

EVIDENTIALITY, INFERENTIALITY AND MIRATIVITY IN THE MODERN HINDI

ALEXANDER SIGORSKIY

ABSTRACT. Alexander Sigorskiy. *Evidentiality, Inferentiality and Mirativity in the Modern Hindi*. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, vol. LII (1)/2010. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-030-6, pp. 71–80

The questions of Evidentiality, Inferentiality and Mirativity in Hindi have not been thoroughly investigated so far. So the proposed description in no way can be exhaustive, and the results obtained are just preliminary. The approach adopted is functional, directed from function towards the modes of expression, because these categories in Hindi are rather semantic and functional, than structural and grammatical.

The results indicate that all the three domains are semantically close to each other. All of them denote a source of new information, but formally they are very different. Three kinds of Evidentiality – reported evidentials, inferred evidentials and miratives – represent a semantic field with fuzzy structure. The only grammaticalized types of evidentials are inferred evidentials marked by moods. All evidentials are combined with different modal meanings.

Some comparisons with other Indo-Aryan languages are made.

Alexander A. Sigorskiy, MGIMO University, Moscow, Russia

INTRODUCTION

1. Investigation of evidentiality in Hindi as well as in other Indo-Aryan languages is just in the initial stage. Nonetheless there are some important and informative papers available.

Peterson in his paper entitled “Evidentials, Inferentials and Mirativity in Nepali” (PETERSON 2000: 13–36) describes evidentiality in Nepali as a part of the evidentiality system in the Himalayan area languages: “The pattern which has emerged is in essence the following: a single category usually serves to mark hearsay, inference through results, surprise and admiration” (PETERSON 2000: 13). There are two perfects in Nepali – evidentiality unmarked and evidentiality marked which marks the mirative and inference through results. Inference from reasoning marks semantically presumptive future. Hearsay is marked by evidential marker *re*. In the second part of the paper “path of development” or the historical aspect of formation of evidentiality, including considerations about etymology of the particle *re* have been discussed. Obviously Nepali evidentials seem to be quite different from those in Hindi.

BASHIR (2006: 30–50; 2009) explores evidentiality, indirectivity (inferentiality) and mirativity in old, middle and new Indo-Iranian languages including Dakhini Urdu, Hindi and Urdu. In Dakhini *sarkaa* “like” marks mirativity and inference from result, *kaate* “say” marks mirativity non-1st person, hearsay and traditional knowledge. In Hindi-Urdu mirativity is marked by the absence of the present AUX and by a simple, non-modified verb; hearsay is marked by *sunaa* “heard” and *kahte haiN* “they say”; inference through result by *lagnaa* “seem”, “like” and traditional knowledge is marked by *kahte haiN* “they say” like hearsay (BASHIR 2006: 49).

MONTAUT (2001) compares evidentiality in Nepali and Hindi and argues the absence of the hearsay meaning in both of them. “These facts [...] question the common assumption that hearsay meaning is central to the notional category of evidentiality.” In (MONTAUT 2003: 345–364; and in MONTAUT 2006: 71–86) mirative extensions of aorist (preterit) are considered.

So the abovementioned authors distinguish three distinct domains in Hindi: evidentiality, inferentiality and mirativity, and admit their connection with perfective aspect and simple (non-modified, non-vector) verbs.

2. All of these three domains – reported evidentials, inferred evidentials, miratives (unexpected information) – share some common semantic properties: encoding or marking a new information source and its reliability. Structurally evidential utterance comprises two parts. The first one is a modal frame: as I infer (Inferentials), as I see (Mirativity), as I hear (Evidentials) (LAZARD 2001: 429). The modal frame or the modus includes also the speaker’s assessment of the reliability of the information obtained. The second, following part of the utterance contains some new information obtained (see KOZINTSEVA 2007: 15).

INFERENCEALS

The most grammaticalized *domain of these three domains* is inferentials comprised by the system of moods – future of indicative or presumptive, subjunctive and conditional. Inferentiality is not the only function of these moods, but obviously it is one of the main functions. Inferentials or inferred evidentials may be defined as follows: “Inferred evidential: information source based on conclusions drawn on the basis of what one can see, or the result of something happening” (AIKHENVALD 2004: 393).

A GRAMMATICAL SKETCH OF THE HINDI MOODS

Keeping Imperative aside the rest of the moods in Hindi are structured in a regular and symmetrical way. Each domain includes four verbal forms: one simple form and three analytical forms.

