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1. INTRODUCTION

Lak is spoken by over 100,000 people in the central highlands of the Republic of Dagestan as well as elsewhere in that Republic, in Russia, and in Turkey. It belongs to the Dagestanian branch of the Northeast Caucasian language family. (The other branch, Nakh, comprises Chechen, Ingush, and Bachi [Tsvo-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 Dagestani languages, among other things, by the complexity of its verbal and nominal inflection. It has more nominal cases than any other Dagestani 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; Field 1997; Guentchëva 1996, Lindstedt 1993). 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/nonassertive, 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 uverditel’nyi, podverditel’nyi, or kategoričeskoe, Georgian mi’k’icreti, see Friedman 1989 on terminology). Table 1 gives the assertive and nonassertive synthetic paradigms for those tenses in which the opposition exists. The -w- prefixed 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 médiault (see Guentchëva 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 (confirmitative) 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 Golab’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 (1991:139).

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 I iro, uru, uri, with loss of the initial i-). If the verb form in question ended in an -r, the r- assimilated to i-. If the verb form ended in -n, the r- assimilated 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 is completely lost. See Boro’udzë (1979) and Kazenn (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 čašar čiça-r-a / čiça-jšar-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). 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

---

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 adative, 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-Koy (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 adative, can have a true present (and future) meaning.

---

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.
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 unā, tu-n ė'a-l-an khačči. Allah-na-l prayer 3-do-DUR-PRES.GER [1-b]DUR.GER me-DAT see-DUR-Inf dog God-obl-gen 

b-i-w-k'una mizir-ta-l ė'ra čapal b-ul-la-l-isa qaata čapur 3-be-3-s-aor.1sg mosque-obl-gen wall dirt 3-do-DUR-3-PTCP house infidel

s-un qa-b-it-an, na ta liq-an b-an la-w-g-stijav. become-inf NEG-3-let-INF 1 it false-INF 3-do-INF go-3-s-as-aor.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 -sa 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 infixed noun class marker), in the future the morphological expression is different: The nonassertive futures add -sa plus 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-ū-n, ra'zij-ra wi-l qama ha-fn. 1 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'ú-sa insan-tal me-DAT what 3-is but line-obl-supES 1-stand-1-s-pf person-pl
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mu-ni-j ra'zij qa'-š-un-sar
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) Xalifu-sh-gu k-unu b-ur: Agar na muq'-šižin wi-n Caliph-obl-poss-and say-past.ger 3-is if I four-th you.sg.obl-dat 
b-uc'-rišn, ina ė-in-sar. 3-pour-pres.cd you say-inf-fut you-emph self prophet-am say-past.ger

ina uwaču š-un-kar-a, — k-uru. 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-sar, haš'a hiwč-ru-guma lič'ilič'i-sa sort-irda-l what 3-do-inf-fut.3sg even apple-pl-even various-adjR sort-obl-gen 
b-ik'-aj-sa. Cavaj anavarr-mu b-ij-a-ju, gaj-mi 3-be-pres.ger-emp some.3 quick-adv 3-arrive-pres.ger those-adjR

tak swit-i-š-umuj b-uc'-a-j, Ča-la-č'i-sa-ksa, only autumn-obl-poss-3-s 3-mature-pres.3sg see-flr-s-pf-3sg

na sswit-i-l-mur sort xu-in-sar-a. 1 autumn-obl-gen-adj sort become-inf-fut.3sg

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

(10) Ti-ja čul-i-ja b-uc'-an-t'isari-w? that-obl-supab side-obl-supab 3-come-asf-inf-fut.3pl-q B-uc'-an-t'isar. 

3-come-inf-asf-inf-fut.3pl

Wi-n qa-k'ul-li-w, lodka čaš'i d-uc'-awi-wa? you.sg.obl-dat NEG-know-IS-Q boat soon 4-come-pot-q

Ca-k'ra sswat-i-ра = d-uc'-an-sar. 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. (Šoloxov 1960:3)
The expression of speaker subjectivity in LAK

In examples (7), (8), and (9), the speaker is making predictions without a sense of absolute certainty. Nonetheless, non specification for absolute certainty should not be confused with doubt. Each example has a high 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 by the adverb probably (cf. Murkelskij 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 a mouse 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 Bućant'isar 'they will come' expresses the speaker's conviction that the boat will arrive, whereas the nonassertive future dućansar 'it will come' is a speculation on when it will arrive. In the case of (11) and (12), the first person intentional futures qaIt anomar 'I will not allow' and banam 'I will do' express the speakers' convictions and also intention concerning their own actions, while the assertive future qaakant'isara '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 bukima 'I will read'. Uslar (1890) and Murkelskij (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 Burjuladze (1976:214-15) it is clear that what I call the intentional future was once a full conjunction 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:

