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Preface

This thesis is essentially a survey of available literature on evidentiality in Avar-Andic. Ideally, such a study would be complemented with data from fieldwork, but due to the complicated geopolitical situation of the area where these languages are spoken (i.e. mountainous Daghestan), this was not feasible within the limitations of a master thesis. As there is still a considerable empirical gap concerning the grammatical semantics of the Andic languages, I would like to continue working on this subject in the future.

In this study, terminology from Russian sources is transliterated using standard scholarly tradition. For the transliteration of phonemes from the Avar-Andic languages, mostly IPA symbols are used, with the exception of tʃ, ʃ, ts, χ, ʁ, which are transcribed respectively with č, š, c, X, R, as they are transcribed in most of the sources used for this thesis. The symbol 'H' represents a pharyngealized laryngeal and the symbol ' denotes that a consonant is ejective.
List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>non-feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>affective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>neuter plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRS</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>preterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFR</td>
<td>inferential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC.P</td>
<td>recent past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The aim of this study is to compare the attested systems of grammatical evidentiality in the Avar-Andic languages (a sub-branch of the East Caucasian language family), in order to propose a plausible scenario for the origin of this category in the Andic languages. According to Alexandra Aikhenvald, the loss or emergence of evidentials in a language is often due to the influence of language contact (2004: 288). She identifies several linguistic areas where languages of different genetic origin share a similar evidentiality system. One of these areas comprises the Balkans, Turkey, the Caucasus, Iran, part of Central Asia and parts of Siberia. The area where the East Caucasian languages are spoken is located in the midst of this area, and evidentiality is widely attested across the family, although authors specializing in these languages consider it to be a relatively recent and marginal phenomenon. So far, it remains unclear where this category originates from in East Caucasian, whereas probable patterns of development have been established for the neighboring South and West Caucasian languages.

What makes the Avar-Andic languages a suitable starting-point in unravelling the development of evidentials in East Caucasian is the fact that the Andic languages are all unwritten languages that share Avar as a literary language. It seems plausible then, that Avar has served as an intermediary for the development of evidentials in the Andic languages, which I expect to become evident from the formal and functional similarities of these forms across the Avar-Andic language group.
Chapter 1
Theoretical framework: evidentiality from an areal perspective

The theoretical framework for this thesis is based on Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald's crosslinguistic study of evidentiality from 2004, in which she establishes evidentiality as an independent category and proposes a typological framework for further investigation. Some important observations made in this study are, first of all, that evidentiality appears to be very sensitive to crosslinguistic spreading in contact situations and second, that specific types of evidentiality systems seem to cluster in certain areas (see Aikhenvald (2004: 288-299)).

In paragraphs 1.1-1.1.3 of this section, first of all evidentiality as a category will be introduced, paying special attention to what should not be considered (grammatical) evidentiality. Aikhenvald's typology is mainly concerned with formal, semantic and pragmatic characteristics of grammatical evidentiality, and does not offer a practical tool to distinguish evidentials proper from forms that carry evidential meaning. Therefore, in paragraph 1.1.1 Aikhenvald's theory is complemented with grammaticalization theory and construction grammar, following Diewald (2006). Paragraph 1.2 introduces the Avar-Andic languages and the East Caucasian language-family from an areal and typological perspective (1.2.1), and gives an overview of evidential forms and patterns of influence and development attested in the area surrounding these languages (1.2.2), based on Aikhenvald (2004), as well as Johanson & Utas (2000).

1.1 Evidentiality as a category

Evidentiality is a grammatical category that encodes the source of information of a statement. Compare for example the sentences (1) and (2) from Tariana, an Arawak language spoken in Brazil (Aikhenvald 2004, 2):
The first sentence is considered appropriate if the speaker actually witnessed José playing football. If, for example, he noticed that José, his sneakers and the football are not in the house, and there are people coming back from the football-field, he may utter the sentence in (2), as he infers from visual clues that the proposition in (2) is the case. A speaker of Tariana, when stating that 'José played football', always has to specify how he obtained this information, with a choice of five different information-sources: direct visual evidence (as in (1)), direct non-visual sensory evidence (for example if the speaker heard how José was playing football), inference from visual evidence (as in (2)), assumption based on what the speaker knows (for example he knows José always plays football in the afternoon around a certain time), or from hearsay (someone else told the speaker about the event). In differentiating five different evidential terms, the system of Tariana belongs to the most elaborate systems that have been attested worldwide.

In the typology of Aikhenvald, systems are labeled with the letters A, B, C or D, depending on the number of terms they distinguish (A = two terms, B = three, C = four and D = five). Each of these categories is subdivided, based on the type of values they distinguish. In the A-category for example, A1 are systems that contrast events directly witnessed by the speaker (in Aikhenvald, this is referred to in short as 'firsthand'), with those not directly witnessed by the speaker (or 'non-firsthand'). A2-systems on the other hand, single out non-firsthand information as opposed to 'everything else'. This 'everything else' category comprises one or multiple forms that are functionally (and most often also formally) unmarked. According to Aikhenvald (2004: 70-77; 2003: 7-8), when evidential forms are contrasted with a form that is 'evidentiality-neutral', one can either consider 'neutrality' a value within the system, or the encoding of evidentiality can be seen as not mandatory, as it can be avoided by employing a neutral form. A choice for either of these two interpretations depends on the status of the unmarked form and its relation to evidentials in a specific language, and therefore should be made for each language individually.

Evidential meanings can be expressed by a variety of forms, such as verbal affixes (as in Tariana), analytic verb-forms, or particles. It is also possible that the evidential values present in a language do not constitute a paradigmatic set of forms, but are "scattered" across the grammar (see Aikhenvald 2004: 80-82) and for example Fortescue (2003) on so-called "scattered coding" in West-Greenlandic). In addition, separate evidential systems can co-exist within the same language, as is the case in the East Caucasian language Archi, in which there is a set of past tense verb-forms that contrast statements based on firsthand information with those based on non-firsthand information. In addition, there is a particle that marks whether a statement is based on hearsay, which
constitutes an independent A3-system (reported versus 'everything else'). These are considered separate sub-systems (rather than scattered coding), based on the fact that the A1-system is restricted to the past tense, whereas the A3-system is not (Aikhenvald 2004: 83).

1.1.1 Evidential strategies

Every language has some means of emphasizing the underlying information source of a statement. Evidentiality as a grammatical category, however, is quite rare crosslinguistically, as it occurs in only a quarter of the world's languages (Aikhenvald 2004, 17). As an alternative, lexical items can be employed, or short phrases (such as 'apparently' or 'they say'), or a specific form or construction can fulfill this role alongside its regular meaning: the latter phenomenon is called an 'evidential strategy' by Aikhenvald. She distinguishes these strategies from grammatical evidentials by proposing that in order to qualify for the latter, a form should have evidentiality "as its main meaning rather than just one of its usages" (Aikhenvald 2004, 38), which raises the question of how the main meaning of a form can be identified. This is an important problem to tackle in advance when dealing with evidentiality in East Caucasian, because evidentials in these languages typically originate from an analytic verb-form that has preserved other meanings besides the evidential (such as perfect or resultative). To resolve this issue, I propose to consider a form expressing an evidential meaning - a grammatical evidential, when it has 'grammaticalized' this evidential meaning. Whether this is the case or not can be tested by grammaticalization theory and construction grammar, following Diewald (2006).

