a discourse marker, often with other verbs of reporting.

The data from Lak support certain typological – or at least areal – characterizations of both where status meanings are located in grammatical systems and how those meanings are related to semantic categories that arise repeatedly. Examples are the association of a nuance of vouching with synthetic paradigms and not vouching with analytic (perfect) paradigms and the association of report, inference, and surprise with not vouching.¹³ The Lak system also highlights the difference between confirmativity, which is inherently linked to the past tenses,

¹² In the Georgian aorist, which is a synthetic confirmative, the subject is ergative and the direct object is dative-accusative in most transitive verbs, whereas in the perfect, which is nonconfirmative and of analytic origin although synchronically synthetic, the subject is dative and the direct object is nominative, and agreement marking is conditioned by case marking.

¹³ Sarcastic disbelief also belongs here for many languages, but I have not yet established this for Lak.

and assertiveness, which can be past or nonpast. Lak uses person marking, noun class agreement, and both inflecting lexical items and particles to reinforce its various status distinctions.

REFERENCES

- AKATSUKA, N., 1985, Conditionals and the Epistemic Scale, *Language* 61, p. 625-39.
- ARONSON, H. I., 1967, *The Grammatical Categories of the Indicative in the Contemporary Bulgarian Literary Language. To Honor Roman Jakobson*, Vol. 1, The Hague, Mouton, p. 82-98.
- , 1977, On the Interrelationships between Aspect and Mood in Bulgarian, *Folia Slavica* 1/1, p. 9-32.
- , 1991, "Towards a Typology of Verbal Categories", in: L. R. Waugh and S. Rudy (eds), *New Vistas in Grammar: Invariance and Variation*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, p. 111-32.
- BOEDER, W., 2000, "Evidentiality in Georgian", in: L. Johanson and B. Utas (eds), *Evidentials in Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, p. 275-338.
- BURČ'ULADZE, G., 1979, "Voprosy stanovlenija ličnogo sprjaženija v laskom jazyke", *Iberiu-k'avk'asiuri enatmecnierebis c'elic'deuli* 6, p. 176-246.
- DANKOFF, R. (ed. and transl. with James Kelly), 1982, *Mahmud al-Kāšgarī Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Luġāt at-Turk.)* (Turkish Sources 7, ed. by Şinasi Tekin and Gönül Alpay Tekin) Part I, Cambridge MA: Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures.
- FIELDER, G. E., 1997, "The Discourse Properties of Verbal Categories and Implications for Balkan Verbal Categories", *Balkanistica* 10, p. 162-84.
- FRIEDMAN, V. A., 1977, *The Grammatical Categories of the Macedonian Indicative*, Columbus, Slavica.
- , 1981, "Admirativity and Confirmativity," *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 17/1, p. 12-28.
- , 1982, "Admirativity in Bulgarian Compared with Albanian and Turkish", *Bulgaria Past and Present*, Vol. 2, Sofia, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, p. 63-67.
- , 1984, "Status and the Lak Verbal System", *Folia Slavica* 7/1-2, p. 135-49.
- , 1988, "The Category of Evidentiality in the Balkans and the Caucasus", in: A. M. Schenker, (ed.), *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists: Linguistics*, Columbus, Slavica, p. 121-139.
- , 1989, "On the Terminology for Lak Synthetic Past Paradigms", in: H. Aronson (ed.), *The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR: Linguistic Studies*, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, p. 106-120.
- , 1992, "Lak Substantival Declension: 40 cases or 50?", in: H. Aronson (ed.), *The Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR: Linguistic Studies*. Second Series, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, p. 113-33.