In examples (11), (12), and (9), the speaker is making predictions without a sense of absolute certainty. Nonetheless, non specification for absolute certainty should not be confused with doubt. Each example has a high 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 by the adverb probably (cf. Murkelskij 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 a mouse 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 Bućant'isar 'they will come' expresses the speaker's conviction that the boat will arrive, whereas the nonassertive future dućansar 'it will come' is a speculation on when it will arrive. In the case of (11) and (12), the first person intentional futures qaIt anomar 'I will not allow' and banam 'I will do' express the speakers' convictions and also intention concerning their own actions, while the assertive future qaakant'isara '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 bukima 'I will read'. Uslar (1890) and Murkelskij (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 Burjuladze (1976:214-15) it is clear that what I call the intentional future was once a full conjunction 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) Čar-ća čima qa-ul-x c'ux-a, ca-l-a o'rnu cukun wanting-if any old.man-ABL.POES ask-IMPV self-GEN-EMPH life how la-n-g-suari-w šawar ŵ-uri-w? — k-unu. Mu-na-n go-3-5-AFFD,3SG-Q news become-PERF,3SG-Q say,PAST.GER this-ABL-DAT cukun-l'aw šawar ŵ-unu qa-bik-l'ang-t'isar! 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! (Soloxov 1960:10).

Apparently what must have originally been the assertive future (infinitive + -ša + person marker) became bleached, while the nonassertive future became limited to expressions of personal intent, primarily in statements, but secondarily 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'j), i.e. 'I hereby assert that...'. (see Burjuladze 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 affords 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 paradigmatic sets. 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 paradigmatic sets are formed using a gerund or participle of the main verb plus a defective verb meaning ‘be’, which has the following finite paradigm (illustrated here by the third person with a class 3 marker): present (bura), past (bija), assertive present (busar), and assertive past (busat).

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’. 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-sa Šamsu tį-su jai-i-l zalłu.
  be-1-S-PAST.GER [1] is rich-ADI Šamsu say-PT sheep-OBL-GEN owner
  Wa-na-l čɑ’u-w-sa jatu-ğatara b-i-w-k’-un b-ur.
  this-OBL-GEN much-ADI sheep-cattle 3-be-3-PAST.GER 3-is
  Cal wa-na-n jala ži与众不同 kuči b-i-w-k’-üm b-ur.
  once he-OBL-DAT most dear-ADI dog 3-die-3-PAST.GER 3-is

Quma la-w-sa Šamsu-1 žuknu b-u-w-nu b-ur ga-ni-ša.
Sad go-1-S-PT Šamsu-GEN decision 3-do-3-PAST.GER 3-is that-OBL-POAB
axiordanj-sa ūrmat b-an, Wa-na-l amru-li-in b-u-w-nu,
respect last-ADI respect 3-[do].INF this-OBL-GEN order-OBL-supLA 3-do-3-PAST.GER
kači-l qa’q’ala sura-ra-wuč d-i-r-g-unu d-ur, insan-na-l-sa
dog-GEN corpse shroud-OBL-INS 4-put-4-S-PAST.GER 4-is person-OBL-GEN-ADI
kun-na-a, q’ur-an ku-tan b-i-w-k’-un b-ur, da’-tṛu du-ul-la-n
like-4S Koran read-DUR-INT 3-be-3-PAST.GER 3-is prayer-PF 4-do-DUR-INT
b-i-w-k’-un b-ur wa ūrmat-ra-šal b-u-w-nu b-un b-ur.
3-be-3-PAST.GER 3-is and respect-OBL-COM 3-bury-3-S-PAST.GER 3-is
Ga-ni-l kita-i-m malla źanna žunu wa g’ini q’ur-an
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 or present gerund (kalaž ’wuk’un ur ‘read, was reading’). These modifications allow for flexibility of example 16a-c).
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 ēwu ‘horse’ is class three, the initial b- and infixed -w- of bāvāwēnu ‘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. ēwu governs both the gerund and the auxiliary:

(17a) Na b-a-w-ē-n u-n b-ur ēwēu.
I 3-sell-3-S-PAST.GER 3-is horse
(Apparently) I sold the horse.

