

DOI: 10.2478/linpo-2013-0018

EVIDENTIALITY IN HINDI: A TYPOLOGICAL VIEW

ALEXANDER A. SIGORSKIY

ABSTRACT: Alexander A. Sigorskiy. *Evidentiality in Hindi: A Typological View*. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-274-4, pp. 123–133.

Evidentiality in a broad sense, including reported evidentials, inferentials, miratives, quotatives and delocutives in Hindi is represented by evidential strategies or non-grammaticalized modes of expression of evidential semantics merged with some other grammatical categories. Hindi evidentials are represented morphologically (inferentials marked by moods), syntactically (mirativity) and lexically (delocutives).

KEY WORDS: evidentials, inferentials, miratives, quotatives, delocutives, modal words and particles

Alexander A. Sigorskiy, MGIMO University, Moscow, asigorskiy@mail.ru

INTRODUCTION

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

First, 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 on the 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 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 obtained by a speaker. It may be an external source (reported evidentials), or internal source or mental activity of a person (inferentials). That new information may be unexpected or 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 kinds of evidentials in Hindi are inferentials expressed by moods – indicative (especially presumptive future tense forms), subjunctive and conditional mood or irrealis. This 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 a “double predicate construction” (CHERNISHOV 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. Additionally, mirativity can be expressed in the same way as inferred evidentiality – by moods including presumptive future forms.

All the three domains – evidentials, inferentials and miratives – comprise a single category which denotes a source of new information. The information may be reported, inferred or unexpected by the speaker. This category is mainly 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 A. 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 the typological point 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). The data from 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) syntactic 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 the speaker (for the speaker's unprepared mind). The 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*
 3SG shop from a little farther=LOC came just PLPRF=SG/M COMP
achaanak 4-5 janoN=ne use moTarsaaikil=par jaate hue=ko
 suddenly 4-5 men=ERG him-DAT motorcycle=LOC going=DAT
laaThiyoN=se maarkar niche giraa diyaa
 clubs=INS beaten-CONV down threw PRT-M/SG
 'He just drove a bit off the shop when suddenly 4-5 lads knocked him down from the motorcycle with their clubs.'
<http://dainiktribuneonline.com/2012/01/बड़ी-लूट-वफिल-पकड़े-गये-लु>

The pluperfect in the independent clause is not the only form of predicate. A predicate may also be marked with Past continuous or the *vaalaa* participle:

- (2) *apane ...ghoRe=se vah ghaayal avasthaa=meN girne hii vaalaa thaa*
 his own horse=LOC 3NOM/SG being injured=LOC fall just about was
ki ... ek us=ke sainik=kii dRShTi us=par paRii
 when ... one his=GEN soldier=GEN-F/SG glance.NOM-F/SG him on fell PRT-F/SG'
 'Being injured he was almost falling from his... horse when eyes of one of his soldiers fell on him.'
http://hi.wikipedia.org/wiki/पृथ्वीराज_चौहान (15 February 2013)

Another mode of expression of mirativity which I can add to what I found in my previous paper, is the verbs *Thaharnaa* 'to remain, to be' and *nikalnaa* '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 *nikalnaa* 'to turn out':

- (3) *aakhir sach hii niklii baat: 'mahbuubaa'=ne*
 after all true turned PRT-F/SG news NOM-F/SG: 'mahbooba'=ERG

kii thii *modii=kii* *taariif*
 done had 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.’

<http://www.bhaskar.com/article/GUJ-after-all-it-turned-out-to-be-true-meh-booba-was-the-praise-of-modi-2703447.html> (2 January 2012)

An example with *thaharnaa*:

- (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.’
<http://www.funonthenet.in/forums/index.php?topic=135780.0;wap2>
 (24 May 2009)

The 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. The 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 the preparation of a list of such verbs is a task for the future.

