

**EVIDENTIALITY IN TURKISH:  
NATIVE SPEAKER JUDGMENT<sup>1</sup>**

**Türkçe’de Tanıtsallık: Anadil Konuşucu Verileri**

**Demet GÜL<sup>2</sup>**

**Article History:**

**Received**

27/10/2017

**Received in revised  
form**

27/10/2017

**Accepted**

16/11/2017

**Available online**

15/12/2017

**Abstract**

Linguistic evidentiality is the category where the information source is explicitly coded in the sentence. The main types of evidentials are direct evidence (audio, visual, sensory) and indirect evidence (inferential, assumptive, reported/hearsay). Languages differ in how and which evidential types they grammaticalize. Our study presents an empirical work on Turkish evidentials. Our study mainly focuses on the following questions: i. Which evidential meanings are coded with [mİş]? ii. What are the tense, and aspect values coded with {mİş} with and without other verbal suffixes? iii. Which suffixes are used to code direct evidentiality, inference, assumptive and reportative/hearsay in Turkish? The study presents analyses of a series of surveys where native speakers of Turkish are asked to identify the type of evidence coded in the sentences, to identify the tense, aspect and modal values of particular verbal suffixes, and to decide which verbal suffixes are used to code given evidential value to the sentence. The native-speaker test results show that Turkish distinguishes between the direct and indirect evidentials. Our study puts forward that, in Turkish, the one and only grammatical marker of evidentiality is {mİş} with indirect evidential meaning, whereas any aspect marker, i.e. {yor}, {DI}, and copula on nominal sentences, may indicate that the speaker is presenting the information from his/her own conscious, i.e. direct evidentiality. That is to say, if the sentence is not marked with {mİş} then it is marked with direct evidential no matter which tense or aspect markers are used.

**Keywords:** Modality, Evidentiality, Morphology, Semantics, Typology

**Özet**

Dilbilgisel tanıtsallık, tümcede aktarılan önerme içeriğinin doğruluğuna yönelik kaynak bilgisinin kodlanmasıdır. Doğrudan (görsel, işitsel ya da duyuşsal) ve dolaylı (çıkarım, varsayım, aktarım) tanıtılabilir tanıtsallık ulamının alt türleridir. Diller, tanıtsallığı nasıl aktardıkları ve hangi alt ulamları biçimsel olarak işaretledikleri açısından farklılık gösterir. Burada sunulan çalışma da Türkçede tanıtsal anlamları aktarmada kullanılan dilbilgisel belirtilerin aktardığı tanıt türlerini tanımlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu çerçevede temel araştırma soruları: i. {-mİş} biçimbirimi, hangi tanıtsal ulamları aktarır? ii. {-mİş} biçimbirimi, diğer eylem çekim ekleri ile birlikte ve tek başına kullanıldığında aktardığı ulamlar farklılaşır mı? iii. Türkçede doğrudan ve dolaylı tanıt alt türleri hangi biçimbirimlerle işaretlenir? Çalışmada, Türkçe anadil konuşucularının hangi biçimbirimler ile hangi tanıtsal ulamların aktarıldığını işaretlemelerini istediğimiz bir sormacadan elde edilen sonuçlar ve bulgular tartışılmaktadır. Sormacaların sonuçları, tanıtsal anlamı işaretlemekle yükümlü tek çekim ekinin {-mİş} biçimbirimi olduğunu kanıtlar niteliktedir. Bu birimin temel işlevi ise dolaylı tanıt türlerini işaretlemektir. Bulgular göstermiştir ki, {-mİş} biçimbiriminin olmadığı tüm tümcelerde bilgi kaynağı konuşucunun kendisidir. İşaretlenen tanıtsal ulam doğrudan tanıtılır. Konuşucu tümcede aktarılan önerme içeriğinin kaynağını başkası değil, kendisi olarak sunmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Kiplik, Tanıtsallık, Biçimbilim, Anlambilim, Tipoloji

<sup>1</sup> The research presented here was completed as a part of a PhD dissertation: Corcu-Gül (2010).