(17b) Ga-na-a b-a-w-ē-n u-n b-ur ēwēu.
be-OBL-GEN 3-sell-3-S-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 urs 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-ē-n ur-a ēwēu.
I 3-sell-3-S-PAST.GER 1-am-1SG horse
I have sold the horse.

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

(19a) Tu-šā b-a-w-ē-n u-n b-ur ēwēu.
m-e-ABL 3-sell-3-S-PAST.GER 3-is horse
I [accidentally] sold the horse.

(19b) Ga-na-šā b-a-w-ē-n u-n b-ur ēwēu.
h-e-OBL-GEN 3-sell-3-S-PAST.GER 3-is horse
He [accidentally] sold the horse.

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

(20a) Tu-šā b-a-āl b-a-šā-kan b-uqāl-ja b-ur.
m-e-ABL this horse 3-sell-INF want-PRES.3GER 3-is
I can sell this horse.

(20b) Ga-na-šā b-a-āl b-a-šā-kan b-uqāl-ja b-ur.
h-e-OBL-GEN this horse 3-sell-INF want-PRES.3GER 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 nonindicative infinitive of this verb is uteh, whose regular past gerund is awkēm (w- is the class 1 marker), pronounced [ikūnu], but this gerund has a reduced form, kēnu which is used both in forming analytic tenses and as a kind of past quotative particle. The progressive infinitive of uteh is tēnu, whose present gerund is tēnu and whose synthetic third singular present is tēnu. The form tēnu has been compared by Usler (1890:184) to the Turkish quotative gerund ifte ‘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 b-a-ām-tā-kan b-ur.
m-e-DAT this horse 3-sell-INF want-PRES.3GER 3-is
I want to sell this horse.

ii. Ga-na-n b-a-ām-tā-kan b-ur.
h-e-OBL-GEN this horse 3-sell-INF want-PRES.3GER 3-is
He wants to sell this horse.
Russian quotative particle mol (from molvi ‘to say’; cf. also the Bulgarian quotative particle kaj from kaže ‘one says’ or the Georgian quotative particle o from the third singular aorist tvva ‘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 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) Xaliflu-x-gu k-unu b-ur: Agar na maq-ilcin wi-n
Caliph-obl-poss and say-past,ger 3-sg if I four-th you,sg,obl-dat
b-urx-rčan, ina č-in-sar, ina-wa cuva idaws-ra, k-unu.
3-pour-pres,cd you say-inf-fut you,empf self prophet-am say-past,ger

Ina uveču k-unu-kar-a, — k-unu.
you drunk become-past,ger-appear,sg 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.”
(Xaililov 1976:213)

(22) Wa šawar b-a-w-mu b-ur qum-na malla-na-n. [...] This news 3-hear,3-past,ger 3-sg big,add mullah-obl-dat.
Ga t’i infected i-w-k’-un ur: “Wa ci ha’ja d-a-ga-šivu-r”!
this say,dur,pres,ger be-1-s-past,ger 1-sg this what shame 4-be,neg,mas-is
Wa-na-l cino’w din-dalu-l infan-tal q’a’rqi ara’-wen
He-obl-gen all faith,obl-gen person-pl file-obl,nl
b-i-wš-čun-un-i-za!
[...] — t’i’j
1-hurt,1-s-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!” (Xaililov 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 Sologov (1960:7), a quoted dedication embroidered on a silk pouch is introduced with the analytic passive state one. However, the details of such questions of tense-aspect usage are beyond the scope of this paper.

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

(23a) Ta šava ur
he at,home [1].is
He is at home.

(23b) Ta šava usar
he at,home is,as,-pres.3sg
He definitely is at home.

(23c) Ta šava usa ur
he at,home.is,pt [1].is
He [apparently] is at home.

(23d) Ta šava ur t’ar
he at,home.1 [1].is quot
He is at home, they say.

(23e) Ta šava usar t’ar
he at,home is,as,-pres.3sg quot
He definitely is at home, they say.