Grammaticalization is the process of a lexical form becoming grammatical, or a grammatical form becoming "more" grammatical, or developing new grammatical meaning (Heine & Kuteva 2002, 2). A construction is a linguistic unit of variable size (ranging from one morpheme to a fixed expression consisting of multiple words), that form a "conventionalized form-meaning correspondence" (Diewald 2006, 6). This means that the meaning of a construction cannot be derived from the sum of its constituent parts. According to Diewald, the conventionalization or grammaticalization of constructions goes through three diachronic stages of development: in the first stage, a construction expands its usage into a new context in which it was not used before. In this stage, the new meaning is "contextually and pragmatically triggered" (Diewald 2006, 4). In the second stage, the form starts occurring typically in certain contexts, or what Diewald refers to as the "critical context" (ibid.), which will eventually trigger the grammaticalization process: in this stage it is always accompanied with ambiguity. Although in some cases not all possible interpretations are judged to be "equally plausible" (Diewald 2006, 21), there is always some ambiguity. Finally, in the third stage, the grammaticalization process is completed, because specific contexts have been conventionalized (in Diewald 'isolating contexts') for different meanings of a construction and consequently, there is no more ambiguity. These forms, with their fixed context, can then be considered new grammatical constructions as a whole (Diewald 2006, 5). How this theory can be applied to evidential forms will be illustrated by comparing an evidential form from an Andic language to an evidential strategy from Dutch.

A common pattern of development for evidentials in Avar-Andic is that of an analytic verb form denoting perfect or resultative, into a non-firsthand evidential: a grammatical form that develops
new grammatical meaning. This pattern is not only common in Avar-Andic, but "typologically widespread" (Aikhenvald 2004, 279), especially amongst languages spoken in the Caucasus and the surrounding area (as will be described in more detail in paragraph 1.2.2). The evidential meanings of these forms show different degrees of grammaticalization in individual languages and there is not always agreement among different authors regarding the status of these forms in a specific language. A case in point is the non-firsthand perfect in the Andic language Bagvalal. In an overview of evidentiality in East Caucasian, Forker characterizes all of the attested perfect forms that can take on evidential meaning in these languages as evidential strategies, because they have other possible meanings besides non-firsthand evidentiality (Inpress-b, 3). According to Tatevosov on the other hand, non-firsthand or 'indirect' evidentiality should be considered the main function of this form (2001: 446), which would qualify it as a grammatical evidential by Aikhenvald's criterium. In my opinion, this form can indeed be considered a grammaticalized evidential, based on its behavior in an isolated context, in comparison with the behavior of an evidential strategy from Dutch in a similar situation.

Consider the following example of evidential use of the perfect in Bagvalal (adapted from Tatevosov (2001: 448), which is compatible with two different readings, both of which are evidential (inferential and reportative):

(3) ʕali-r siː k' k' k' k'ʷaːː bb bb-- oo oo ek' ek' ek' ek'ʷa
Ali-ERG bear kill kill kill kill-- -- NN NN-- -- CONV CONV CONV CONV AUX AUX AUX AUX PRS PRS PRS PRS

'Apparently, Ali killed a bear.' / 'I heard Ali killed a bear.'

1. The speaker meets Ali in the forest while he is cutting up a bear and infers that 'Ali killed a bear' (inferential).
2. Someone told the speaker that 'Ali killed a bear' (reportative).

A resultative reading of the Bagvalal perfect is impossible in this example, because it concerns a dynamic situation not witnessed by the speaker, whereas the resultative is only compatible with stative situations directly witnessed (see table 3 in Tatevosov (2001: 453), which shows that for the evidential, the opposite is true). This means the resultative and the evidential are in complementary distribution and are therefore not ambiguous, as opposed to the inferential and reportative reading of (3). Compare this to a translation of the sentence in (3) in Dutch, using an evidential strategy with the modal verb moeten 'must':

---

1 In De Haan (2000), this construction is presented as a grammaticalized evidential, but the main argument in favor of this position seems to be that moeten does not fall within the scope of negation, and neither do evidentials in other languages. However, as De Haan himself points out, this is not a feature specific to the evidential reading of this verb: moeten never falls within the scope of negation, regardless of its interpretation.
Apart from two evidential readings, this construction has a third possible reading, that is non-evidential, and derives from the fact that the verb *moeten* is primarily a modal verb denoting obligation\(^2\). The choice for any of these three readings depends on context: in isolation it is three-way ambiguous\(^3\). Some situations might favor an evidential reading, but a context that justifies a modal interpretation can always be constructed. This means the division of labor between the evidential and the modal meaning of this construction depends mostly on conversational implicature, which means it is (at least not completely) grammaticalized.

### 1.1.2 Epistemic modality

Evidentials should not be confused with epistemic modals, which express an evaluation of the probability of a statement (Plungian 2001, 354). The usage of specific evidentials can have epistemic implications, for example evidentials expressing hearsay, can be employed to avoid responsibility for the truth-value of a statement. Inferential evidentials on the other hand, if they only allow inference from some kind of tangible evidence, can emphasize the speaker's confidence in what he is saying, because he cannot use this form when his utterance is not rooted in sufficient evidence and knowledge (this will be discussed in more detail in 3.2.3). However, evidentials are not necessarily linked to such judgements on the side of the speaker, which is why epistemic meanings are considered optional semantic extensions of evidentiality (following Aikhenvald (2004: 6)), and therefore will be discussed separately.

---

\(^{2}\) The example and its possible interpretations were elicited from my own intuitions as a native speaker of Dutch and subsequently verified with other speakers by way of a short survey. I presented them with the sentence about Ali and asked what they thought it meant, without providing any context. All of them mentioned it was hard to define without any context, so I asked them to construct a possible scenario (singular, as to not bias them that multiple possibilities were expected). All of them mentioned multiple solutions. The modal interpretation was considered the least plausible, because speakers found it difficult to imagine a situation where one would be obligated to kill bears, but none of them denied that it was possible, given the right context was provided.

\(^{3}\) This three-way ambiguity is also mentioned in De Haan (2000: 79), but is not taken as an indicator of grammaticalization.
1.1.3 Reported speech

Particles marking reported speech can be divided in quotatives and hearsay-evidentials, only the latter of which are considered evidentials. Both forms denote that a proposition comes from a source other than the speaker himself. The main difference between these two forms according to Aikhenvald is that quotatives always identify a concrete source, whereas hearsay-evidentials merely mark the secondhand-nature of the information (2004: 64). An additional criterium to distinguish these forms, is that quotatives usually occur in subordinate clauses, whereas hearsay-evidentials occur predominantly in main-clauses, as is the norm for evidentials in general (see Aikhenvald (2003a: 17)). The reason these distinctions are relevant for this study, is that both quotatives and hearsay-evidentials occur in the Avar-Andic languages and they bear great formal resemblance to one another.

