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Abstract

The paper is organized as follows. First, some preliminary remarks on the category of evidentiality are made and then the results of my previous paper on the evidentiality, inferentiality and mirativity in Hindi are discussed. Then some new findings on these topics are presented. Reported speech markers – quotatives, including diachronic aspect, and delocutive nouns and verbs as the compressed modes of direct speech are described. Typological characteristics of Hindi in respect of evidentiality are suggested.

This paper builds on my previous work on evidentiality, inferentiality and mirativity in Hindi (Sigorskiy 2010). So it would be reasonable to begin with a summary of the results obtained before.

Preliminary remarks
But as a preliminary some general remarks are necessary. Hindi is not a language with a shaped evidential system. Evidentiality is rather a periphery of its grammatical structure. The inferential and the presumptive types of evidentiality seem to be the only domains which are marked in verb – by the forms of the future tense of the indicative mood, and by the forms of subjunctive and conditional moods. But evidentiality is not the only grammatical category and by no means the main category marked by them. The semantics of evidentiality is an extension of the modal semantics of the Hindi moods. While modality is the expression of the attitudes of a speaker including possibility, probability, necessity, obligation, etc., evidentiality denotes a source of new information obtaining by a speaker. It may be an external source (reported evidentials), or internal source or mental activity of a person (inferentials). New information may be unexpected and surprising for a person unprepared to obtain it (miratives).

The main results obtained
The main results of the first part of my investigation are as follows.

As is known there is no grammatically marked “heresay” type of evidentiality or reported evidentiality in Hindi which is supposed to be the main type of evidentiality. The most grammaticalised kind of evidentials in Hindi are inferentials expressed by moods – indicative (especially future tense forms), subjunctive and conditional mood or irrealis. It means that the evidential (inferential) semantics is always combined with the modal semantics of the moods.

Mirativity mainly is marked in Hindi by different types of exclamatory sentences with exclamatory particles. Mirativity can be expressed by a syntactic construction referred to as “double predicate construction” (Chernyshev 1968), “Theme-Focussing” (Gambhir 1983), or “thematic jo hai vo construction” (Davison 2007a: 236). But mirative reading of this construction seems to be context-bound. Besides, mirativity can be expressed in the same way as inferred evidentiality – by moods including future forms.

All the three domains – evidentials, inferentials and miratives – comprise one category which denotes a source of new information. Information may be reported, inferred or unexpected for the speaker. This category mainly is not grammatical, but functional. Evidentiality uses mainly narrative or descriptive strategies; mirativity employs syntactic strategies; while inferentials are the most grammaticalized modes of expression.

“Pure” evidentiality is not observed in Hindi. Everywhere it is combined with some modal semantics denoting various degrees of reliability of the information concerned. In this regard Hindi evidentials are what (Aikhenvald 2004: 392) calls evidential extensions or strategies: “use of a non-evidential category (such as tense, aspect, or modality) to refer to an information source”. But it doesn’t mean that evidentiality is regarded in Hindi as something of little importance. Evidential information may be obligatory as inferred evidentials and miratives, and may be optional as reported, heresay, secondhand etc. evidentials. From typological of view Hindi is not a standard prototypical evidential language because due to historical reasons the prototypical evidentiality is...
considered to be the reported evidentiality (reported evidentials were the first to be described). Material of Hindi indicates that this point of view needs to be reconsidered.

**New findings**

Evidentiality in a broader sense of the word including reported evidentiality, inferentiality and mirativity has three modes of expression: 1) grammatical, 2) syntactical and 3) lexical.

**Mirativity**

Besides exclamatives, double predicate construction and mirative inferentials, mirativity may be expressed by a specialized syntactic construction – a complex sentence representing a situation which includes two events, the first one just finished is interrupted by another event, unexpected and surprising for a speaker (for a speaker’s unprepared mind). Pluperfect with particle *hii* “just”, “as soon as” in a main clause and preterite in a subordinate clause are the grammatical markers of the situation showing an unexpected turn of events. For an example:

(1) *vah dukaan=se kuchh duuri= par aaya hii thaa ki achaanak 4-5 janoN=ne*  
‘3SG shop from a little farther=LOC came just PLPRF=SG-M COMP suddenly 4-5 men=ERG use moTarsaaikil=par jaate hue= ko laaThiyoN=se maarkar niiche giraa diyaa*  
*him-DAT motorcycle=LOC going=DAT clubs=INS beaten-CONV down threw PRT-M/SG’  
‘He just droved a bit off the shop when suddenly 4-5 lads knocked him down from the motorcycle with their clubs.’