According to Murkelnitskij (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 – avljia x-unu ur-a-w, wa k’irišiw-ri-j
you quot crazy become,past,ger 1-be,1-sg,q this heat,obl-supres
šore’a-j sukno-ra-l ha’zak lač t’an-
boy,obl-supres,gen house,gen,obl,gen trousers dress,dur,inf
You – she says – have gone crazy, dressing a boy in heavy clothes in this heat? (Sologov 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 Xaililov (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 uč’in ‘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 ĕsqurtal x-un qad-it-la-j malla-na-l ĕ-ajwa-t’ar.
this finish become,inf neg,let,dur, pres,gen mullah,obl/gen say,3sg,impf,quot
— Ha’jí! Ga-ni-jn kačči ma-č-a-ra! ... Žu-č-a, pity that,obl-supres,la dog neg,say,impf,pl we,gen,empf friend say,impf
(27) Šamsu gen. b-u-w-nu b-u-r, jat-i-l turzan-dali-wa jala
Šamsu-GEN order 3-de-3-PAST GER 3-is sheep-GEN pen-OBL-hab most
beč ni šuće'al-va ta liši j b-a-ra, k-unu
fat-add fifty-3 ewe separate 3-[de]-IMPV-PL say-PAST-GER
Shamsu 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 šaj 'appearing' is included by Murkelinskij (1971:199) as a kind of "unwitnessed" (zaglазнове). It is clear from example (28), however, that the meaning of that is 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-u-r: Dik' čan-sa xi-aj, k'ilčin-mur
husband-OBL GEN say-PAST GER 3-is meat small-ADH seem-PRES GER second-ADD
kasak na b-u-t-aw. Jala gamaču-na-l gu k-unu b-u-r:
piece 3-throw-TPIF.1SG then guest-OBL GEN and say-PAST GER 3-is
Harca-naa-l canna cannasa kasak b-u-t-an d'rkin-sa še-aj,
each-OBL GEN to oneself for oneself piece 3-throw-INF need-ADH seem-PRES GER
na-gu ca kasak b-u-t-aw.
1-too one piece 3-throw-TPIF.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 šaj can also be used where English would use 'think' in the sense of 'speculate' as in the following example:
6. ADMIRATIVITY AND DUBITATIVITY

In previous work (Friedman 1981, 1982, 1988) I have shown that the Albanian
admiringly differs significantly from admiring usage in Balkan Slavic, Turkish,
and Georgian. The Albanian admiringly is a special set of paradigms, including
a true present tense, all marked for nonconfirmativeness 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. 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
admiringly, 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 facilitative role
of admiring 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 admirable is used without any additional lexical
 specification. The Lak, Turkish, and Bulgarian translators all used preterit/perfect
forms (the analytic preterit in Lak, the miš-past in Turkish, and the indefinite past
in Bulgarian) which in this context have precisely the emotive effect of the
Albanian present admirable. The Macedonian and Georgian translators, however,
who had exactly the same type of option available (the Macedonian could have
been biš as in Bulgarian, whereas the Georgian could have used the second
person present perfect q’opilvar), 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, Šoloxov1982:14]

(33b) Qëm-k-e dyale j urte. Pandeha se do të më jepe
be-ADM-2SG boy partc quiet I thought that PUT SUBJ me give,IMPF-2SG
ndonjë grushë me dorën e djaihë. [Albanian, Shollahov 1978:22
some fist with hand.ACC partc right

(33c) Tu-n ina urç’a-mur ka-ni-x tuč-x-ra rišun-xa si-x-iva,
me-DAT you right-ADIM hand-OBL-POES me-supPR-am hi-INF-PTCP seem-IMPF-3SG
ina t’urca imit-xa insan i-w-x’un ur-a,
you as for peaceful-ADIV person [1]be-1-8-PAST.GER [1]are-2SG

[Lak, Šoloxov 1960:19]
(33a) Sen yine dayanıklı oğlan-miş-sm, dedi, ben bunu yapar-ken
you then peaceful boy-miş-PAST-2SG he said I this.ACC doing-while
sen-in sağlambil 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-miş-ti-m. [Turkish, Šolohov 1969:21]

think-miş-PAST-di-PAST-1SG

(33e) Misli-e-h, će šte me udariš s djasna-ta, no ti
thought-MPIR-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) Misli-e-v deka ke me tresneš so desna-ta, no ti,
thought-MPIR-1SG that FUT you hit with right-the but you
izgleda, si miren čovek. [Macedonian, Šolohov 1970:16]
it appears are mild person

(33g) megona mardžveniš gamart ‘q’amdi, magram čans, montmeni
I thought with.right you would hit me but it seems peaceful
bić’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 šive-š’, papiros-k-i kuri-š’. and but you richly live-PRES.2SG cigarette-OBL-PL smoke-PRES.2SG

(Šoloxov 1982:593)

(34b) Po ti qen-k-e pasanik, pt-k-e cigare tē hekurosura!
but you be-ADM-2SG rich.person drink-ADM-2SG cigarettes Partic rolled

But you are [to my surprise] rich, you smoke [as I discover] rolled cigarettes. (Šolohov 1978:9)

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

(34c) Ina-ri-w avadanu unu-kar-a, p’ap’rusu
you are 2SR-EMPH rich [1,be] PRES.GER-appear-2SG cigarette

t’-ij ur-a-xa.
say-PRES.GER [1]be-2SG-EMPH

Indeed you are rich [apparently], you smoke [store-bought] cigarettes.
(Šoloxov 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 żawar b-a-w-nu b-ur qun-ma malla-na-n. [...] 