INFERENCEALS

As was shown by LIPEROVSKIY (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 at the top to uncertainty, lack of confidence, weak reliability at the bottom. The 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 don’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 koi* *paRhnaa chaahtaa hai?*
 why your book-ACC-F/SG really somebody read INF wants PRS-3-M/SG
 ‘Is there actually somebody who wants to read your book?’
<http://za.samwaad.com/2012/03/blog-post.html>

In the following example the rhetorical question is questionable:

- (7) *main shaayad hii smitaa paaTil ban sakuuN*
 1SG hardly Smita Patil become could SBJV-1SG
 ‘I could hardly become Smita Patil’
<http://aajtak.intoday.in/story.php/content/view/48681/31/201/I-do-not-know-if-I-can-be-Smita-Patil-says-Chitrangada-Singh.html>

Inferentials may be marked lexically with modal verbs as a modal frame of the utterance. In the following example (8) it is the verb *jaan paRna* ‘to seem’:

- (8) *mujhe to jaan paRaa ki is bhaaShaN kaa*
 mujhe1SG-DAT seemed PRT-M/SG COMP this speech GEN-M/SG
uttar un par huaa hogaa’
 effect-NOM-M/SG 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_अद्भूत_दृश्य!

EVIDENTIALS

Though Hindi lacks grammaticalised evidentials, it may express evidentiality in a periphrastic way. In the following example the fact that visual information is more reliable than nonvisual, auditory information (firsthand vs. secondhand information) is expressed periphrastically:

- (9) *kaii logon se maiNne sunaa ki yahaaN baarish*
 some people from 1SG=ERG hear-PRT-M/SG COMP here rain-NOM-F/SG
jyaadaa lambii nahiiN hotii par maiNne khud dekhaa ki
 much long NEG be PRS-HAB-F/SG but 1SG=ERG myself seen-PRT-M/SG that
do do din tak baarish nahiiN rukii
 two-two days=LOC rain-NOM-F/SG NEG stop-PRT-F/SG’
 ‘I heard from many people, here does not rain for a long time, but I saw myself two days rain did not stop.’
<http://www.ghumakkar.com/2012/03/17/mussoorie-uttarakhand>

Reported speech usually has no special grammar markers in the MSH, neither for the source of information, or for the information itself. If the information reported is reliable and doesn’t raise any doubts, the indicative mood is used.

- (10) *vah bol rahaa thaa ki mere saath bhoot kuud*
 3SG tell DUR-PRT-M/SG COMP me with demonNOM-M/SG jump
rahaa hai
 PRS-DUR-M/SG’
 ‘he was telling that a demon is jumping with me.’
<http://www.bhaskar.com/article/MP-IND-she-jumped-past-me-say-2881818.html> (19 February 2012)
- (11) *DakTar ke mutaabik naaraayaN=kii maansik haalat Thiik nahiiN*
 Doctor according narayan=GEN-F mental state-NOM-F/SG well NEG
hai
 PRS-3SG’
 ‘According the doctor the mental state of Narayan is not well.’
<http://www.bhaskar.com/article/MP-IND-she-jumped-past-me-say-2881818.html> (19 February 2012)

If the information seems to be doubtful and unreliable, some special modes of expression, such as verbs like ‘seem, look, appear’ and indirect moods, like the subjunctive in the following example are used (this example was given above as example 8).

- (12) *mujhe to jaan paRaa ki is bhaaShaN=kaa asar*
 1-SG-DAT seemed PRT-M/SG COMP this speech=GEN=M/SG effect-NOM-M/SG
unpar huaa hogaa
 3-PL=LOC been be-FUT PRF-FUT-M/SG
 ‘It seemed to me that this speech affected him.’
http://wikisource.org/wiki/वह_अद्भूत_दृश्य! (4 March 2007)

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

DIACHRONIC AND AREAL ASPECTS OF EVIDENTIALITY IN HINDI

As I mentioned above, reported evidentiality is expressed in Hindi in a periphrastic, narrative way. But historically grammatical markers – quotatives were present in Old Hindi. What is more, they exist in the MSH also.

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

Colin P. MASICA (1993: 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, Dakkhini Urdu, Oriya, Bengali, Assamese, and also Nepali, the use of a postposed marker based on the C P [Conjunctive Participial] of the verb say (...) has often been remarked upon as a Dravidian calque...”

This division is described by 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 (Dakkhini 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 (2007b: 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.”

The 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.

Early Dakkhini texts preserve more “northern” features than modern Dakkhini. In (13) direct speech is marked with the final complementizer *kar* ‘being done’ (“DOING/MAKING, which ... is often found to subsume SAYING” – PLANK 2005: 462). Usually the verbs of saying are found in this position. Example (14) includes the verb *samajhnaa* ‘to consider’ and examples from modern Dakkhini (15) and (16) contain the converb *bolke* ‘being said’ as quotative.