<sup>2</sup> Asst. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Science and Letters, English Language and Literature Department, Linguistics Program, Mersin University, TURKEY, e-mail: demetc@mersin.edu.tr

### Introduction

The discussion on evidentiality dates back to the discussion on mood and modality. Before certain studies which distinguish the categories of mood and evidentiality (Aikhenvald, 2004; Faller, 2002, Ifantidou, 2001) these two titles were evaluated to be a part of a single system (Lyons, 1977; Sweetser, 1990; Bybee, 1995; Palmer, 2001). Recently, it seems that evidentiality is more commonly accepted as a distinct verbal system, along with tense, aspect, and modality. Turkish (and many Turkic languages) acts as one of the most commonly indexed languages in studies which analyse evidentiality.

The studies on markers of evidentiality in Turkish go back to early grammar descriptions including Banguoğlu (1959), Lewis (1967), Underhill (1985), Kornfilt (1997), Gencan (2001). The linguistic studies- i.e. Yavaş (1980), Sezer (1990, 2012), Uzun (1998, 2004), Csáto (2000), Johanson (2000, 2003)- also deal with the questions on the category. One can barely claim that the mentioned studies agree on a single system defining how evidential meanings are distinguished in Turkish. In most of the traditional grammar books on Turkish, the term evidentiality is not named at all. Instead, the authors refer to semantic distinctions of two verbal past tense suffixes, namely *{-mİş}* and *{-DI}*.

Another term, indirectivity, introduced by Johanson (2000, 2003) labels the category which contrasts with direct knowledge. Indirectivity, he notes, can express reportative or inferential. Johanson (2000) claims this category to be different from evidentiality. Johanson (2000: 84) suggests that this category is peculiar to Turkic and certain languages of the Balkan area. Since the number of the languages expressing this meaning is limited in number, there is not any chance to present more precise definition of the term here.

Some linguists, on the other hand, prefer using the term evidentiality for the meaning expressed by *{-mİş}* (Yavaş, 1980<sup>3</sup>; Sezer, 1980, 2012; Uzun, 1998, 2004). These researchers categorize *{-mİş}* as an evidential marker. They agree on the idea that *{-mİş}* is neither a tense nor an aspect marker. To these researchers, *{-mİş}* codes indirect evidence.

By the term evidentially, we refer to the linguistic category that codes the source of information expressed in the sentence. To understand the notion of evidentiality, one needs to take a closer look at the categorization of evidential values. Plungian (2001: 353) categorizes the evidential values in two main terms. The first distinction is made between direct evidential and indirect evidential. Direct evidential includes a direct perception of the situation expressed in the proposition. Indirect evidentials, on the other hand, mark situations where the situations are not directly perceived by the speaker. In Table 1, details about Plungian's (2001) categorization of evidential values can be followed. Plungian (2001: 353-4) paraphrases and exemplifies each of these evidential values as follows:

*"A. Direct evidence (including direct access to P)*

*Visual: 'P, and I see/saw P.'*

---

<sup>3</sup> Although Yavaş (1980) does not openly name the term evidentiality, the semantic notions she explains fit into the category perfectly well.

Sensoric: 'P, and I perceive(d) P' [P may be heard, smelled, tasted, etc.].

Endophoric: 'P, and I feel (felt) P' [P is the speaker's inner state, cf. I am hungry, I want to sleep, I know the answer, etc.].

B. Reflected evidence (including direct access to some situation Q related to P)

Synchronous inference: 'P, because I can observe some signs of P' [P at To]; cf. He must be hungry (because he shows signs of it, etc.)

Retrospective inference: 'P, because I can observe some traces of P' [P before To]; cf. He must have slept there (because we see his untidy bed, etc.)

Reasoning: 'P, because I know Q, and I know that Q entails P'; cf. Today there must be a fair in Salzburg (because I know the routines of this region, etc.)

C. Mediated evidence (including neither direct nor reflected access to P)

Quotative: 'P, because I was told that P'; cf. They say he's leaving; He is said to have left, etc." (Plungian, 2001: 353-4)

**Table 1:** The classification of evidential values (Plungian, 2001: 353)

Personal				Non-personal	
Direct			Indirect		
Visual	Non-visual		Reflected		Mediated
			Inference		Reasoning
	Sensoric	Endophoric	Synchronic	Retrospective	Reported

In our study, we define *{-mİş}* as the marker of evidentiality, after Yavaş, (1980), Sezer (1980, 2012) and Uzun (1998, 2004). In this study, we display the results of a native speaker judgment test where the speakers are asked to conjugate the verbs of given sentences. The questionnaire is designed to test which verbal suffixes are used by the native speakers to code different evidential meanings. Guiding research questions of the study are as follows:

- i. Which markers do native speakers use to mark different evidential meanings, namely direct evidence, inferred evidence (retrospective and synchronous), reasoning and reportative?
- ii. In Aikhenvald's typological categorization of evidentiality, which category does the Turkish evidentiality system fit into?