This news 3-hear-PAST.GER 3-is big-add mullah-OBL-DAT.

Ga t’-ij i-w-k’-un ur: "Wa ci ha’ja d-a-ga-şiwa-r! 
this say ...DUR-PRES.GER be-1-S-PAST.GER [1]is: this what shame 4-be-NEG-MAS-IS
Wa-na-l cinav din-dalu-l insan-tal q’a’r’a-’ara-wan 
He-OBL-GEN all faith-OBL-GEN person-PL filth-OBL-IRLA
b-i-w-ë-unn-i-xa!
1-hurl-1-S-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 bivčumića 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 poveće od tebe. — Toj poveće znael!
    he knows more from you he more knew
    [Macedonian, Friedman 1977:78]
(36b) — man šen-ze meti icis. — Namdvilad meti scodania.
    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, admirate, dubitative) and, moreover, new past tenses using old perfects as auxiliaries (Bulgarian biš + 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 admirable 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 preterit with nonconfirmative 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 (Frasherio Aromanian dialect of Bela di Supra), which reanalyzed the Albanian third person singular present confirmative marker as a particle marking nonconfirmativity and added it to a native participial base. For example, the Albanian perfect ka punnua 's/he has worked' is the historical source of the present confirmative punnuqa 's/he works [to my surprise, etc.], which in turn serves as the model for the Vlah lukraca, 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, -ko, -merk in Georgian, cld in Romanian, dubitative goja in Albanian, -c 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 admirate 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.
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**ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>S</em></td>
<td>Continuation of a discontinuous root or affix after the insertion of another morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Morpheme expressed by zero [used only where relevant]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASIL</em></td>
<td>Ablative adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ACC</em></td>
<td>Accusative adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ADID</em></td>
<td>Definite, restrictive adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ADII</em></td>
<td>Indefinite, nonrestrictive adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ADM</em></td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ADV</em></td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASOR</em></td>
<td>Assertive orist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASOFUT</em></td>
<td>Assertive future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASPF</em></td>
<td>Assertive perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ASPRES</em></td>
<td>Assertive present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CD</em></td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CDM</em></td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DAT</em></td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DIM</em></td>
<td>Diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>DUR</em></td>
<td>Durative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>EMPH</em></td>
<td>Emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FUT</em></td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>GEN</em></td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>GER</em></td>
<td>Gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>HRT</em></td>
<td>Hortative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>IMP</em></td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>IMPV</em></td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>IMAB</em></td>
<td>In-ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>INEL</em></td>
<td>In-elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>IES</em></td>
<td>In-essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>INF</em></td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>INFUT</em></td>
<td>Intentional future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BLA</em></td>
<td>In-lative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>INPR</em></td>
<td>In-prolative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>INST</em></td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ITER</em></td>
<td>Iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>MAS</em></td>
<td>Masculine, verbal noun, abstract noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NEG</em></td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OBL</em></td>
<td>Oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PARTC</em></td>
<td>Particle of concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PODIR</em></td>
<td>Post-directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PERF</em></td>
<td>Transitive or intransitive perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PL</em></td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>POAB</em></td>
<td>Post-ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>POES</em></td>
<td>Post-essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>POSS</em></td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>POT</em></td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PRES</em></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PTC</em></td>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Q</em></td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>QUOT</em></td>
<td>Quotative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SG</em></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SUBJ</em></td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SUBAB</em></td>
<td>Super-ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SUBES</em></td>
<td>Super-essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SULAB</em></td>
<td>Super-lative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SUPER</em></td>
<td>Super-prolative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>TTP</em></td>
<td>Transitive perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BEYOND EVIDENTIALITY AND MIRATIVITY: EVIDENCE FROM TSAKHUR**

Timur MAISAK and Sergei TATEVOSOV

1 INTRODUCTION

This study concerns evidentiality and mirativity in Tsakhur (< North Caucasian, Nakh-Daghestanian, Lezgic). 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”, “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 Mischle (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 Mischle 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.