Old Dakkhini

(13) *Maamlaa yuuN hai kar bolyaa*
 case-NOM-M/SG thus PRS-3-SG being done QUOT said PRT-M/SG
 ‘[he] said this is the point.’ (Vajahi, ‘Sabras’, 1635, in SHAMATOV 1974: 239)

(14) *lekin in donoN mulkoN ko apne kabze meN nahiiN rakh*
 but these both countries=ACC own possession=LOC NEG keep
saktaa huuN samajh kar ... usko takht par baiThaayaa
 can1SG having considered QUOT 3SG=ACC throne=LOC sit-CAUS-PRT-M/SG
 ‘having considered that he can’t keep both these countries in his own possession he throned him.’ (Miir Asgaralii Kaazii, 1869 in SHARMAA 1954: 444)

Modern Dakkhini

(15) *unuuN aaj aao bol-ke bol-e the*
 3PL-DAT today come having said QUOT said had PLPRF-M/PL’
 ‘They had said come today.’ (KACHRU 1979, cited in SINGH 1980: 192)

(16) *mere bhaaii=ku laRkaa huaa bolke*
 my brother=DAT boy-NOM-M/SG happened PRT-M/SG having said QUOT
mere=ku Teligraam milaa
 1SG=DAT telegram-NOM-M/SG get PRT-M/SG’
 ‘I got a telegram that my brother had a son.’ (KACHRU 1986: 167)

Converbs *pukaarte jaante* (durative) ‘exclaiming on and on’ in the Modern Braj example (17), *bolke* and *kahkar* ‘being said’ in the Modern Standard Hindi examples (18, 19, 20) are used as quotatives.

Modern Braj

- (17) *mard baccaa* “jay gaNge – jay gaNge” *pukaarte jaaNte aruu*
 man boy-NOM-M/SG “hurray ganga–hurray ganga” exclaiming on and on and
nahaay ke puujan karte
 performing ablution pooja do.IMPRF-M/PL
 ‘The man and the boy exclaiming “hurray ganga – hurray ganga” and performing
 ablution were making the pooja.’ (SHARMAA 1992: 57).

MSH

- (18) *poliTiks ek gaTar hai bolke sab log*
 politics one gutter PRS-3SG having said CONV all people NOM-M/PL
bhaag jaate haiN
 run away PRS- M/PL
 ‘Exclaiming “Politics is a gutter!” people run away.’
<http://www.facebook.com/iacpuncicity/posts/443762885662673>
 (21 September 2012)
- (19) *khush raho kahkar chalaa*
 happy stay IMP having said CONV go away PRT-M/SG
 ‘He said “be happy” and went away.’
<http://jyoti-khare.blogspot.ru/2012/07/blog-post.html>
- (20) *subah naashtaa nahiiN kiyaa yah kahkar*
 morning breakfast-NOM-M/SG NEG do PRT-M/SG this having said QUOT
aafis se lanch Taaim se thoRaa pahle hii chalaa gayaa
 office=LOC lunch time a little bit before just go away PRT-M/SG
 ‘He said, “I hadn’t breakfast yet” he left the office a little bit before the lunch
 time.’
<http://www.bhaskar.com/article/MP-RAT-c-310-141840-NOR.html>
 (30 April 2013)

I haven’t mentioned here compound/simple verbs as modes of evidentiality, inferentiality and mirativity because it is the subject of special investigation. Some notes were made by BASHIR 2006, section 3.5, based upon examples provided by P. Hook.

DELOCUTIVE VERBS AND DELOCUTIVE NOUNS
 AS EVIDENTIALITY MARKERS

The notion of the ‘delocutive verb’ was introduced by E. BENVENISTE 1977 (1966). According to PLANK 2005: 459, “Delocutive verbs can be defined as verbs derived from a base X which means ‘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, the term ‘delocutive nouns’, not ‘delocutive verbs’ would be more preferable, due to the peculiarities of verb derivation. The overwhelming verb derivation model is N/ADJ + honaa ‘to be’, karnaa ‘to do’ and some others as the universal operators transforming nouns or adjectives to verbs. Delocutives in Hindi seem to be insufficiently explored, 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) you-you I-I ‘quarrel’, *tuu-tuu-maiN-maiN*, *karnaa* ‘to call names’, ‘to trade insults’:

- (21) *in donoN kii tuu-tuu-maiN-maiN kaaphii der tak*
 3PL both=GEN-F/SG tuu-tuu-maiN-maiN NOM-F/SG enough a long while
chaltii rahtii hai
 continues.PRS/DUR-3F/SG
 ‘quarrel between both of them continues for a long while.’
http://hi.wikipedia.org/wiki/लस्सी_ते_चा (15 February 2013)

- (22) *donoN tuu-tuu-maiN-maiN karte rahte haiN*
 both tuu-tuu-maiN-maiN doing are be PRS-DUR-M/PL
 ‘both are trading insults.’
<http://aks-raghuvendra.blogspot.ru/2013/04/blog-post.html>

2. *haaN meN haaN milaanaa* (F) ‘to flatter’, *jiihuzuurii* ‘bootlicking’:

- (23) *kisii kii haaN meN haaN milaane ko urduu meN ‘jiihuzuurii’*
 one’s=GEN-F ditto say=ACC Urdu=LOC ‘jiihuzuurii’
kahaa jaataa hai
 said is PRS-PASS-M/SG
 ‘“kisii kii haaN meN haaN milaanaa” is called in Urdu “jiihuzuuri.”’
<http://shabdavali.blogspot.ru/2011/07/blog-post.html>

3. *haaNjii haaNjii* ‘yes sir yes sir’:

- (24) *main haaNjii haaNjii karke muskaraa detaa*
 1SG yes sir yes sir saying smile PR-M/SG
 ‘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
 ‘why shall we cry cheers for the government?’
<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* introduces a false statement:

- (26) *terii kasam yaar tere paise kal tak*
 your 2-GEN/SG oath-NOM-F/SG friend your money-NOM-M/PL tomorrow till

zaruur de duuNgaa terii kasam
 sure 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

The typological properties of Hindi evidentials are given on the basis of PLUNGIAN (2010) and AIKHENVALD (2004, 2006).

There is no prototypical, grammatically marked evidentiality in Hindi. All evidentials, inferentials and miratives are an extension or a periphery of some other grammatical forms. The most grammaticalized are inferentials, marked by moods – indicative including presumptive future, subjunctive or conditional/irrealis moods. Inferential semantics is usually combined with presumptive and epistemic semantics. In addition to inferentiality marked by moods, it may be manifested by discourse words, lexical units etc.

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

The distinction of visual/sensory, firsthand/non-firsthand etc. evidentials is usually not expressed explicitly in Hindi. Hindi evidentials are not combined only with resultative semantics or limited by resultativity, as can be seen in Iranian and Turkish (COMRIE 2000: 3–4).

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

ABBREVIATIONS

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

REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD Alexandra 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 AIKHENVALD Alexandra. 2006. "Evidentiality in Grammar." In: BROWN 2006: 320–325.
 AIKHENVALD Alexandra. 2012. "The Essence of Mirativity." *Linguistic Typology* 16(3), 435–485.
 ARORA Harbir, SUBBARAO KĀRUMŪRI V. 1989. "Convergence and Syntactic Reanalysis: The Case of so in Dakkhini." *Studies in Linguistic Sciences* 19(1), 1–18.
 BASHIR Elena. 2006. "Evidentiality in South Asian Languages." In: *The Proceedings of the LFG-06 Conference*, 30–50, <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/11/lfg06.html>.
 BAYER Josef. 1999. "Final Complementizers in Hybrid Languages." *Journal of Linguistics* 35, 233–271.