**1. Method**

The presented study is a quasi-quantitative explanatory research. The statistical results of the questionnaire are analyzed to understand the preferences of the native speakers. The preferences of the speakers are used as a guide to explain which suffixes express certain evidential values. This section provides a description of the participants, an explanation of the questionnaire as the measurement instrument, an explanation of the procedure, an explanation of the technique used to analyze the data and the statistical results.

### 1.1. Participants

The questionnaire was applied to 147 university students (108 female, 37 male, 2 did not specify gender). The participants were chosen among the students of various departments of Ankara University Faculty of Letters and Gazi University Faculty of Science and Letters History Department. The ages of the applicants range from 17 to 39 (̄: 18,39).

Except from the ones mentioned above, 5 of the questionnaires were excluded. Among these were the questionnaires where the participants were observed to answer the questions without reading (by 1 female and 1 male participant) or did not answer all the questions (by 2 male participants). One of the male participants was not a native speaker of Turkish. His questionnaire was also excluded from the study. This left us with 142 questionnaire sheets answered by 142 participants (107 females, 33 males, 2 unspecified of gender). We did not exclude the sheets when they did not specify gender because gender is not a variable in the study.

### 1.2. Questionnaire

The questionnaire used in the study is composed of 37 questions. Each question is composed of a context which specifies a certain type of evidential meaning and a sentence without a conjugated predicate. The questions can be categorized into 4 depending on the evidential meanings specified by the given context: direct, inference, reasoning, and reported evidential contexts. The speaker, the hearer, time and place of utterance are specified for each sentence in each question. Since the participants are native speakers of Turkish, the questionnaire was run in Turkish. Below are examples of 4 different questions, each of which is designed to specify a different evidential value. In Question (1), for example, the context is designed to specify direct evidential where the speaker presents the information from his/her own experience. Here the speaker witnesses the event.

- (1) *Duwardaki saatin hareketine dalmış saniye sayacını izlerken bir anda sayaç ilerlemeyi kesiverir. Bu durumda, ne dersiniz?* (While you are watching the handles of the clock on the wall, it suddenly stops moving. What would you say?)  
Aaa! Saat \_\_\_\_\_ (dur-). (Oh! The watch \_\_\_\_\_. (stop))

Contexts defined in the next two questions specify reflected evidence meaning. In Question (2) below, the given context specifies the evidential value of retrospective inference. In the context, the speaker observes that the watch on her/his wrist does not work. This proves that the watch has stopped at a certain point in the past- namely 7:25 in the context defined for Question (2).

- (2) *Öğleyin saati öğrenmek için kolunuzdaki saate baktınız, ama saat hâlâ 7:25'i gösteriyor. Ne dersiniz?* (In the noon you look at your watch to see what time it is. It says it is 07:25. What do you say?)  
Aaa! Saatim \_\_\_\_\_ (dur-). (Oh! My watch \_\_\_\_\_. (stop))

In Question (3), the given context specifies reasoning. The speaker uses his/her his/her past experience and world-knowledge to make a guess about Ahmet. No evidence other than this world-knowledge is available in the given context.

- (3) *Ahmet'in her sevgilisine aşk mektubu yazdığını biliyorsunuz. Bu artık onun özelliği haline gelmiş. Yanında yeni sevgilisini görünce Ahmet'in bu kıza da bir mektup yazdığını tahmin ediyorsunuz. Bu tahmini yanınızdaki arkadaşınıza söylüyorsunuz.* (You know that Ahmet writes love letters to his each and every girlfriend. This is what he does! When you see his new girlfriend, you

assume that he has written a love letter to this girl also. You express this supposition of yours to your friend.)  
*Bence Ahmet bu kıza da aşk mektubu \_\_\_\_\_ (yaz-). (I think Ahmet \_\_\_\_\_ (write) love letter to this girl, too.)*

The context defined in Question (4) specifies mediated evidence, in other terms reportative. In the defined context, the speaker is asked to report what s/he has heard/learned from his husband. The speaker is not responsible for the truth value of the information expressed in the utterance. S/he conveys the information without making any changes.