1.2 Evidentiality from an areal-typological perspective

According to Aikhenvald, evidentiality as a category has proved to be quite productive in spreading across languages in contact situations (2004: 10), and she identifies several areas where similar evidentiality systems occur in languages that are genetically unrelated. One of these areas stretches from the Balkans into Central Asia and Siberia, and includes the Caucasus and Turkey. The Caucasus is infamous for its linguistic heterogeneity (see figure 1), being home to three separate indigenous language-families (one of which is the East Caucasian language family) and a number of Turkic and Indo-European languages. In 1.2.1, the Caucasus as a linguistic area will be briefly introduced, with a focus on East Caucasian and the Avar-Andic languages. Subsequently, in 1.2.2, the evidentiality systems in the area surrounding East Caucasian will be discussed, along with current theories on their status and development: whether the attested forms are considered evidentials proper, and if they developed language-internally or under the influence of another language.
1.2.1 The East Caucasian family and the Avar-Andic languages

East Caucasian is one of three language-families that are considered to be indigenous to the Caucasus: a geographical area located in between the Black and the Caspian sea. On the map in figure 1, East Caucasian is represented by the blue, purple, red and green areas scattered across the right side of the map. The yellowish area to the Southwest represents the South Caucasian or Kartvelian languages and the pink areas to the Northwest constitute the West Caucasian or Abkhazo-Adyghean family. Much remains unclear as to the genetic affiliation of these families, although most scholars agree that the South Caucasian languages are of different origin than the other two families. Some scholars consider West and East Caucasian to be part of a North Caucasian macro-family, but as mentioned in Tuite (2008: 22), the central work in defense of this hypothesis, the 'North Caucasian etymological dictionary' by Nikolaev & Starostin, published in 1994, remains controversial.

---

4 This is a screenshot of an interactive digital map which can be accessed via: http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/didact/karten/kauk/kaukasm.htm. Each color on the map represents an individual Caucasian language (different dialects are not distinguished); the two gray areas represent Armenian and Ossetian (both Indo-European); the salmon-colored area to the North includes Russian (Indo-European) and several Turkic languages (such as Karachay, Balkar, Kumyk and Noghay); and the white area in the South includes Turkish and Azeri Turkic. A larger and more detailed map by Koryakov (2002) can be found in the appendix.

5 A comprehensive overview of theories of genetic affiliation and areal influence is given in Chirikba (2008), although he does not mention criticism of the 'North Caucasian etymological dictionary': this can be found in Tuite (2008).
Of the three Caucasian language-families, East Caucasian is the most numerous, and in terms of its diversity can be compared to Indo-European (Authier & Maisak 2009, vii). Traditionally, the family is considered to comprise 29 languages which, following Alekseev (1998: 156), can be divided in eight different groups: Nakh (Batsbi or Tsova-Tush, Chechen, Ingush); Andic (Akhvakh, Andi, Bagvalal, Botlikh, Chamalal, Godoberi, Karata, Tindi); Tsezic (Bezhta, Hinukh, Hunzib, Khwarshi, Tsez); Lezgic (Agul, Archi, Budukh, Kryz, Lezgian, Rutul, Tabasaran, Tsakhur, Udi). Lak, Dargwa and Khinalug are considered independent groups and Avar, Andic and Tsezic are united in an Avar-Andic-Tsezic macro-group. Classification varies among different authors, but discussing all of these variations would far exceed the scope of this study. Furthermore, it is not directly relevant for this study, since the existence of the Avar-Andic group as such (i.e. the Avar and Andic branches are one another’s closest relatives on a family-level), is not under discussion. The East Caucasian family sometimes is also referred to as Nakh-Daghestanian, which divides the family in Nakh and 'everything else', based on the fact that the languages that belong to the seven remaining groups are spoken predominantly in the republic of Daghestan.

As can be seen in figure 1 (page 9) and figure 2 (in the appendix), the respective speech-communities of Avar and the Andic languages live in close proximity to one another, and Avar is the most widespread. In addition, Avar is a literary language and one of the fourteen official languages of the republic of Daghestan (Forker Inpress-a, 1), whereas the Andic languages are all unwritten. Speakers of Andic use Avar as a literary language and the language of education is either Avar or Russian. Chirikba describes Daghestan as a "classical example of a multilingual polyglottal area" (2008: 7), which means that speakers of different Daghestanian languages often master multiple other languages alongside their mother-tongue. According to Lewis et al (2015), the Andic peoples are mostly trilingual, mastering Avar and Russian besides their mother-tongue. Speakers of Bagvalal are claimed to also master Tindi. Speakers of Avar-Andic are not reported to master any of the neighboring Tsezic languages (or the other way around: speakers of Tsezic languages are not known to speak any of the Andic languages), nor are they known to master Chechen, a major literary language that is spoken in the area to the West of the area where Avar and the Andic languages are spoken. However, this does not necessarily mean that such contact does not exist.

1.2.2 Evidentiality in the Caucasus and beyond

According to Aikhenvald, small evidentiality systems are "an areal feature of a largish 'evidentiality belt' spreading across the Balkans, the Caucasus and Central Asia into Siberia" (2004: 290). The

---

6 For example in Koryakov (2006: 21), the total number of languages amounts to forty, because he labels eleven languages that are traditionally considered dialects of Dargwa, as independent languages. Also, as mentioned by Alekseev (1998: 156), some authors include Khinalug in the Legzic group, and Archi and Udi are sometimes excluded from this group.

7 In figure 1, the Andic languages are the small blue and purple dots located inbetween Chechen on the left and Avar to the right. In figure 2 in the appendix they can be discerned more clearly.
Attested systems in this area have also been the subject of a collective monograph edited by Johanson & Utas (2000). For the purposes of this paper, it seems disproportionate to take account of all the languages covered in Aikhenvald (2004) and Johanson & Utas (2000), which is why the scope of this paragraph has been narrowed down to the languages of the Caucasus and the neighboring languages Turkish and Persian. This selection encompasses languages pertaining to five different language-families: the three indigenous Caucasian families, Indo-European and Turkic.

Evidentiality systems that have been attested in the languages spoken in this area usually distinguish no more than two different evidential values: firsthand versus non-firsthand; non-firsthand versus 'everything else', or reported versus 'everything else'. What Aikhenvald refers to as non-firsthand information, other authors refer to as 'indirect' or 'indirective' (as for example in Johanson & Utas (2000)). The minimal evidentiality-system consists of either a general non-firsthand marker (which can be taken to refer to either information from hearsay or an inference based on sensory evidence, depending on the context), or a specified reported marker, opposed to 'everything else'. No systems are attested in which a firsthand or an inferred evidentiality marker is contrasted with 'everything else'. In the languages under consideration, non-firsthand markers commonly originate in a perfect or resultative form of the verb (as mentioned, among others, by Comrie (2000: 3)) and are characterized by varying degrees of grammaticalization across languages.

Both Aikhenvald and Johanson identify Turkish as a major influence on the development of evidential forms in this area, as the Turkish evidential perfect marker -miş was already present as such in Old Turkic, and according to Johanson it is "more stable" as an evidential marker than, for instance, the perfect in Persian (2000: 64). In other languages in the area, evidentiality is thought to be a more recent phenomenon. Boeder (2000) mentions that in Old Georgian, the resultative was nothing more than a resultative, whereas in modern Georgian it has developed a non-firsthand evidential meaning (possibly triggered by language contact with Turkish, see Boeder (2000)). Whether or not this evidential meaning can be considered to be grammaticalized in Georgian, remains a topic of discussion. Aikhenvald considers it to be merely one of the possible meanings of the perfect, but Boeder points out that these forms are referred to in older grammars as 'non-witnessed past', which suggests this possible meaning is rather salient. According to Aikhenvald, small evidential systems distinguishing non-firsthand versus 'everything else' have developed under the influence of Turkish in two other Kartvelian languages: Megrelian and Svan, whereas a combined influence of Turkish and Persian has probably triggered the development of evidentiality in Armenian (2004: 289). According to Lazard, the evidential perfect can be considered grammaticalized only in Western Armenian: in Eastern Armenian it remains just one of the possible meanings of this form (2001: 360). An evidential perfect exists in Persian, but its status within the grammar is still debated (see Comrie (2000: 4)). Regarding the West Caucasian languages, non-firsthand evidential markers can be reconstructed for Proto-Akhalaz and Proto-Circassian, implicating that these forms developed language-internally. However, evidentials are absent in the now extinct Ubykh language, even though speakers of Ubykh were often bi- or trilingual with Abkhaz and the Circassian languages (Aikhenvald 2004: 293).