- Indicative Present

1. Simple form (imperfective participle) functioning as iterative or narrative and historical present. This form needs to be illustrated with an example:

- (1) *jab bhii aNdhii aatii, merii bahan ghabraa jaatii*
 when ever storm .F.SG come. IMPF.F.S G 1st POSS.F.SG sister.F.SG agitated go IMPF.F.SG
 ‘Whenever it stormed, my sister would become agitated’ (KACHRU 2006: 149, transliteration is mine – A.S., glosses are original).

2. Present (*aataa hai* ‘comes’, *kartaa hai* ‘does’).
3. Perfect (*aayaa hai* ‘has come’, *kiyaa hai* ‘has done’).
4. Present Continuous (*aa rahaa hai* ‘is coming’, *kar rahaa hai* ‘is doing’).

- Indicative Past

1. Simple form (perfective participle) – Preterit is used sometimes as conditional. Example:

- (2) *agar naksaliyoN ne hamlaa kiyaa to vaayusenaa bhii...kaarravaaai*
 if naxalites ERG att ack M SG made PRET M SG Air Force also action F SG
karegii take
 will FUT F SG
 If Naxalites would attack, then the Air Force will also take an action. (http://www.bbc.co.uk/hindi/india/2009/10/091007_naxal_chidambaram_alk.shtml)

2. Imperfect (*aataa thaa* ‘came’, *kartaa thaa* ‘did’).
3. Pluperfect (*aayaa thaa* ‘had come’, *kiyaa thaa* ‘had done’).
4. Imperfect Continuous (*aa rahaa thaa* ‘was coming’, *kar rahaa thaa* ‘was doing’).

- Indicative Future

There are two points of view about Future tense in Hindi, especially about analytical forms of Future. One of them argues that Future is a part of the Indicative mood; another one considers them as a system of the Presumptive mood. The argumentation against the Presumptive mood in favor of Future as a part of Indicative mood can be found in (LIPEROVSKIY 1964: 18–25; 1984: 124). The opposite point of view which accepts Presumptive mood as an independent mood in Hindi is presented for instance in (KACHRU 2006: 146).

1. Simple form (*aaegaa* ‘will come’, *karegaa* ‘will do’).
2. Future (Presumptive) imperfect (*aataa hogaa* ‘must be coming’, *kartaa hogaa* ‘must be doing’).
3. Future (Presumptive) perfective (*aayaa hogaa* ‘would have come’, *kiyaa hogaa* ‘would have done’).
4. Future (Presumptive) Continuous (*aa raha hogaa* ‘must be coming’, *kar rahaa hogaa* ‘must be doing’).

- Subjunctive Mood

1. Simple Subjunctive (*aae* ‘may come’, *kare* ‘may do’). As Old Present it is used in proverbs in its original function as Present:

- (3) *maar ke aaage bhuut naace*
 beating ahead bhoot NOM M SG dances 3SG
 (Even) bhoot (ghosts) dances in the face of beating (ZOGRAF 1998: 215).

2. Subjunctive imperfective (*aataa ho* “may come”, *kartaa ho* “may do”).
3. Subjunctive Perfective (*aayaa ho* “would / might have come”, *kiyaa ho* “would / might have done”).
4. Subjunctive Continuous (*aa rahaa ho* “would be coming”, *kar rahaa ho* “would be doing”).

- Conditional Mood

1. Simple Form (*aataa* “were he to come”, *kartaa* “were he to do”).
2. Conditional Imperfective (*aataa hotaa* “were I came”, *kartaa hotaa* “were I done”).
3. Conditional Perfective (*aayaa hotaa* “had I came”, *kiyaa hotaa* “had I done”).
4. Conditional Continuous (*aa rahaa hotaa* “were he be coming”, *kar rahaa hota* “were he be doing”).

All simple finite verbal forms tend to express indirect modality. Imperfect and Perfect Participles besides their primary function as markers of imperfect and perfect aspect are markers of conditional or counterfactual (unreal) modality. Simple future, especially of *honnaa* “to be” verb, marks presumptive modality; and simple subjunctive marks hypothetical modality. All of them retain to some extent their original direct modal semantics.

The four moods represent a scale of modalities: indicative (indicative mood), presumptive (future forms of the indicative), hypothetical (subjunctive mood) and counterfactual (conditional or unreal mood).