- , 1994a, "Surprise! Surprise! Arumanian Has Had an Admirative!", *Indiana Slavic Studies* 7, p. 79-89.
- , 1994b, "Assertive Verb Forms in Lak", in: H. Aronson (ed.), *Non-Slavic Languages of the USSR: Papers from the Fourth Conference*, Columbus, Slavica, p. 114-119.
- , 1996, "Gender, Class, and Age in the Daghestanian Highlands: Towards a Unified Account of the Morphology of Agreement in Lak", in: H. Aronson (ed.), *NSL 8: Linguistic Studies in the Non-Slavic Languages of the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Baltic Republics*, Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society, 187-99.129.
- , 1998, "The Grammatical Expression of Presumption and Related Concepts in Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance", in: Michael Flier and Alan Timberlake (eds), *American Contributions to the 12th International Congress of Slavists*, Bloomington, Slavica, p. 390-405.
- GUENTCHÉVA, Z., 1996, "Introduction" in: Z. Guentchéva (ed.), *L'Énonciation médiatisée*, Louvain-Paris, Peeters (BIG 35), p. 11-18.
- GOLAB, Z., 1964, "The Problem of Verbal Moods in Slavic Languages", *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 8, p. 1-6.
- JAKOBSON, R., 1957/1971, *Shifters, Verbal Categories and the Russian Verb*, Cambridge, Harvard, Reprinted in *Selected Writings 2: Word and Language*, The Hague, Mouton, p. 130-147.
- Ha³MZATOV, R., 1972, *Tul Daġustan*. Maxačkala, Dagestanskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- KAZENIN, K. I., 1999, "Ličnoe soglasovanie v laskom jazyke: Markirovannost' i nejtralizacija", in: E. V. Rakhlina and G. Y. Testelefs (eds), *Tipologija i teroija jazyka: Ot opisanija k ob'jasneniju. K 60-letiju Aleksandra Evgenieviča Kibrika*, Moscow, Jazyki ruskoj kultury, p. 383-99.
- KIBRIK, A. E., 1978, *Materialy k tipologii ergativnosti. 2. Laskij jazyk*. (Problemnaja gruppa po èksperimental'noj i prikladnoj lingvistike, Predvaritel'nye publikacii 12.7). Moscow, AN SSSR, Institut russkogo jazyka.
- KOZINCEVA, N., 1994, "Kategorija evidencial'nosti (problemy tipologičeskogo analiza)", *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 3, p. 92-104.
- LEWIS, G. L., 1967, *Turkish Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University.
- LINDSTEDT, J., 1993, "Za razvitioto na južnoslavjanskija perfekt", *Studia Slavica Finlandensia* 10, p. 31-4.
- MICHAILOVSKY, B., 1996, "L'Inférentiel du Népal". in: Z. Guentchéva (ed.), *L'Énonciation médiatisée*, Louvain-Paris, Peeters (BIG 35), p. 109-123.
- MURKELINSKIJ, G. B., 1967, "Laskij jazyk", in: E. A. Bokarev (ed.), *Jazyki narodov SSSR: IV. Iberijsko-kavkazskie jazyki*, Moscow, Nauka, p. 488-507.
- , 1971, *Grammatika laskogo jazyka*. Maxačkala, Dagučpedgiz.
- MURQILINSKIJ, H., 1981, *Laku maz: 7-8 klasiirt:ansa učebnik*, 4th ed. Maxačkala, Dagučpedgiz.
- SILVERSTEIN, M., 1976, "Hierarchy of features and ergativity", *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, in: R. Dixon (ed.), Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, p. 112-171.
- SHOLLOHOV, M., 1978, (transl. Dhimitër Pasko), *Fati i njeriut* (Albanian translation of *Sud'ba čeloveka*), Prishtina, Rilindja.
- ŠOLOXOV, M., 1982 [First edition, 1956], "Sud'ba čeloveka", *Mikhail Soloxov: Sobranie sočinenij v vos'mi tomax*, Vol. 7, Moscow, Pravda, p. 591-623.
- , 1960, (transl. G. Bagdaev and M. Aliev), *Insannal q'adar* (Lak translation of *Sud'ba čeloveka*). Maxačkala, Dagestanskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- , 1966, (transl. R. Inanišvili and G. Xomerik'), *Bedi k'acis* (Georgian translation of *Sud'ba čeloveka*), Tbilisi, Nak'aduli.
- , 1969, (transl. Suat Dervis), *Insannin alınyazısı* (Turkish translation of *Sud'ba čeloveka*), Skopje Sevinç.