---

8 A few languages from this area have not been taken into account because they are not treated by Aikhenvald (2004), nor in Johanson & Utas (2000), namely: Laz (Kartvelian); Ossetian, Kurdish, Tat (Indo-Iranian); Noghay (Turkic).
For the East Caucasian languages, the origin of evidentiality-marking remains unclear. According to Authier en Maisak, evidentiality within the verbal paradigm in East Caucasian is "marginal, and probably recent" (2009: ix). In an overview of evidentiality in East Caucasian, Forker states that in these languages "grammaticalized evidentiality as part of the verbal paradigm is actually rather rare" (Inpress-b, 9), although not all of the East Caucasian languages are actually taken into account in this study. Aside from this, the language-family is well-represented in Aikhenvald (2004), with examples from Agul, Archi, Bagvalal, Godoberi, Dargwa, Hunzib, Lak, Lezgian, Tsakhur and Tsez, although not all of them are considered to have grammaticalized evidentiality. Whether this is the case or not, is not always made explicit in Aikhenvald. As mentioned in 1.1, Forker considers all evidential extensions of the perfect 'evidential strategies'. In my opinion, more research on the usage of these forms is necessary in order to support or refute this claim.

For Proto-Nakh, two evidential suffixes have been reconstructed (Aikhenvald 2004: 28), distinguishing firsthand and non-firsthand in the past, and for Lezgian and Archi, Aikhenvald mentions the presence of a hearsay-evidential. In Lezgian this constitutes the entire evidential system, whereas in Archi it is considered a separate sub-system parallel to the system of verbal evidentiality. Evidential particles marking hearsay have been described also for Agul (in Maisak & Merdanova 2002, 8) and the Tsezic languages (see Khalilova 2009, 42).
Chapter 2
Evidentiality in Avar-Andic: a survey of descriptive literature

This section explores the evidential forms attested in descriptive grammars of the Avar-Andic languages and compares their formal characteristics. In paragraph 2.1, a general outline of available forms is presented, and in 2.2, different forms will be discussed in more detail, starting with the perfect and followed by constructions with the verb 'to find' and particles expressing hearsay-evidentiality.

2.1 General characteristics

The central evidential form in Avar-Andic is the perfect form of the verb: an analytic verb form composed of an auxiliary and a lexical verb that expresses non-firsthand evidentiality and is opposed to a simple past form. In all of the languages under discussion, the perfect can express such a meaning: none of these languages is reported to have a perfect that denotes only actions that took place in the past but the results of which have some relevance for the present. In some languages the simple past expresses firsthand evidentiality, whereas in others it is evidentiality-neutral. Two languages (Avar and Bagvalal) are reported to employ a construction with the verb 'to find' as a firsthand or inferential-marker. In general, verbal evidentiality is limited to the past tense, with the

---

1 Two languages (namely Andi and Botlikh) had to be excluded from comparison in 2.2.1, due to the fact that the sources on these languages do not describe verb-forms and their semantics in much detail. Therefore, the presence of evidentials in these languages can neither be confirmed nor excluded.

2 In an article on evidentiality in Avar, Forker mentions the existence of a series of forms with the past participle, which supposedly also express evidentiality. She mentions that Bokarev (1949) and Charachidzé (1981) describe nonfirsthand evidential use of these forms, but already in these works it is mentioned as a very infrequent form and according to Forker it is currently not used in this meaning anymore. Moreso, contemporary native speakers even reject such examples as ungrammatical (Forker Impress-a, 8), which is why it will not be discussed in this section.
exception of the present perfect in Godoberi. Particles marking reported speech are found in all of
the Avar-Andic languages, but it is not clear which of these can be considered hearsay-evidentials.

2.2  Specifics

2.2.1  The perfect

The evidential perfect in Avar-Andic is used to mark an event that happened in the past and was not
witnessed personally by the speaker. This form can occur in three possible constellations with
regards to other past tense forms and evidential values: the non-firsthand perfect can be opposed to
a neutral past tense-form (2.2.1.1), as in Avar, Bagvalal and Karata; there can be an opposition
between an analytic (perfect) non-firsthand form and a synthetic firsthand form (2.2.1.2), as in
Chamalal, Tindi or Akhvakh; or both firsthand and non-firsthand can be differentiated within the
perfect and opposed to a neutral past tense-form (2.2.1.3), which only occurs in Godoberi.

2.2.1.1  Non-firsthand perfect and neutral past

Languages pertaining to this type have not just one, but a 'series' of perfect forms: a perfect proper
and several forms derived thereof. For example in Avar, the perfect is formed with the perfective
converb of the lexical verb and the auxiliary b-ugo. The pluperfect is obtained by inserting the
perfective converb of the auxiliary inbetween the lexical verb and the auxiliary. Compare the
following forms of the verb b-ičize ('to sell, give away, release') (adapted from Forker Inpress-a, 3),
which constitute the 'perfect series' of Avar:\n
(5)  The perfect series in Avar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Pluperfect</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b-ič-un b-ugo</td>
<td>b-ič-un b-uk’un b-ugo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-sell-PF,CONV N-AUX</td>
<td>N-sell-PERF,CONV N-AUX.PRF,CONV N-AUX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The 'b' at the beginning of the verbs is actually a noun-class marker for neuter singular.
According to Forker, these forms always express evidentiality (Inpress-a, 6), with the exception of the perfect. The latter only takes on evidential meaning either in combination with specific verbs (namely those that "do not denote a change of state" (Forker Inpress-a, 5)), or when an evidential reading is somehow triggered by the context. These perfect forms are opposed to the 'aorist series': a set of synthetically formed unmarked past tense forms that are evidentially neutral.

A similar system exists in Bagvalal, although in Bagvalal the different readings of the perfect seem to be motivated by combinations with specific types of lexemes and are therefore not ambiguous (as was discussed in 1.1.1), whereas in Avar, evidential readings can also be triggered by the context. In Bagvalal, the evidential perfect is opposed to a 'preterite series': a set of morphologically less marked and evidentiality-neutral forms (Maisak & Tatevosov 2001: 294). The perfect is formed with the preterial converb of the lexical verb and the auxiliary: derived forms combine different forms of the lexical verb with an auxiliary inflected for perfect. Compare the following forms of the verb hec'i, 'to get up, stand up' from Maisak & Tatevosov (2001, 293):

(6) The preterite, pluperfect, perfect and evidential perfect in Bagvalal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Pluperfect</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Evidential pluperfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hec'i</td>
<td>b-uk'a</td>
<td>hec'i-b-o    ek'ʷa</td>
<td>hec'i-b-o   b-uk'a-b-o  ek'ʷa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stand up</td>
<td>N-AUX.PST</td>
<td>stand up-N-CONV</td>
<td>stand up-N-CONV N-AUX-N-CONV AUX.PRS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preterite series contains forms like the pluperfect, which combine different forms of the lexical verb with the preterite of the auxiliary. Their evidential counterparts are formed with the perfect form of the auxiliary (the composite form buk'a-bo ek'ʷa).