Another mode of expression of mirativity I can add to what I have found in my previous paper, is the verbs *thaharna* ‘to remain, to be’ and *nikalna* ‘to turn out’. Both of them in the mirative function are always in preterite.

These examples (3) and (4) illustrate the range of mirative meanings propounded in Aikhenvald 2012, 437:

“The range of mirative meanings subsumes the following values included under the ‘mirativity’ label: (i) sudden discovery, sudden revelation or realization (a) by the speaker, (b) by the audience (or addressee), or (c) by the main character; (ii) surprise (a) of the speaker, (b) of the audience (or addressee), or (c) of the main character; (iii) unprepared mind (a) of the speaker, (b) of the audience (or addressee), or (c) of the main character; (iv) counterexpectation (a) to the speaker, (b) to the addressee, or (c) to the main character; (v) information new (a) to the speaker, (b) to the addressee, or (c) to the main character.”

An example with *nikalna* ‘to turn out’:

(3) *aakhir sach hii niklii baat: mahbuubaa=ne*  
‘after all true turned PRT-F/SG news NOM-F/SG: ‘mehbooba’=ERG kii thii modii=kii taariif had done PLPRF-F/SG Modi=GEN-F/SG praise-NOM-F/SG’  
‘After all it turned out to be true: Mehbooba was the praise of Modi.’


An example with *thaharna*:

(4) *aakhir kyoN? vah gadhaa jo Thahraa!*  
‘at last why? - 3SG ass-NOM-M/SG that remained PRT-M/SG’
‘but why? - he is an ass, after all.’

Unprepared mind in the last phrase in (4) is not the speaker as in (3) but the addressee. The addressee is surprised because he expected a different answer. Information is new for the addressee, not for the speaker. Both verbs – ‘nikalnaa’ and ‘Thaharnaa’ – demonstrate in (3) and (4) opposite directionality in the mirative context.

Obviously these two verbs are not the only verbs that comprise a class of verbal mirative constructions, but preparation of the list of such verbs is a task for the future.

Inferentials

As was shown in Liperovskij (2006: 222) modality of reliability is expressed in Hindi by modal words and particles. These modal phrases comprise a scale of reliability from critical, strong reliability on the top to uncertainty, lack of confidence, weak reliability on the bottom. Syntactic behavior of the modal words of strong and medium reliability differs from those of weak reliability. The modal words of the former class express confidence in affirmative sentences and strong doubt in rhetorical questions, while weak modal words doesn’t form rhetorical questions.

Examples of rhetorical questions:

(5) kyaa sarkaar vaakaii asahaay hai?
   ‘why government-NOM-F/SG actually helpless is PRS-3SG’
   ‘Is the government really helpless?’
   <http://www.bhaskar.com/indiakisoch/93> (29 September 2011)

(6) kyaa aapkii kitaab vaastav meN koti paRhnaa chaahtaa hai?
   ‘why your book-ACC-F/SG really somebody read INF wants PRS-3-M/SG’
   ‘Is there in fact somebody who wants to read your book?’
   <http://za.samwaad.com/2012/03/blog-post.html>

In the following example rhetorical question is questionable:

(7) main shaayad hii smitaa paatil ban saktaaN
   ‘ISG hardly Smita Patil become could SBJV-1SG’
   ‘I could hardly become Smita Patil’

Inferentials may be marked lexically with modal verbs as a modal frame of the utterance:

(8) mujhe to jaan paraa ki is bhaaShaN kaa uttar
   ‘mujhe1SG-DAT seemed PRT-M-SG COMP this speech GEN-M/SG effect-NOM-M/SG un par huua hogaa’
   3PL-HON=LOC would FUT-PRF-M/SG
   ‘It seemed to me that this speech produced the effect on him.’
   <http://wikisource.org/wiki/वह_अग्नि_रूप>
The reported speech usually has no special grammar markers in the MSH, neither for a source of information, or for information itself. If the information reported is reliable and doesn’t raise any doubt indicative mood is used.

(11) vah bol raahaa thaa ki mere saath buhut kudd raahaa hai
‘3SG tell DUR-PRS-M/SG COMP me with demon NOM-M/SG jumpPRS-DUR-M/SG’
‘he was telling that a demon is jumping with me.’

(12) DakTar ke mutaabik naaraayaN=kii maansik haalat ThiiN nahiiN hai
‘Doctor according narayan=GEN-F mental state-NOM-F/SG well NEG PRS-3SG’
‘According the doctor the mental state of Narayan is not well.’