Now a set of examples is given to illustrate interaction of inferentials with modality marked by different moods, or in a wider sense, their interplay with TAM – tense, aspect, mood; the interplay between inferred evidentials with modal frame representing a degree of reliability from the point of view of the speaker who is the author of the utterance.

- Indicative Present and Present Continuous

- (4) *vah dheere se muskaraa diyaa. use maalum hai, maiN jhuuTh bol rahaa huuN*
 3SG slightly smiled PRET M SG 3SG DAT known is 3SG, 1SG lies telling is
 PrCont 1M SG

He gently smiled. He knows I am lying (VARMA 1989: 82).

The speaker has read the smile of his friend as a hint that the latter has understood that the speaker is telling a lie and the speaker is sure about it. Here the Indicative mood marks this sureness of the speaker.

- Indicative Future

- (5) *maiNne socaa thaa, acaanak use dubaaraa dekhakar vah aašcaarya meN paR jaayegii*
 1SG ERG thought was M SG PIPerf suddenly 3SG DAT again seen CONV 3SG NOM
 surprise in LOC fall will FUT F SG

I thought she will be surprised seeing him again (ibid.: 99).

The speaker has inferred what will be in a few moments. Presumptive future refers to subsequent point of time in the past (Future in the past).

- Presumptive future imperfect

- (6) *tum ab aao... vah tumhaarii raah dekhtii hogii,*
 2PL now come IMP 2PL 3SG 2PL F POSS way F SG NOM see FUT IMPF F SG
usne kahaa
 he 3SG ERG said PRET M SG
 You come now... she may be waiting for you; he said (ibid.: 122).

The speaker has inferred a situation which is quiet possible at this point of time (simultaneous with the point of reference).

- Presumptive future perfect

- (7) *bahut saal pahle ve yahaaN aaye hoNge.... maiNne*
 many years before 3 PL NOM here came will FutPerf 3M PL ... 1SG ERG
socaa
 thought PRET 1 SG M
 They may have come here many years ago, I thought (ibid.: 99).

- Subjunctive perfect

- (8) *Sambhav hai, maiNne tumheN kahiiN saRak par dekhaa ho,*
 maybe AUX 3 SG PRES 1SG ERG 2 PL DAT somewhere street on LOC seen may SubjPerf
usne haNste hue kahaa
 3 SG ERG laughing CONV said PRET M SG

I may have seen you somewhere on the street; she said laughing (ibid.: 176).

Examples (8) and (9) demonstrate a contrast between presumptive and hypothetical modality marked by presumptive future and subjunctive, respectively. Presumptive indicates that the speaker is more convinced about his assumption while hypothetical subjunctive indicates that the speaker is less convinced about his assumption, and consequently the information obtained is less reliable.

Some lexical entries modify modal meaning of the verbal phrase. Thus *shaayad hii* “hardly” indicates that an assumption is highly improbable. So hypothetical modality turns to dubitative (but not unreal).

- (9) *šaaayad hii kabhii kisii ne naNge sir dekhaa ho appaa saahab ko*
 Hardly once somebody ERG bare head has seen PerfSubj 3 M SG appa sahib ACC sp
 Hardly one ever has seen Appa Sahab bare headed
 (BHANDARI 1989: 48).

- Simple conditional

- (10) *Raayanaa use dekhtii to avašya cakit rah jaatii*
 Rayana F SG NOM 3 SG ACCsp see COND F SG certainly surprised would be COND F SG
 Had Reina seen him she might have been certainly surprised
 (VARMA 1989: 181).

The speaker presupposed a situation that can not become real and speculates about what might happen if inferred presupposition would have taken place.

Aikhenvald argues “that irrealis and information source are different categories” (AIKHENVALD 2004: 257). But material of Hindi demonstrates that, first, inferred evidentials and epistemic modality (presumptive, hypothetical and counterfactual) are combined in one and the same grammatical form – moods, and second, new information is represented in inferred evidentials in a wider sense – as “world-building” or “construction of new worlds”.

- Conditional Perfect

- (11) *taT se duur aayaa yah bhuukaaMp jamiin ke paas aayaa*
 shore ABL far came PerfPrtp M SG this earthquake NOM M SG land near came
hotaa to kahiN jyaadaa vinaaškaarii hotaa
 were PerfCOND M SG much more destructive would be COND M SG...
 The offshore earthquake would have been much more destructive had it been closer to land (<http://www.voanews.com/hindi/archive/2005-08/2005-08-16-voa3.cfm>).