- ŠOLOHOV, M., 1970, (transl. Cvetko Martinovski), *Sudbinata na čovekot* (Macedonian translation of *Sud'ba čeloveka*), Skopje, Naša kniga.
- , 1981, (transl. Asia Spirova), *Sādbata na čovekāt* (Bulgarian translation of *Sud'ba čeloveka*), Sofia, Otečestvo.
- SLOBIN, D. I. and A. A. AKSU-KOÇ, 1982, "Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Use of the Turkish Evidential", in: P. J. Hopper (ed.), *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics & Pragmatics*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, p. 185-200.
- USLAR, P. K., 1890, *Lakskij jazyk (Ėtnografija Kavkaza. Jazykoznanie 4)*. Tbilisi, Upravlenie Kavkazskago Učebnago Okruga.
- XAJDAKOV, S. M., 1961, *Očerki po leksike lakskogo jazyka*. Moscow, Akademija nauk SSSR.
- XALILOV, X. M., 1969, *Lakral laqi balajrdu - Lakskie èpičeskie pesni*, Maxačkala, Dagestanskoe filial, AN SSSR.
- XALILOV, X. M. (ed.), 1976, *Satira i humor narodov Dagestana*. Maxačkala, Dagestanskoe filial, AN SSSR.
- XALILOV, X. & S. XAJDAKOV, 1989, *Lakral ahalinal mahri*, Maxačkala, Dagučpedgiz.
- ŽIRKOV, L. I., 1955, *Lakskij jazyk*. Moscow, Akademija nauk SSSR.

ABBREVIATIONS

S	continuation of a discontinuous root or affix after the insertion of another morpheme	DIM	diminutive	PODIR	post-directive
[]	morpheme expressed by zero [used only where relevant]	DUR	durative	PERF	transitive or intransitive perfect
ABL	ablative	EMPH	emphatic	PL	plural
ACC	accusative	FUT	future	POAB	post-ablative
ADJd	definite, restrictive adjective	GEN	genitive	POES	post-essive
ADJi	indefinite, nonrestrictive adjective	GER	gerund	POSS	possessive
ADM	admirative	HRT	hortative	POT	potential
ADV	adverb	IMPF	imperfect	PRES	present
AOR	aoorist	IMPV	imperative	PTCL	participle
ASAOR	assertive aorist	InAB	in-ablative	Q	interrogative
ASFUT	assertive future	InEL	in-elative	QUOT	quotative particle
ASPF	assertive perfect	InES	in-essive	SG	singular
ASPRES	assertive present	INF	infinitive	SUBJ	subjunctive
CD	conditional	IntFUT	intentional future	SUAB	super-ablative
COM	comitative	InLA	in-lative	SUES	super-essive
DAT	dative	InPR	in-prolative	SuLA	super-lative
		INST	instrumental	SUPR	super-prolative
		ITER	iterative	TRPF	transitive perfect
		MAS	masdar, verbal noun, abstract noun		
		NEG	negation		
		OBL	oblique		
		PartC	particle of concord		

BEYOND EVIDENTIALITY AND MIRATIVITY:
EVIDENCE FROM TSAKHUR¹

Timur MAISAK and Sergei TATEVOSOV

1. INTRODUCTION

This study concerns evidentiality and mirativity in Tsakhur (< North Caucasian, Nakh-Daghestanian, Lezgie).

Evidentiality is generally recognized as a category that "shows the kind of justification for a factual claim which is available to the person making that claim" (Anderson 1986: 274). Evidentiality involves the semantic distinction between "attested", or "direct" and "non-attested", or "indirect" evidence, the latter being further subdivided into "inferred" and "hearsay" (reported) evidence (see Willett 1988 for discussion).

Mirativity has been treated for a long time as an instance of evidentiality, in particular, as a contextual effect evidentials produce under certain semantico-pragmatic conditions. However, as DeLancey (1997, 1998) has shown, there exist cross-linguistic observations that mirativity should rather be viewed as a notion separate from (although related to) evidentiality. In DeLancey's view, mirativity involves a grammaticalized distinction between "information which is part of the speaker's integrated picture of the world and information which is new and not yet part of that integrated picture" (DeLancey 1997:49).²

In what follows we discuss data from Tsakhur, in which both mirative and evidential meanings are expressed grammatically but in a rather unusual and complicated way; evidential and mirative markers in Tsakhur do not count as instances of what is commonly regarded as a prototypical realization of these categories.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The verbal system of Tsakhur is characterized in section 2. In sections 3-4 two main morphosyntactic carriers of evidentiality and mirativity are discussed.

¹ Data for this study were collected during two field trips to the village of Mishlesh (Daghestan Republic, Russia) carried out by the group of researchers from the Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, Moscow State University. The authors are very grateful to the inhabitants of Mishlesh who served as informants on Tsakhur, especially to Ismail Mamedov. The financial support from Russian Foundation for the Humanities (RGNF No. 98-04-06198a) and Research Support Scheme (No. 1474/1999) is gratefully acknowledged.

² See also Lazard's (1999) critical comments on DeLancey's suggestions.