---

4 Please note that this is not the full paradigm of available forms.
In Karata, there is also an opposition of evidentiality-neutral and less morphologically marked forms versus more complex analytic forms expressing non-firsthand evidentiality, but the system in Karata seems to be less paradigmatic, as becomes clear from the following overview based on Magomedbekova (1967):

(7) \[ \text{Past tense forms in Karata} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Evidential past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>qwara- e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'wrote'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidential past</td>
<td>qwara-boxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bik'wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-PST,CONV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUX,PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>qwara-da bik'wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-PRS, AUX,PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'was writing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidential imperfect</td>
<td>qwara-da bik'wa-boxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-PRS, AUX,PST-CONV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect 2</td>
<td>qwara-boxa ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-PST,CONV, AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'has written'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past obligation</td>
<td>qwara- tla bik'wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-INF, AUX,PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'had to write'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidential past obligation</td>
<td>qwara- tla bik'wa-boxa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-INF, AUX,PST-CONV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>qwara-boxa bik'wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write-PST,CONV, AUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'has been written'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 In Magomedbekova proshedsee obščee or ‘general past’ in Russian (1967: 121).
6 All of the evidential forms are called proshedsee zaglaznoe, or ‘past non-witnessed’ in Magomedbekova (1967: 131). They are differentiated from the neutral forms only in terms of evidentiality and therefore, it can not be asserted with certainty that the ‘evidential past’ is a perfect as it is in the other two languages just discussed.
7 There are two constructions described as ‘past uncompleted’ by Magomedbekova (1967: 131), but whereas the first is translated with pisal (the imperfective past form of ‘to write’ in Russian), the latter is translated with the perfective past form of ‘to write’ (napisal).
8 This form is labeled proshedsee nadležašee ‘past subjective’ by Magomedbekova (1967: 131), but the example is translated as ‘had to write’ (nado bylo pisat’). As Magomedbekova does not specify what the label ‘past subjective’ indicates, I chose to replace it with ‘past obligation’, based on its translation.
As this overview shows, the neutral forms outnumber their evidential counterparts, whereas in the other languages there are two parallel paradigms.

### 2.2.1.2 Non-firsthand perfect and firsthand past

In three of the Avar-Andic languages the morphologically least marked past tense form by default expresses firsthand evidentiality, and is opposed by a single analytic form expressing non-firsthand evidentiality (rather than a set of so-called 'perfect series'). For example in Chamalal, there is a synthetic past tense-form called prošedšee očevidnoe, or 'past witnessed', which is opposed by an analytic 'past unwitnessed' (prošedšee zaglaznoe), formed with a past converb and the copula ida (Bokarev 1949). According to Bokarev, the simple past can be evidentiality-neutral, but from his work it does not become clear how different interpretations arise. Beside the witnessed and unwitnessed past, there is a non-evidential pluperfect in Chamalal, which is formed with the past converb and the past tense of the auxiliary (buk’a).

In Tindi, the non-firsthand past is historically formed with the simple past and the enclitic auxiliary -ija, but the simple past suffix and the enclitic have subsequently merged into one suffix (-oː), for example: iho 'did' (past tense of 'to do') + ija > ihoː, 'has done' (Magomedova 2003, 563-64). Its analytic origin surfaces when the form is negated, because then the negative auxiliary hik'i is used, creating the form: iho hik'i ('has not done'). Alongside these two forms, there are two analytic past tense-forms in Tindi: the imperfect and the pluperfect, both of which are evidentiality-neutral.

For Akhvakh, different sources show slightly different pictures of the available evidential forms. In the descriptive grammar of Magomedbekova (1967), no verb forms expressing evidentiality are described. Magomedova & Abdulavera (2007) on the other hand, identify a synthetic 'witnessed past' (with the following possible suffixes: -eri /-ede, -ari /-ade, -ori /-vari /-vade, -eni, -ani, -oni) and an analytic 'unwitnessed past', formed with the past tense of the auxiliary godi (bik’urut’al in past). In addition, Akhvakh is reported by M&A to have a pluperfect (davnoprošedšee), imperfect (nesoveršennoe prošedšee) and an analytic 'general past' (prošedšee obš’ee), all of which are evidentiality-neutral. Both the work of Magomedbekova (1967) and that of M&A (2007) were based on the Northern dialect of Akhvakh. In Creissels’ work on the southern Axaxdərə dialect, four synthetic evidentials are distinguished (called 'perfectives' in Creissels (2008b: 4)): the first two (with the suffixes -iri, -ari, -eri and -idi, -ada) correspond in part to the suffixes of 'witnessed past' and 'general present' described in M&A (2007: 689-90). According to Creissels, they all denote firsthand evidentiality. The third form, with the suffix -wudi, expresses non-firsthand evidentiality and does not occur at all in M&A, whereas the fourth (-wa, -aji, in M&A 'future indefinite' (2007: 690)) is used to mark admirativity and epistemic modality. Creissels also mentions the presence of analytic constructions with bik’urut’al, as in M&A, but it remains unclear what they are used for exactly and how they relate to the synthetic forms (Creissels 2008b: 4).

---

9 From here on referred to as M&A.
2.2.1.3 Non-firsthand and firsthand perfect and neutral past

So far, Godoberi is the only Avar-Andic language in which a system has been attested, that distinguishes both firsthand and non-firsthand evidentiality by way of the perfect. The past perfect 1 is formed by adding the auxiliary *buk'a* to different forms of the lexical verb and marks events that took place in the past, hold some relevance for the future and were witnessed personally by the speaker. The past perfect 2, formed with the present perfect of the auxiliary (*buk'a-da*), shares the same time-reference, but marks events not witnessed by the speaker. These forms have a parallel set of derived forms (the past resultative and past progressive 1 and 2), which differ from one another in evidentiality only. There are also two forms for present perfect: one is formed with the past converb and the enclitic copula -(i)da, and expresses non-firsthand evidentiality. The other is formed by combining the past converb with the past progressive of the auxiliary *buk'a* (*buk'atada*) and expresses firsthand evidentiality. In addition, there is a synthetically formed neutral past tense, which, according to Dobrushina & Tatevosov is by far the most frequently used past tense-form (1996: 92).

The future perfect forms available in Godoberi (definite and indefinite) are also claimed to express evidentiality, but the following examples of this form are given in Dobrushina & Tatevosov (1996: 96):

(8)  anwar w-aʔi-tɬi-bu-q'ʷatɬi  Šali  Rum-u
Anwar  M-come-INF-FUT-PTCP-when  Ali  fall.asleep-PST.CONV
wu k'ɿ-i-sɿ:u
M-be-INF-FUT.DEF

"When Anwar comes, Ali will (definitely) have (already) fallen asleep.

(9)  anwar w-aʔi-tɬi-bu-q'ʷatɬi  Šali  Rum-u
Anwar  M-come-INF-FUT-PTCP-when  Ali  fall.asleep-PST.CONV
wu k'ɿ-i-tɬi-bu da
M-be-INF-FUT-PTCP-COP

"When Anwar comes, Ali will have (already) fallen asleep."