If information seems to be doubtful and unreliable some special modes of expression as verbs like ‘seem, look, appear’ and indirect moods like subjunctive in the following example are used.

(13) mujhe to jaan paRaa ki is bhaaShaN=kaa asar
‘1-SG-DAT seemed PRT-M/SG COMP this speech=G EN=M/SG effect-NOM-M/SG unpar huua hoga
3-PL=LOC might been PRF-FUT-M/SG’
‘It seemed to me that this speech affected him.’

Reported evidentiality may be expressed in Hindi not only in a periphrastic way but grammatically also, though such grammatical markers are represented mostly in Dakhini. Grammatical modes of reported evidentiality are discussed in the following passage.

**Diachronic and areal aspects of evidentiality in Hindi**

As mentioned above reported evidentiality is expressed in Hindi in periphrastic, narrative way. But historically grammatical markers – quotatives were presented in Old Hindi. What’s more they exist in the MSU also.

Reported evidentiality marked by quotatives is a peculiarity of the medieval and modern Dakhini or Southern Hindi of the Deccan, mainly of the city of Hyderabad. Reported evidentiality is marked in Dakhini by converbs of some verbs (‘to do’, ‘to tell’) used as quotatives. The isolated Dakhini is an exception in this respect among various tongues of the Hindi area.

Colin P. Masica (1991: 402-403) defines two groups among the New Indo-Aryan languages regarding subordinate clauses with verbs of saying, telling, hearing, thinking, knowing, etc.: 1) Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi, Kashmiri, and Sindhi where clause-initial subordinators are preferable, and 2) Bengali, Assamese, Oriya, Gujarati, Nepali, and Marathi where “either clause-initial or clause-final subordinators are possible (mainly the latter in Oriya, Marathi, and Nepali), with concomitant placement rightward or leftward respectively, while in Sinhalese there are only the latter … In Sinhalese, Dakhani Urdu, Oriya, Bengali, Assamese, and also Nepali, the use of a postposed marker based on the C P [Conjunctive Participal] of the verb say … has often been remarked upon as a Dravidian calque…”

This divide is described be J. Bayer in the following way: “The bigger modern South-Asian languages generally fall into the Indo-Aryan and the Dravidian group. The former show the Indo-European (IE) model of sentential complementation and relativization, i.e. complement or relative clauses have an articulated left periphery in which we see either a functional head such as a complementizer (C) or an operator like a relative pronoun or relative phrase. Sentential complements are uniformly positioned to the right of the heads that select them. The Dravidian model typically has clause-final affixal operators which bind variables to their left unselectively; the function of complementizers is performed by clause-final elements which are usually grammaticalized verbs of saying. In the unmarked case, sentential complements are positioned to
the left of the heads that select them. In various languages on the Indian subcontinent the two systems coexist in one and the same grammar. The languages in question, Marathi, Southern Hindi-Urdu (Dakhkini Hindi-Urdu), Oriya, Bengali, and Assamese, are geographically located in the South and in the East and North-East of India.” (Bayer 2001:11). Such languages are called hybrid languages: “I call those languages hybrid which show a mix of final and initial heads.” (Bayer 1999: 233). Also Singh: 1980.

A. Davison (2007: 175) recognizes three classes in this respect: “Languages with final yes/no question markers allow final complementizers, either demonstratives or quotative particibles. These properties define three classes, one with only final CP heads (Sinhala), one with only initial CP heads (Hindi, Panjabi, Kashmiri) and others with both possibilities.”

Indo-Aryan – Dravidian convergence is a result of the long historical process of contacts between Aryans and Dravidians as is shown in Pray 1980, Arora, Subbarao 1989 and Junghare 2009. Early Dakhini texts preserve more “northern” features then modern Dakhini. In (13) direct speech is marked with final complementizer kar ‘being done’ (DOING/MAKING, which … is often found to subsume SAIING – Plank 2005: 462). Usually the verbs of saying are found in this position.

Example (14) includes the verb samajhnaa ‘to consider’ and examples of modern Dakhini (15) and (16) contain the converb bolke ‘being said’ as quotative.