- (4) *Eşiniz, Ahmet, arayıp “Akşam lokantada yer ayırttım. Arkadaşlarımla yemeğe çıkacağım.” diyor. Sabah anneniz size gelmek istediğini söylemişti. Annenize telefon edip bunu söylüyorsunuz. (Your husband, Ahmet, calls you and says “I reserved a table for dinner at a restaurant. I will eat out with my friends to night.” You call Mom and tell this to her:) Ahmet akşam iş arkadaşları ile yemeğe \_\_\_\_\_ (çık-). Az önce telefon edip haber verdi. (Ahmet \_\_\_\_\_ (eat) out to night. He has just called and told me so.)*

The verbs given in the questions varied in their lexical aspectual properties. The distinction was not a detailed one. We asked the participants to conjugate active verbs and stative verbs. We did not question further lexical properties of the verbs. The lexical aspectual properties of the given verbs can be listed on the Table 2 below.

**Table 2:** Lexical aspectual properties of the given verbs.

Evidential values of given sentences	Number of active verbs	Number of stative verbs
Direct evidence	4	8
Inference	4	4
Reasoning	4	4
Reportative	4	4

Except from the ones listed above, in one of the questions, the predicate was “üzgün” (sad). This question was placed in the study to question whether there were any differences between the nominal predicates and verbal predicates in cases where context specified reportative evidential.

### 1.3. Data Analysis Technique

Verbal suffixes used by the participants are analysed in SPSS 15.1 software in 2009. We calculated the number of each suffix being used as the final verbal suffix in each predicate <sup>4</sup>.

We have mentioned that the contexts defined for each of the 37 questions specified direct, inferred, reasoning and reported evidentials. The contexts for each sentence in the questionnaire were clearly defined so that there would not be any ambiguous cases. The context was the guide for the researcher in the categorization of the answers. Table 3 below shows the categorization of the questions and which verbs were used in the given sentences.

<sup>4</sup> The detailed results can be found in the original study, Corcu-Gül (2010). The discussion is summarized here due to page count limitations.

**Table 3:** Categorization of the evidential values

Specified Value	Evidential	Question Number	Verbs
Direct Evidence		2, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25, 37	tahmin et-; çal-; sat-; önemse-; iste-; dur-; um-; yüz; unut; uyu-; uzaklaştır-; kes-
Inference		4, 21, 26, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36	vazgeç-; sat-; çalış-; yağ-; dur-; seyret-; özle-; yaz-
Reasoning		1, 3, 6, 18, 19, 27, 31, 34	yaz-; yap-; sevin; tırman-; taklit et-; yürü-; dur-; davran-;
Reported		5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 22, 28, 29,	uğra-;hisset; konuş-; de-; at-; çık-; git; üzgün; yorul-;

The researcher was the only coder in the process. 5436 answers were collected throughout the process. However, due to the reasons explained in §2.1, 5254 of them were included in the analysis. There were not any multiple answers among the coded questionnaires.

#### 1.4. Procedure

The questionnaire was applied to the undergraduate students of Ankara University and Gazi University with the permission of the professors. The applicants were asked to answer the questions during a course time in their classrooms. The linguistic aim of the study was not openly specified to the applicants. They were informed about the instructions both orally and in script. They were informed that the questions are not a part of a language test.

The researcher administered the whole process. The researcher asked for the permission of the professors teaching at the faculty. If professors agreed, the procedure was explained to the students. The instructions were read aloud. The students were clearly informed that this was not a language test, and that their answer would be a guide for the researcher. The whole procedure was completed in 5 different sessions. 4 sessions took place at Ankara University Faculty of Letters (in Psychology Department, Korean Language and Literature Department, Dutch Language and Literature Department and History Department) and one session took place in History Department in Gazi University Faculty of Science and Letters. Each of these sessions lasted 35-40 minutes. The participants were questioned about their age and gender (see §1.1). No other demographic data were collected.