These are rather situations where the speaker expresses a certain degree of confidence that a specific situation will take place in the future, which is more likely a presumptive (as the construction with the synthetic future form of *b—isã* described by Maisak & Tatevosov (2001) for Bagvalal (see 2.2.2)), as the speaker has some reason to assume that something either will be the case, or will definitely be the case. This represents an evaluation of the likelihood that something will take place, rather than a reference to an information-source. For this reason, I would not consider the future perfect forms in Godoberi to be part of the evidentiality system.
2.2.2 Constructions with the verb 'to find'

In Avar and Bagvalal, constructions with the verb 'to find' have been attested as a means of expressing evidential values. Creissels mentions the existence of such a construction within the inventory of analytic verbal constructions in Axaxdarə Akhvakh (2008b: 4), but does not specify what it means or how it is used, which is why it is excluded from this overview for now. In Avar, the construction with b-atize 'to find' expresses non-firsthand evidentiality. It distinguishes itself from the non-firsthand perfect, in that it expresses inference from sensory evidence only and cannot be interpreted as expressing information obtained from hearsay. Also, the construction with b-atize can have overtones of mirativity (Forker Inpress-a, 12), unlike the evidential perfect forms. Although Forker does not specify if there are any restrictions on the tense in which the form is used, in her examples the verb b-atize always bears a past time reference, because it marks a discovery the speaker has done, which can be paraphrased with 'it turned out that' (the discovered fact can then be the result of a completed action, such as 'someone has bought a car', or a situation, such as 'someone is dead'). Furthermore, this construction cannot co-occur in a sentence with evidential perfect forms (ibid).

In Bagvalal, the construction with b-isã can be divided into three separate forms, depending on the form of b-isã, as well as the form of the lexical verb it is combined with. First of all, when combined with the preterite or the preterial converb of the lexical verb, this construction marks inference from sensory evidence, analogous to the construction in Avar. What distinguishes this form from the evidential perfect (besides its incompatibility with a hearsay-reading), is that the speaker is not necessarily the reference-point for the source of the information, as in the following example from Maisak & Tatevosov (2001: 311):

```
(10) rahati o-b q’anin-b-o b-isan-č’u-b-q’atani,
morning this-N eat-N-CONV N-find-NEG-PTCP-N-CONV
hetɬi-b-o ekʷa...
say-N-CONV AUX.PRS

"When in the morning she discovered it didn't eat the hay, she said..."
```

The topic of the story is a woman who thought a car was like a horse, and therefore put some food out for him. Literally the sentence reads: 'In the morning it not-eat found. has said...'. In Forker, there is a similar example for the construction with b-atize in Avar, where the subject discovering something is not the speaker (see Forker (Inpress-a, 11)).

When b-isã is combined with the imperfective converb, it functions as a marker of firsthand evidentiality, indicating that the speaker directly witnessed a certain situation. As a rule this refers to sensory perception, but in M&T (2001: 310) one example is presented, where the situation concerned can not literally be seen:

---

10 Henceforth: M&T.
"(As it turned out,) he forgot my adres".

In this example, the speaker had given his address to an acquaintance, who then failed to write him. When the speaker met this acquaintance again, he found out his acquaintance forgot his adress: the verb 'to forget' is paired with b-isã in a firsthand evidential construction, supposedly because the speaker has personally verified that his acquaintance indeed forgot his adress. This form is characterized by a very low degree of grammaticalization, as speakers do not use it in the majority of cases where they personally witnessed something (M&T 2001, 308).

The third construction is called the 'presumptive' (M&T 2001, 315): it is based on the synthetic future form of b-isã and denotes inference from logical reasoning. According to M&T (2001: 316), the verb in this form is on its way to be lexicalized as a presumptive marker, as it can be combined with lexical verbs in different tenses, in which case the tense of the lexical verb governs the proposition. In the other constructions b-isã is technically capable of occurring in different tense-forms, but in practice is almost never used in the non-past (M&T 2001, 308-309).

### 2.2.3 Particles

As mentioned in 1.1.3, particles marking reported speech can be divided in quotatives, that specify the concrete source of an utterance, and hearsay-evidentials, which merely mark that an utterance is based on hearsay, without referring to a specific source. In the Avar-Andic languages both types of markers are found, but they can not always be strictly separated based on the aforementioned criterium. First of all, when using a quotative, the speaker is not obligated to specify the source of the quote: the focus can also be on the recipient. Compare for instance the examples (12) and (13) from Akhvakh (Magomedbekova 1967: 107):

(12) ima-tɬ'ehe eteri hu jaːʃeɬːe.  
father-quot say that girl

"Father," said that girl.

The suffix -tɬ'ehe is attached to ima 'father', which is the final constituent of the quote, and in the main clause the source of the utterance ('that girl') is specified.

---

11 In the examples (13) and (14) only the quotative-markers are indicated with glosses, due to the fact that in the source only the original sentence and its paraphrase in Russian were given. Literal translations of the lexical items have been added with the help of the Akhvakh-Russian dictionary of M&A (2007), but further glossing has been omitted, because my knowledge of Akhvakh morphology is not sufficient, and this information is not directly relevant here.
"Mother bought you a book", we have heard.

In (13) it remains unclear who uttered the phrase in the subordinate clause, as the main clause specifies the recipient (namely 'we') rather than the source of the utterance.

Some markers can be used as quotatives as well as hearsay-evidentials. Compare the following examples with the suffix -Rala in Bagvalal (Chumakina & Maisak 2001, 723)12:

(14) "čo-Rala tak mala-di." - hetɬ'i gaʔišnik-šːu-r.
   what-quot tak malo-quot - say traffic cop-OBL.M-ERG

"Why so little?" - said the traffic cop.

(15) deː s'orolu-w ek'ʷa-Rala
   smart-m aux.prs-quot

(They say) I'm smart.

In the first sentence, the particles -Rala and -di mark a quote, which is complemented by the verb hetɬ'i ('to say'), pointing to the source of the quote (the traffic cop). In the second sentence, the particle Rala is added to an isolated proposition, which generates the meaning of hearsay (here: 'I'm smart (they say)'). Quotative particles functioning as hearsay-evidentials have been attested also in Avar (see Forker (Inpress-a)) and the Tsez languages (see Khalilova (2011)). A not uncommon pattern is the development of a verb with the meaning 'to say' into a quotative marker and subsequently into a hearsay-evidential. This has been attested among others in the East Caucasian language Lezgian (Aikhenvald 2004, 273), in which this marker forms an A3 evidentiality-system (reported versus 'everything else') on its own.