**Old Dakhini**

(13) maamlaa yuuN hai kar bolyyaa
‘case-NOM-M/SG thus PRS-3-SG being done QUOT said PRT-M/SG’

(14) lekin in donoN mulkoN ko apne kabze meN
‘but both these countries=ACC own possession=LOC nahiiN rakh saktaa huuN samajh kar … usko ta∠U par baiThaayaa
‘NEG keep can1SG having consideredQUOT 3SG=ACC throne=LOC sat-PRT-M/SG’

(MiIr Asgaralii Kaazii, 1869 in · ri Raam · armaa 1954: 444).

**Modern Dakhini**

(15) unuuN aaj aao bol-ke bol-e the
‘3PL-DAT today come having said QUOT had said PLPERF-M/PL’

(16) mere bhaii=ku lalRkaa huaa bolke
‘my brother=DAT boy-NOM-M/SG happened PRET-M/SG having said QUOT mere= ku Teligraam milaa
1SG=DAT telegram-NOM-M/SG get PRET-M/SG’


**Modern Braj**

(17) mard baccaa “jay gaNge – jay gaNge” pukaarte jaante aruu nahaay ke
‘man boy-NOM-M/SG “hurray ganga–hurray ganga” exclaiming on and on and performing ablution

puujan karte IMPRF-M/PL
were making pooja.’

The man and the boy exclaiming “hurray ganga – hurray ganga” and performing ablution were making the pooja.’

(18) poliTiks ek gaTar hai bolke sab log bhaag jaate haiN
‘Politics one gutter PRS-3SG having said CONV all people NOM-M/PL run away PRS-M/PL’
‘Exclaiming “Politics is a gutter!” people run away.’

(19) khush raho kahkar chalaa
‘be happy having said CONV went away PRET-M/SG’
‘He said “be happy” and went away.’

(20) subah naashtaa nahiiN ki yaa yah kahkar
‘morning breakfast-NOM-M/SG NEG did PRT-M/SG this having said QUOT
aafis se lanch Taaim se thoRaa pahle hii chalaa gayaa PRT-M/SG
office LOC lunch time a little bit before just went away’
‘He said, “I hadn’t breakfast yet” he left the office a little bit before the lunch time.’

Colin P. Masica (1991: 402-403) defines two groups among the New Indo-Aryan languages regarding subordinate clauses with verbs of saying, telling, hearing, thinking, knowing, etc.: 1) Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi, Kashmiri, and Sindhi where clause-initial subordinators are preferable, and 2) Bengali, Assamese, Oriya, Gujarati, Nepali, and Marathi where “either clause-initial or clause-final subordinators are possible (mainly the former in Bengali, mainly the latter in Oriya, Marathi, and Nepali), with concomitant placement rightward or leftward respectively, while in Sinhalese there are only the latter … In Sinhalese, Dakhani Urdu, Oriya, Bengali, Assamese, and also Nepali, the use of a postposed marker based on the C P [Conjunctive Participal] of the verb say … has often been remarked upon as a Dravidian calque…”

This divide is described be J. Bayer in the following way: “The bigger modern South-Asian languages generally fall into the Indo-Aryan and the Dravidian group. The former show the Indo-European (IE) model of sentential complementation and relativization, i.e. complement or relative clauses have an articulated left periphery in which we see either a functional head such as a complementizer (C) or an operator like a relative pronoun or relative phrase. Sentential complements are uniformly positioned to the right of the heads that select them. The Dravidian model typically has clause-final affixal operators which bind variables to their left unselectively: the function of complementizers is performed by clause-final elements which are usually grammaticalized verbs of saying. In the unmarked case, sentential complements are positioned to the left of the heads that select them. In various languages on the Indian subcontinent the two systems coexist in one and the same grammar. The languages in question, Marathi, Southern Hindi-Urdu (Dakhini Hindi-Urdu), Oriya, Bengali, and Assamese, are geographically located in the South and in the East and North-East of India.” (Bayer 2001:11). Such languages are called hybrid languages: “I call those languages hybrid which show a mix of final and initial heads.” (Bayer 1999: 233).

A. Davison (2007: 175) recognizes three classes in this respect: “Languages with final yes/no question markers allow final complementizers, either demonstratives or quotative participles. These properties define three classes, one with only final CP heads (Sinhala), one with only initial CP heads (Hindi, Panjabi, Kashmiri) and others with both possibilities.”

Indo-Aryan – Dravidian convergence is a result of the long historical process of contacts between Aryans and Dravidians as is shown in Pray 1980, Arora, Subbarao 1989, Subbarao, Arora 1988/1990 and Junghare 2009.

I didn’t touch here compound/simple verbs as modes of evidentiality, inferentiality and mirativity because it is a topic of a special investigation. Some notes were made in Bashir 2006, section 3.5, based upon examples provided by P. Hook.