#### 1.5. Results

Each predicate conjugated by the 142 participants was analysed to find out which suffixes are used by native speakers to code certain evidential meanings. In Table 4, the verbal suffixes and the associated evidential meanings can be followed:

**Table 4:** Results of the questionnaire

		Direct Evidence	Indirect Evidence		
			Inferred	Reported	Reasoning
		Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
{-AcAk} FUT	n	71	6	69	123
	a%	4,2%	0,5%	5,4%	10,8%

		Evidentiality			
		Direct Evidence	Indirect Evidence		
			Inferred	Reported	Reasoning
		Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
{-Ar} AOR	n	317	9	20	203
	a%	18,6%	0,8%	1,6%	17,9%
{-DI} PAST	n	627	86	106	138
	a%	38%	7,6%	8,3%	12,2%
{-Dir} ASSUMP	n	136	11	1	587
	a%	8,1%	1,0%	0,1 %	51,7%
{-Iyor} PROG	n	293	73	12	17
	a%	17,2%	6,5%	0,9%	1,5%
{-mAktA} PROG	n	7	1	1	0
	a%	0,4%	0,1%	0,1 %	0%
{-mAll} NEC	n	112	40	5	20
	a%	6,6%	3,5%	0,4%	1,8%
{-mIs} EVID	n	101	898	1025	32
	a%	6%	79,1%	80,5%	2,9%
{-sA} OPT	n	7	0	1	0
	a%	0,4%	0%	0,1%	0%
other	n	23	1	21	6
	a%	1,3%	0,1%	1,6%	0,5%
null	n	10	11	13	9
	a%	0,6%	1,0%	1,0%	0,8%
Total	n	1704	1136	1274	1135
	a%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*n*: answer count; *a*: percentage in a row

The rows in Table 4 display the final suffixes used in the predicates and the columns in the table show the evidential values specified in the contexts. Each row displays the answer count (n) and frequency analysis results (a) for each final suffix used in the sentences. Certainly, there have been cases where the participants used more than one TAM marker to conjugate the given verbs. In such cases, we took only the final suffix in the analysis process. Cinque (2001) suggests that, it is the final suffix that marks the modal/evidential meaning. That is why basing the discussion on final suffixes only do not affect the presented analysis. Furthermore, when the distinction is relevant we are going to present a detailed analysis of the results.

In Table 4, we see that participants used *{-DI}* (24,2 %) and *{-IDI}* (13.8%) to express direct evidentiality the most. However, other suffixes were also used with high frequencies. *{-Ar}* was used in 317 sentences (18.6 %), *{-Iyor}* was used in 293 sentences (17,2 %), which are not far different from the answer counts of predicates marked with *{-DI}* and *{-IDI}*. Likewise, use of *{-Dir}* and *{-mAl}* in direct evidential contexts were relatively frequent (8,1 % and 6,6 % respectively.)

Contrasting with the general tendency, in 101 answers (6%), speakers marked sentences with *{-mİş}* in direct evidential context. With a close analysis, we see that two sentences in indirect evidential category raise the number of *{-mİş}* sentences: Question 15 -given in (5)- (0,9 %), and Question 24- given in (6)- (1,4 %), and Question 35- given in (7)- (2,1 %).

- (5) Context: While you are watching the handles of the clock on the wall, it suddenly stops moving. What would you say?  
*Aaaa! Saat-im \_\_\_\_\_ (dur)*  
 Aaaa! watch-poss1sg \_\_\_\_\_. (to stop)  
 “Oh! My watch \_\_\_\_\_. (to stop)”
- (6) Context: Last night, your daughter was lying on the coach watching TV. You bring a blanket to her and say “Sleep here, tonight”. When your husband asks why there is a pillow on the coach you say the following:  
*Dün gece Aysel kanepede \_\_\_\_\_ (uyu-)*  
 Last night Aysel coach-dat \_\_\_\_\_. (to sleep)  
 “Aysel, \_\_\_\_\_ (to sleep) on the coach last night.”
- (7) Context: Umut misses a good job opportunity, because he did not write a good CV. You wish that he had done better. You tell your feelings to his father:  
*Keşke Umut, daha güzel bir CV \_\_\_\_\_ (yaz-)*  
 I wish Umut more beautiful a CV \_\_\_\_\_. (to write)  
 “I wish Umut \_\_\_\_\_ (to write) a more well-prepared/better CV.”

Sentence (6) was conjugated as “*durmuş*” (has stopped) in 15 instances (0,9%). This was not surprising since “*Aaa!*” the exclamation, is a marker of newly noticed past event and surprise, which certainly triggers the direct evidential meaning. This sample sentence was taken from Johanson’s (2000, 2003) study. We did not omit the exclamation in the question sentence because we did not want to make any changes in the original version of the sentence.