Particles marking reported speech are described for all of the Avar-Andic languages. However, across descriptive literature different labels are used to describe these forms and as a rule, the choice for a certain label is not motivated and examples of usage are scarce. This makes it difficult to decide which markers can be considered evidentials. Table 1 contains an inventory of the particles described for each language by different sources, following the labels found in the respective sources (some of these are translated from Russian)13:

---

12 The lexical items in this sentence are actually all Russian, with the exception of hetɬ'i, 'say'.
13 In this table Andi and Botlikh, which until now have been set aside, are included, because unlike the verbal forms, these particles were included in the literature.
Table 1  Reported speech markers in the Avar-Andic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Evidential particle</th>
<th>Quotative particle</th>
<th>Unwitnessed action particle</th>
<th>Quotative form of the verb</th>
<th>Indirect speech particle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avar (Forker)</td>
<td>-ila</td>
<td>-ilan, -an, -ali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhvakh (Magomedbekova 1967)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-tʃ'ːe, -di, -etʃ'ːehe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Magomedova &amp; Abdulaiwa 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-tʃ'ːe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andi (Alekseev 1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-łoRo, -Rvodu</td>
<td>-łoDi, -Rvodi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagvalal (Chumakina &amp; Maisak 2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Reː, -Ra, -di, -Rala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botlikh (Gudava 1962)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-talu, -kul, -xul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamalal (Bokarev 1949)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-daqʃ, -tʃaqʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Magomedova 1999)</td>
<td>-ła, -wa</td>
<td>-tʃ'u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godoberi (Haspelmath 1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karata (Magomedbekova 1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-tʃe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tindi (Magomedova 2003)</td>
<td>-lda</td>
<td></td>
<td>-tʃ'o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So far, only for Bagvalal and Avar the existence of hearsay-evidentials can be confirmed (in Avar, these are the suffixes -ila and -an, and in Bagvalal it is the suffix -Rala), based on Forker (Inpress-a) and Chumakina & Maisak (2001). For Godoberi, the existence of such forms can be excluded, as the attested markers do not occur in main-clauses (see Haspelmath (1996)).
Chapter 3  
Semantics and pragmatics

A majority of the available sources on Avar-Andic languages are concerned mainly with formal characteristics of grammatical forms, which is why information on the semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in these languages is scarce, with the exception of Avar (see Forker (Impress-a)) and Bagvalal (see Maisak & Tatevosov (2001)). Therefore, this paragraph is based for the most part on material from these two languages, and where possible, this is complemented with information on other languages. In 3.1, the semantics of evidentials in these languages will be discussed, such as the overlap in meaning between forms, their behavior in first-person clauses and mirative extensions. In 3.2, pragmatic aspects will be discussed, such as narrative conventions and epistemic judgement.

3.1  Semantics

3.1.1  General non-firsthand versus reported and inferential

In both Avar and Bagvalal there is a general non-firsthand form that can denote either reported information or inference from visual evidence, depending on the context. But in addition, there are also specified markers for both meanings (the inferential constructions with b-isa and b-atize, and the hearsay-particles). It is not quite clear how these forms, that (in part) cover the same meanings, are distributed, but at least in Avar, the hearsay-evidential can be combined with the evidential perfect. Unfortunately, it remains unclear what kind of effect this produces on the meaning of a sentence. In Abkhaz for example, the general non-firsthand marker can be combined with an impersonal reportative verb, both of which signal that the speaker wants to avoid responsibility for the truth-value of the statement. When combined, this appears to have a "cumulative distancing effect" (Aikhenvald 2004: 186). However, in Avar only the hearsay-particle has epistemic overtones, which makes it rather unlikely that this combination gives rise to such an effect.

3.1.2  Non-firsthand evidentiality and first person clauses

One of the more reliable methods for identifying a non-firsthand evidential, is its behavior in combination with a first-person subject. As a rule, non-firsthand forms (regardless of whether they are inferential or reportative) can not be used in first-person clauses unless a specific context is
provided that justifies such usage. Intuitively, it would seem a first-person subject is by definition incompatible with non-firsthand evidentials, as it would mean the speaker participated in an event, yet he did not witness it personally. Rather than being ungrammatical however, this construction implies that the speaker was either not consciously present during the event he is talking about, or that his actions were non-volitional (Aikhenvald 2004: 220). In Bagvalal for example, when the evidential perfect occurs in a first-person clause, it means the speaker did not consciously participate in a situation X, and learned that X was the case only afterwards, either because someone told him (reported) or he inferred it from visible traces. Compare the following examples from M&T (2001, 306):

(16)  
\[\text{den roX-li w-efi-w-o ek'wa,}\]  
\[\text{L.ERG forest-INTER M-GO AWAY-M-CONV AUX.PRS}\]  
\[\text{he: si: k'wa-b-o ek'wa.}\]  
\[\text{next, afterwards bear kill-N-CONV AUX.PRS}\]  

"(They told me) yesterday I went into the forest and then I killed a bear (but I don't remember it myself, because I was drunk)."

(17)  
\[\text{waH, den ča č'ere-b-o ek'wa.}\]  
\[\text{Oh, L.ERG tea poor out/over-N-CONV AUX.PRS}\]  

"Oh! I spilled tea (I see)."

In (16), the speaker says he went into the forest and killed a bear, using a non-firsthand perfect: personally he had no recollection of this (because he was intoxicated at the time), but other people had told him about it afterwards. In (17), the speaker did not mind what he was doing as he was pouring himself a cup of tea when suddenly, he noticed a puddle of tea next to his cup. From this visual evidence, he inferred that he must have spilled while he was pouring the tea. In Bagvalal, this construction can also be used when the speaker was consciously present in the events leading up to a certain resulting situation, but he is surprised by the latter, which will be treated in the following paragraph. According to Forker, in Avar the perfect can be used with a first-person subject, without implying that the speaker is not entirely conscious of the situation, as in the following example (Forker Inpress-a, 4):

(18)  
\[\text{dun unt-un w-ugo}\]  
\[\text{I be ill-CONV M-COP}\]  

'I am sick.'

The pluperfect on the other hand (and all of the other forms derived from the perfect for that matter), can not be used with a first-person subject unless a proper context is provided (Forker Inpress-a, 7). This confirms that the perfect in Avar is not entirely grammaticalized as a marker of non-firsthand evidentiality.
3.1.3 Mirativity

Evidentials often acquire mirative extensions, which mark unexpected information and surprise on the side of the speaker. In Avar, the inferential construction with b-atize is said to have mirative overtones (see Forker (Inpress-a, 12)), whereas in Bagvalal this has been mentioned only for constructions with non-firsthand evidentials in combination with first-person subjects, as in the following example (from M&T (2001, 307)):

(19)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{den} & \text{ʕali} & k'k'k'k'ʷaː & \text{ek'ek'ek'ek'ʷa}.\\
\text{ERG} & \text{Ali} & \text{kill-Conv} & \text{AUX.PRS}
\end{array}
\]

I (it turns out) have killed Ali!

Leading up to the situation in (19), the speaker was consciously fighting with Ali and beat him with a rock. Ali then fell down and the speaker checked his pulse, after which, to his own astonishment, he concluded that Ali had died. In other words: the speaker was fully aware that he beat Ali with a rock, but he was not aware that in doing so, he killed Ali.

3.2 Pragmatics

3.2.1 Narratives

Crosslinguistically, evidentials are often linked to (traditional) story-telling (Aikhenvald 2003, 18). This is true also for Avar, Akhvakh, Bagvalal and Godoberi, which are reported to employ non-firsthand evidentials in narratives dealing with events long ago (and thus not witnessed by the speaker), including fairytales and myths. In Akhvakh, Bagvalal and Godoberi, the non-firsthand evidential perfect is used for this purpose, although in Bagvalal the perfect can alternate with the preterite in a rather complicated way in such contexts (as described in M&T 2001, 296-299). This suggests that in Bagvalal, the usage of evidential perfects in narratives is less conventionalized than in other languages. For example in Godoberi, any narrative about events that happened long ago and were not directly witnessed by the speaker consists entirely of evidential perfect forms (with the exception of dialogues within the story) (Dobrushina & Tatevosov 1996: 95). In Avar narratives, both the evidential perfect and the hearsay-particle -ila can be used. Unfortunately, it remains unclear what motivates a choice for either of the two forms. In addition, the particle can be added on top of an evidential perfect form, but it is not quite clear what the effect is of such a combination.