**Delocutive verbs and delocutive nouns as evidentiality markers**

The notion of ‘delocutive verb’ was introduced by E. Benveniste. 1977 (1966). According
“Delocutive verbs can be defined as verbs derived from a base X which mean ‘by saying or uttering ‘X’ (to someone) to perform an act which is culturally associated with the meaning or force of X’, where X is a variable ranging over types of things that can be said or uttered – 2nd person pronouns and other terms of address, words for asking and answering questions, formulaic expressions for social acts like greetings, various kinds of expressives, characterizations of speech peculiarities.”

As for Hindi a term ‘delocutive nouns’, not ‘delocutive verbs’ would be more preferable due to the peculiarities of verb derivation. Overwhelming verb derivation model is N/ADJ + honaa ‘to be’, karnaa ‘to do’ or some others as universal operators transforming nouns or adjectives to verbs. Delocutives in Hindi seem to be insufficiently explored in Hindi, so just a random sample of delocutives is presented here. Delocutives are used as compressed expressions of direct speech.

1. **tuu-tuu—main-maiN (F)‘quarrel’, tuu-tuu—main-maiN karnaa ‘to call names’, ‘to trade insults’:**
   
   (21) in donoN kii tuu-tuu—main-maiN kaaphii der tak chaltii rahtii hai  
   ‘quarrel between both of them continues for a long while.’  

2. **haaN meN haaN milaanaa (F) ‘to flatter’, jiihuzuuri i ‘bootlicking’:**
   
   (23) kisii kii haaN meN haaN milaana ko urduu meN ‘ jiihuzuuri’ kahaa jaataa hai  
   ‘kisii kii haaN meN haaN milaanaa” is called in urdu “jiihuzuuri.”’  

3. **haaNjii haaNjii ‘yes sir yes sir’:**
   
   (24) main haaNjii haaNjii karke muskaraa detaa  
   ‘saying ‘yes sir yes sir’ I smile.’  
   <http://mail.sarai.net/pipermail/deewan_mail.sarai.net/2007-December/001433.html>

4. **jayjaykaar (F) ‘cheers’:**
   
   (25) to kyaa ham sarkaar=kii jay-jay kaar karenge?  
   ‘so what 1PL government GEN=F cheers do FUT-M/PL?’  
   <http://aajtak.intoday.in/video/we-should-say-goverment-zindabad-1-729524.html> (5 May 2013)

5. **kasam (F) ‘oath’:**
   
   In the following example the delocutive kasam introduce a false statement:
   
   (26) terii kasam yaar tere paise kal tak zaruur  
   ‘your 2-GEN/SG outh-NOM-F/SG friend your money-NOM-M/PL tomorrow till sure  
   de duunGaa, terii kasam shall give back-FUT-M/SG. your oath-NOM-M/SG’  
   ‘I swear, I’ll give you money back tomorrow. I swear.’  
   <http://iamshishu.blogspot.ru/2008/10/blog-post_22.html>

**Hindi evidentials from typological point of view**

Typological properties of Hindi evidentials are given on the basis of Plungian 2010. There is no ‘a proper’, grammatically marked evidentiality in Hindi. All evidentials, inferentials and mirares are an extension or a periphery of some other grammatical forms. The
most grammaticalized are inferentials marked by verbal moods – indicative including future, subjunctive or conditional/irrealis moods. Inferential semantics used to be combined with presumptive and epistemic semantics. Besides moods inferentiality may be manifested with discourse words, lexical units etc.

Converbs of the verbs of saying used as Quotatives are mainly a peculiarity of Dakhini. But it would be wrong to argue that it is entirely the result of Dakhini-Dravidian convergence. Quotative converbs as left head complementizers exist in Northern Hindi also.

Distinction of visual/sensory, firsthand/non-firsthand etc evidentials usually is not expressed explicitly in Hindi.

Evidential semantics are scattered over the whole grammar in Hindi, and its modes of expression are not grammaticalized, but it doesn’t mean that evidential meanings can’t be expressed properly.

**Abbreviations**

1 first person  HON honorific
2 second person IMPRF imperfect
3 third person LOC locative
ACC accusative M masculine
COMP complementizer NEG negation
CONV convert NOM nominative
DAT dative PASS passive
DUR durative PLPRF pluperfect
ERG ergative PRS present
F feminine PRT preterit
FUT future QUOT quotative
GEN genitive SBJV subjunctive
HAB habitual
SG singular
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