- BAYER Josef. 2001. "Two Grammars in One: Sentential Complements and Complementizers in Bengali and other South Asian Languages." In: BHASKARAO & SUBBARAO 2001: 11–36.
- BAYER Josef, BHATTACHARYA T., HANY BABU M.T. (eds.). 2007. *Linguistic Theory and South Asian Languages: Essays in Honour of K.A. Jayaseelan*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- BENVENISTE Emile. 1971 (1966). *Problems in General Linguistics*. Coral Gables, Florida: University of Miami Press, 239–248.
- BHASKARAO Peri, SUBBARAO Kārumūri V. (eds.). 2001. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages: Tokyo Symposium on South Asian Languages – Contact, Convergence and Typology*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- BROWN K. (ed.). 2006. *Encyclopedia of Languages and Linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- CHERNISHOV Vladimir A. 1968. "Ob odnom priyeme stilisticheskogo sintaksisa khindi (dvoinoye skazuyemoye)." In: *Yazyki Indii, Pakistana, Nepala i Tseilona*. Moskva: Nauka, Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury (Concerning a Technique of Stylistic Syntax of Hindi (Double Predicate). In: *Languages of India, Pakistan, Nepal, and Ceylon*), 252–259.
- COMRIE Bernard. 2006. "Evidentials: Semantics and History." In: JOHANSON & UTAS 2006: 1–12.
- DAVISON Alice. 2007a. "Hierarchical Structure and Linear Order: Correlative Clauses in Hindi-Urdu." In: MASICA 2007: 211–245.
- DAVISON Alice. 2007b. "Word Order, Parameters, and the Extended COMP Projection." In: BAYER et al. 2007: 175–198.
- DI EWALD G., SMIRNOVA E. (eds.). 2010. *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin–New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- GAMBHIR Vijay. 1983. "Theme-Focussing in Hindi." *Indian Linguistics* 44, 1–4, 25–38.
- JOHANSON L., UTAS B. (eds.). 2006. *Evidentiality in Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology*, ed. by G. Bossong, B. Comrie, vol. 24). Berlin–New York 2000.
- JUNGHARE Indira Y. 2009. "Syntactic Convergence: Marathi and Dravidian." *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov* 2(51), *Philology and Cultural Studies* VII, 163–170.
- KACHRU Yamuna. 1979. "The Quotatives in South Asian Languages." *South Asian Language Analysis* 1, 63–77.
- KACHRU Yamuna. 1986. "The Syntax of Dakkhini: A Study in Language Variation and Language Change." In: KRISHNAMURTI et al. 1986: 165–174.
- KRISHNAMURTI Bh., MASICA Colin P., SINHA A.K. (eds.). 1986. *South Asian Languages: Structure, Convergence and Diglossia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- LIPEROVSKI V.P. 2006. "Vyrazhenije modal'nosti dostovernosti v jazyke hindi." In: *Smaranam. Pamyati Oktyabriny Fjodorovny Volkovoj* (Denoting of Modality of Realibility in the Hindi Language. In: *Smaranam. A Gedenkschrift for Oktyabrina Fjodorovna Volkova*). Moskva: Vostochnaja literatura: 221–228.
- MASICA Colin P. 1993. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MASICA Colin P. (ed.). 2007. *Old and New Perspectives on South Asian Languages: Grammar and Semantics*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass: 211–245.
- PLANK Frans. 2005. "Delocutive Verbs: Crosslinguistically." *Linguistic Typology* 9, 459–491.
- PLUNGIAN Vladimir. 2010. "Types of Verbal Evidentiality Marking: An Overview." In: DI EWALD & SMIRNOVA 2010: 15–58.
- PRAY Bruce R. 1980. "Evidence of Grammatical Convergence in Dakkhini Urdu and Telugu." In: *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*: 90–99.
- SHAMATOV A.N. 1974. Klassicheskij dakhini (juznyj Hindustani XVII v.) (*Classical Dakkhini (Southern Hindustani of the 17th century)*). Moskva: Nauka, Glavnaya redaktsiya vostochnoy literatury.
- SHARMAA Raam KRiShNa. 1992. *Kaaha kau jhagrau*. Jaypur: Rajasthaan brajabhaaShaa akaadmii.
- SHARMAA Śrīi Raam. 1954. *Dakhinii kaa gadya aur padya*. Ilaahaabaad: Hindii prachaar samitii.
- SIGORSKIY Alexander. 2010. "Evidentiality, Inferentiality and Mirativity in the Modern Hindi." *Lingua Posnaniensis* 52(1): 71–80.
- SINGH Udaya Narayan. 1980. "Bole: An Unresolved Problem in Bengali Syntax." *Indian Linguistics* 41(1), 188–195.
- SUBBARAO Kārumūri V., ARORA Harbir. 1988/1990. "On Extreme Convergence: The Case of Dakkhini Hindi-Urdu." *Indian Linguistics* 49, 92–107.