MIRATIVITY

Mirativity reports “information which is new or surprising to the speaker regardless of whether the information source is first- or second-hand” (DELANCEY 1997: 33). “Mirativity covers speaker’s ‘unprepared mind’, unexpected new information, and concomitant surprise” (AIKHENVALD 2004: 196).

- Mirativity mainly is marked in Hindi by different types of exclamatory sentences.

Exclamatory sentences with exclamatory particles:

- (12) *Baap re baap! Yah kyaa hai?*
 Daddy, oh daddy! This what is 3SG?
 Oh, my God! What is it?
 (http://akhirikalam.bharatuday.in/2007/05/blog-post_10.html)

Preterit (aorist)-marked Miratives with inversion involved:

- (13) *sipaahii kaa beTaa niklaa cor, tiin giraftaar*
 policeman GEN M SG son M SG turned out PRET M SG thief, three arrested
 The son of a policeman turned out to be a thief, three are arrested
 (4 Apr 2009, 0130 hrs IST, <http://navbharattimes.indiatimes.com/article-show/4356406.cms>)

- Miratives with different verbal forms:

Perfect

- (14) *Dekh rahaa huuN hamaarii kal kii nanhiiN guRiyaa aaj dekhte*
 (I) see PrCont 1M SG our F SG GEN yesterday’s small F SG doll F SG today

dekhte kitnii baRii ho gayii hai
 seeing seeing CONV how F SG big F SG become has PERF F SG

I wonder our little doll has grown so fast before our own eyes (08.25.2007, http://www.sahityakunj.net/LEKHAK/P/Parashargaud/adhure_sapne1.htm)

Present Continuous

- (15) *Are, tuu to bahut jaldii-jaldii baRii ho rahii hai, sonaa!*
 Really, you 1SG very quickly tall F SG growing is PrCont F SG, Sona!
 Really, you are growing tall very quickly, Sona!

(BHANDARI 1989: 50).

- Syntactic type of Mirativity:

Mirativity can be expressed by a syntactic construction referred as “double predicate construction” (CHERNYSHEV 1968), “Theme-Focussing” (GAMBHIR 1983), or “thematic *jo hai vo* construction” (DAVISON 2007: 236). But mirative reading of this construction seems to be context-bound.

- (16) *par lochan baabuu haiN ki na mantrimaNDal kii mRtyu kii*
 but Lochan Babu are 3PLHON that neither cabinet of ministers GEN F SG death GEN F SG
ghoṢNaa se pulkit ho rahe haiN, na raav-caudhrii kii kiimat se camatkRt
 news by happy are PrCont3PL HON, nor rao-caudhri GEN F SG price by surprised

But as for Lochan Babu he is not happy neither about announcement of the fall of the cabinet of ministers, nor is not surprised by the value of Rao-Chaudhri (BHANDARI 1989: 58).

This construction reports surprise of the speaker at somebody’s reaction towards some event.

Mirativity can be expressed in the same way as inferred evidentiality – by moods.

- (17) *biyar kaa DeRh gilaas piine ke baad raayanaa itne khule,*
 Beer GEN M SG one and a half glass ACCUnsp drink after Reina F SG so free
sahaj bhaav se bolne lagegi maiNne nahiiN socaa thaa
 and easy talk will begin FUT F SG 1SG ERG no thought was PIPerf M SG
 I had not thought that Reina would begin to talk so freely and easily after taking one and a half glass of beer (VARMA 1989: 98).

EVIDENTIALITY

According to Aikhenvald, “All evidentiality does is supply the information source. The ways in which information is acquired – by seeing, hearing, or in any other way – is its core meaning” (AIKHENVALD 2004: 4).

From examples given below we can see that Hindi seems to lack pure category of evidentiality as well as other related categories of inferentiality and mirativity. A report about new information usually is combined with its estimation, or/and reaction of a (the) speaker.