When a speaker talks about past events from his own experience in Avar and Bagvalal, an evidentially neutral form is used. In Bagvalal, the firsthand construction with b-isã can be used to emphasize that the speaker witnessed something with his own eyes. However, as mentioned in 2.2.2, in many cases where the speaker witnessed something directly, this form is not used. Speakers of Godoberi also seem to prefer the neutral simple past over the firsthand perfect when talking about their own experiences (Dobrushina & Tatevosov 1996: 95).
3.2.2 Epistemic extensions

In Avar as well as Bagvalal, non-firsthand evidentials do not imply that the speaker is less certain of the truth of what he is saying (with the exception of hearsay-particles). As shown by Tatevosov (2003), in the case of inferentials it is rather the other way around: the use of an inferential evidential is only appropriate if the proposition is rooted in sufficient evidence and knowledge. Consider the following example from Bagvalal (from Tatevosov (2003: 184)):

(20) k'amandir k'w-a-w-o ek'w-a.
    Commander kill-M-CONV AUX.PRS

   'The commander has been killed.'

In (20), the speaker is watching a battle in which the commander of the attacking party suddenly falls to the ground. According to Tatevosov, the utterance in (20) is considered inappropriate by native speakers if the speaker merely sees the commander falling to the ground, because the commander might be only unconscious or wounded. According to a 'probability constraint', formulated by Tatevosov, the speaker can only use the inferential evidential if for whatever reason he is certain that the situation he proposes, is more likely to be the case than any other situation (2003: 184). In the case of (20) for example, if the speaker checked the pulse of the commander and thus verified he is dead, the sentence in (20) is completely appropriate. In addition to probability, there is also a 'recoverability constraint': an utterance with an inferential evidential should always be rooted in a combination of visual evidence (i.e. a witnessed result) and 'conventionalized knowledge of the world' (Tatevosov 2003, 186). It cannot be based on assumptions with no clearly identifiable ground. Whether or not the usage of an inferential is appropriate for a speaker can depend on the knowledge he is expected to have. This can be illustrated with example (21) (adapted from M&T (2001: 304)), about a break-in to someone's house. Upon seeing the traces of the break-in, the sentence in (21) is considered a legitimate conclusion when uttered by a police-man who has a lot of experience with break-ins and crime-scenes, whereas it is judged inappropriate when uttered, for example, by the owner of the house, who has never seen a break-in before and does not possess the same professional knowledge as the police-man.

(21) a-r huns'-abi q'acaR-lu-r kub-i-1 huma-li-r
    this-NPL door-PL thief-OBL.M-ERG iron-OBL-GEN spear-OBL-ERG

   qini-r-o ek'w-a.
   break-NPL-ONV AUX.PRS

   'The thief (I see) broke in the door with a crowbar.'

Due to the fact that the probability and recoverability constraints render it impossible for the speaker to use inferential constructions when an assertion is not grounded in a combination of sufficient evidence and knowledge, the usage of these forms implies a certain degree of confidence.
on the side of the speaker that what he says is true, since in his evaluation the proposition meets the constraints of probability and recoverability.

According to Aikhenvald, "a reported evidential can develop an epistemic extension of unreliable information, as a means of 'shifting' responsibility for the information to some other source one does not vouch for" (2004: 193). In both Bagvalal (Chumakina & Maisak (2001, 723)) and Avar (Forker Impress-a, 3), particles of reported speech in general are said to signal that the speaker is not entirely sure of his statement and wants to avoid responsibility: this is not limited to hearsay-evidentials, but also includes quotative particles.
Conclusion

In summary, modest two-term evidentiality systems seem to be in place in all of the Avar-Andic languages (with the exception of Andi and Botlikh, for which this can not be confirmed nor excluded). Avar, Bagvalal and Karata mark only non-firsthand information, by way of a series of evidential past perfect forms, which are opposed to morphologically less marked evidentially neutral past tense forms. In Chamalal, Akhvakh and Tindi the non-firsthand past perfect is contrasted with a simple past form that marks statements based on firsthand information. In these languages non-firsthand evidentiality is limited to the perfect proper: in derived forms such as the pluperfect, the evidential distinction is neutralized. In Godoberi, both firsthand and non-firsthand evidentiality are expressed by a series of perfect forms (including a present perfect). These two paradigms are in opposition to an evidentiality-neutral simple past. Each language seems to have such a neutral past tense form, which means the expression of evidentiality is not mandatory. Nonetheless, conclusions regarding the level of grammaticalization of these forms can not be drawn based on the material treated in this study: this would require a systematic study of the behavior of evidential forms in context and in comparison to their neutral alternatives. Although the non-firsthand perfect comprises hearsay and inference based on visual evidence, some languages in addition have specialized forms to express these meanings.

Alongside the evidential perfect forms, constructions with the verb 'to find' as an auxiliary, in combination with a lexical verb, can be used in Avar and Bagvalal to mark non-firsthand information based on inference from sensory evidence (Avar and Bagvalal) or firsthand information (Bagvalal). Constructions with these verbs can also express epistemic meanings, but as the different readings are triggered by specific forms of the verb 'to find' and the lexical verb it is paired with, no ambiguity arises. As with the perfect, the material on which this study is based does not allow for any definitive conclusions on the status of these forms within the grammar of the individual languages, although according to M&T the construction marking firsthand evidentiality shows a very low degree of grammaticalization (2001: 308). In all of the Avar-Andic languages particles marking reported speech have been attested, but it remains unclear whether they can be considered to constitute an independent evidentiality system that distinguishes reported information versus 'everything else', as is found, for instance, in the distantly related languages Lezgian and Archi (see 1.1 and 2.2.3). Most likely it will differ from language to language whether this is the case or not: so far it can be established that in Avar and Bagvalal, quotatives can function as hearsay-evidentials, whereas in Godoberi they cannot.

The attested evidentiality-systems in Avar-Andic conform to the areal type, as they form small, two-term-systems originating from a perfect form of the verb, which are possibly complemented with analytic constructions with the verb 'to find' or specialized hearsay-evidentials. What is surprising
however, is that the systems found in the Andic languages, are not as similar to that of Avar as might be expected. First of all, the perfect as an evidential marker in Avar is not entirely grammaticalized, whereas in any case in Bagvalal it is (see 1.1.1 and 2.2.1.1): this makes it unlikely that the former induced the development of the latter. Second, four of the Andic languages mark firsthand information, which does not occur in Avar, but has been attested in the neighboring Tsezic languages and in Chechen. This suggests that the contact-situation of speakers of Andic languages might be less straight-forward than it appears. Also, the possibility that this category emerged language-internally, can not be excluded. Overall, this survey points to some promising topics for future research: first and foremost, the usage of evidentials in East Caucasian at large and Avar-Andic in particular so far remains understudied, while such research is a prerequisite for drawing conclusions on the status of these forms within the grammar of individual languages and subsequently, their status within a larger areal context. In addition, little is known about the possible semantic extensions of these forms, how they relate to mirativity and epistemic modality and the way they are used in discourse.
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