- (18) *Usne bataayaa ki sunaa hai ki tumhaare mohallevaale*
 3SG ERG told PRET M SG that heard is PERF M SG that yourPOSS 2PL localityM SG
avinaaş ko roj caar Daalar milne lage haiN, pemeNT guugal vaale
 avinaaş DAT daily 4 dollars M PL get began PERF M PL payment Google's people
kar rahe haiN. maiN ne kahaa ki mujhe to koi jaankaarii nahiiN
 is doing PrCont M PLISG ERG told PRET M SG that me DAT any information no
 He told that he has heard that Avinash from our locality has started getting four
 Dollars per day; payment is made by Google's people. I told that I know nothing
 about it (http://taanabaana.blogspot.com/2008/02/blog-post_13.html)
- (19) *jahaan tak mujhe maaluum hai aThaarahviiN šataabdii se pahle hinduu vahii*
 As far as me DAT know 18th century before Hindu M SG those only be
ho saktaa thaa joki paidaa hii hinduu huaa ho. Yah niyam
 could PIPerf M SG who bourn Hindu M SG would be SubjPerf M SG. This rool ACCunsp M SG
kisne badlaa yaad nahiiN
 who ERG changed PRET M SG memory not
 As far as I know, before 18th century a Hindu can be only the one who was borne
 a Hindu. Who has changed this rule I don't remember (http://halchal.gyandutt.com/2008/11/blog-post_25.html).

Converb of the verb *kahnaa* “to say” functions as a quotative in Hindi:

- (20) *khair choRiye sar kahkar usne aaNsuu poNche ...*
 All right, give it up, sir, having said CONV 3 SG ERG tears M PL wiped PRET M PL
 All right, stop it, sir, she said and wiped her tears
 (Sunday 20 Sep, 2009 01:55 PM, <http://www.pressnote.in/readnews.php?id=52348>)

Grammaticalized quotatives are represented in Dakhini Hindi (KACHRU 1986: 166–167) and in other old, middle and new Indo-Aryan languages (MEENAKSHI 1986; SINGH 1980). Comparison of quotatives in Hindi and Russian is made in (SIGORSKIY 2006: 142–144).

Reported evidentials indicate the information a speaker is not sure about, the information which is unreliable and doubtful from the point of view of the speaker.

CONCLUSION REMARKS

Summarizing my preliminary results I may conclude that all the three domains – evidentials, inferentials and miratives – comprise one category which denotes a source of new information. Information may be reported, inferred or be unexpected for the speaker. My conclusion agree with those of G. Lazard who has combined them into a category of mediativity (LAZARD 1999; 2001). This category mainly is not grammatical, but functional and semantic with fuzzy field structure. They 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”. Evidentiality uses mainly narrative or descriptive strategies; mirativity employs syntactic strategies; while inferentials are 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.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very grateful to Prashant Tripathi and Hem Chandra Pande for corrections and valuable and helpful comments.

SYMBOLS

ACC – accusative	M – masculine
ACCsp – accusative specific	NOM – nominative
ACCunsp – accusative unspecific	PERF – perfect
AUX – auxiliary	PerfCOND – Perfect Conditional
COND – conditional mood	PerfPrtp – Perfect Participle
CONV – converb	PerfSubj – Perfect Subjunctive
DAT – dative	PL – plural
ERG – ergative	PlPerf – Pluperfect
F – feminine	POSS – possessive
FUT – future	PrCont – Present Continuous
FutPerf – Future Perfect	PRES – Present
GEN – genitive	PRET – preterit
HON – honorific	SG – singular
IMP – Imperative	SUBJ – subjunctive
IMPF – imperfect	SubjPerf – subjunctive perfect
LOC – locative	

PRIMARY SOURCES

- MANNU Bhandari. 1989 (1st ed. 1979). *Mahabhoj (The Great Feast)*. Dilli: RadhaKrishna.
 VARMA Nirmal. 1989 (1st ed. 1964). *Vé din (Those Days)*. Nai Dilli: Rajkamal Prakashan.

REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD Alexandray. 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 BARKHUDAROV Aleksey S., BESKROVNYI Vasilij M., ZOGRAF Georgiy A. 1998. *Poslovitsy i pogovorki Severnoy Indii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tsentr “Peterburgskoye vostokovedeniye.”
 BASHIR Elena. 2007. “Evidentiality in South Asian Languages.” *The Proceedings of the LFG-06 Conference*, 30–50. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/11/lfg06.html>.
 BASHIR Elena. 2009. “Traces of Mirativity in Shina.” *South Asian Languages Analysis 2009 (SALA XXVIII)*, Abstracts. www.sala.unt.edu/SALA_2009_Abstracts.pdf.
 BESKROVNYI Vasilij M., BYKOVA Elena M., LIPEROVSKIY Vladimir P. (eds.). 1968. *Yazyki Indii, Pakistana, Nepala i Tselona*. Moskva: Nauka, Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury.
 CHERNYSHCHEV Vladimir A. 1968. “Ob odnom priyeme stilisticheskogo sintaksisa khindi (dvoynoye skazyemoye)” [Concerning One Method of Stylistic Syntax of Hindi (Double Predicate)]. In: BESKROVNYI et al. 1968: 252–259.

- DAVISON Alice. 2007. "Hierarchical Structure and Linear Order: Correlative Clauses in Hindi-Urdu." In: MASICA 2007, 211–245.
- DELANCEY Scott. 1997. "Mirativity: The Grammatical Marking of Unexpected Information." *Linguistic Typology* 1, 33–52.
- GAMBHIR Vijay. 1983. "Theme-Focussing in Hindi." *Indian Linguistics* 44, 1–4, 25–38.
- KACHRU Yamuna. 1986. "The Syntax of Dakkhini: A Study in Language Variation and Language Change." In: KRISHNAMURTI et al. 1986: 165–174.
- KACHRU Yamuna. 2006. *Hindi*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- KHRAKOVSKIY Viktor (ed.). 2007. *Evidencial'nos't' v yazykakh Evropy i Azii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.
- KOZINTSEVA Nataliya M. 2007. "Tipologiya kategorii zasvidel'stvovannosti" [Typology of the Category of Evidentiality]. In: KHRKOVSKIY 2007, 13–26.
- KRISHNAMURTI Bh., MASICA Colin P., SINHA Anjali K. (eds.). 1986. *South Asian Languages: Structure, Convergence and Diglossia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- LAZARD Gilbert. 1999. "Mirativity, Evidentiality, Mediativity, or other?" *Linguistic Typology* 3(1), 91–109.
- LAZARD Gilbert. 2001. *Études de linguistique générale. Typologie grammaticale*. Leuven–Paris: Peeters, 425–441.
- LIPEROVSKIY Vladimir P. 1964. *Kategoriya nakloneniya v sovremenom literaturnom khindi* [Category of Mood in Modern Literary Hindi]. Moskva: Nauka.
- LIPEROVSKIY Vladimir P. 1984. *Glagol v yazyke khindi* [Verb in the Hindi Language]. Moskva: Nauka.
- LÖNNE Dirk W. (ed.). 2003. *Tohfa-e-dil, Festschrift Helmut Nespital*. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikation, 1.
- MASICA Colin P. (ed.). 2007. *Old and New Perspectives on South Asian Languages: Grammar and Semantics*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.
- MEENAKSHI K. 1986. "The Quotative in Indo-Aryan." In: KRISHNAMURTI et al. 1986: 209–218.
- MONTAUT Annie. 2001. "Evidentiality in Indo-Aryan: the Absence of the Hearsay Meaning and the Delimitation of the Category Evidentiality." <http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/conferences/sala01/abstracts>.
- MONTAUT Annie. 2003. "On the Evidential Meanings of the Hindi Aorist." In: LÖNNE 2003: 345–364.
- MONTAUT Annie. 2006. "Mirative Meanings as Extensions of Aorist in Hindi/Urdu." In: SINGH 2006: 71–86.
- PETERSON John. 2000. "Evidentials, Inference and Mirativity in Nepali." *Linguistics in the Tibetan-Burman Area* 23(2), 13–36.
- SIGORSKIY Alexander A. 2006. "Khindi i russkiy: nekotoryye aspekty grammatiki i funktsionirovaniya" [Hindi and Russian: Some Aspects of Grammar and Functioning]. In: VEDEDINA 2006: 138–151.
- SINGH Rajendra (ed.). 2006. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics 2006*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- SINGH Udaya Narayan. 1980. "Bole: An Unresolved Problem in Bengali Syntax." *Indian Linguistics* 41(1), 188–195.
- VEDEDINA L'udmila G. (ed.) 2006. *Lingvostranovedeniye: metody analiza, tekhnologiya obucheniya*, 1. Moskva: MGIMO-Universitet.
- ZOGRAF Georgiy A. 1998. "O yazyke poslovits" [About the Language of Proverbs]. In: BARKHUDAROV et al. 1998: 213–215.