In his explanation of the sentence “*Aaaa! Saatim durmuş*”, Johanson (2000) claims that the speaker presents the information from her/his own knowledge. That is, he claims the sentence is marked with direct evidential.

However, the native speakers, while answering the questionnaire, specified the context as indirect and completed the sentence with the indirect evidential suffix *{-mİş}*. In the questionnaire, it is clear from the context that the speaker did not witness the exact time when the watch has stopped running. What the speaker witnesses is that the watch does not show the correct time. With a careful examination, the speaker sees that it does not run. Thus, in the given context the speakers make the judgement that the watch has stopped. The indirect context is, perfectly, marked with the indirect evidential suffix *{-mİş}*.

In sentence (6), the given verb is “*uyu-*” (to sleep), was conjugated by *{-mİş}*. The verb to sleep is collocated with indirect evidential contexts. It may seem instinctive to make such a claim, however a simple Google search of the form “*uyumuş\**” brings about 160.000.000 results, whereas the search for “*uyudu\**” brings 7.750.000 results.



This is not only the case with the verb “to sleep”. Other small number of uses in direct evidential contexts is always used with stative verbs, e.g. *tahmin et-* (to guess) (1%).

In sentence (7), the speaker is asked to express a certain wish. The expected conjugation of the predicate was “*yazsaymış*” (I wish Umut had written...). However, expressing optative with the third person with evidential value is not one of the most common language usages in daily life. It is not illogical, thus, to sympathize the native speaker if s/he had difficulty in analysing the context. This unfamiliar situation may be the main reason why contexts, where the optative in direct or indirect contexts is specified, turned unexpected results more than other contexts.

All of the suffix constructions ending with *{-mİş}*, however, make 6% of the total suffixes used in direct evidential contexts. 94 % of the answers are not marked with *{-mİş}* in these contexts. This provides enough evidence to claim that absence of this suffix is an indication of direct evidential value of the sentence.

In the literature, evidentiality in Turkish is defined by the binary distinction of *{-DI}* and *{-mİş}* the results displayed in Table 4 column 1 put forward that *{-DI}* is not the only option when the speakers present the expressed information from their own knowledge store. *{-Ar}*, *{-Iyor}*, *{-Dir}*, *{-mAIl}* may as well be used. Uzun (1998), and many other studies (Kornfilt, 1997; Göksel and Kerslake, 2005; and numerous others) associate each of these suffixes with different modal meanings. The relatively low rates may be due to certain modal meanings. At the end of the day, it is clear in the results that Turkish native speakers do not regard *{-DI}* as being the sole choice when they witness an event/situation or when they have direct access to the information expressed in the sentence.

Column 2 presents the frequency analyses of the verbal suffixes in inferred evidential contexts. *{-mİş}* gets the highest frequency rate of 79,1 % in the column. *{-DI}* (7.6%) and *{-Iyor}* (6.5%) are the following two rates. The analysis seems sufficient enough to claim that native speakers use *{-mİş}* in inferred evidential contexts<sup>5</sup>.

In column 3, suffixes that native speakers used in reported evidential contexts. Results show that 80,5 % of the speakers used *{-mİş}* to code reported evidence. The next two frequent forms are *{-DI}* (8,3 %) and *{-AcAk}* (5,4 %).

Thus, results presented in column 3 approve the fact that *{-mİş}* is the main marker of reported evidentiality in Turkish.

As for the category of reasoning, our data supports the necessity of a categorical distinction. Reasoning is defined where the speaker uses a generally known fact to make a claim about the event/situation. The participant native speakers in our study used *{-Dir}* (51,7 %), *{-Ar}* (17,9 %), *{-DI}* (12,2 %) and *{-AcAk}* (10,8 %). *{-mİş}* was used only 32 times in 1135 sentences (2,9%). These results are in harmony with the categorization offered by Faller (2002). She defines reasoning as a sub-category of epistemic modality. In along with a detailed discussion, Faller (2002) claims that reasoning is not a type of evidential meaning. Tura-Sansa (1986) defines *{-Dir}* as an epistemic modal marker. Since then, *{-Dir}* is defined as an assumptive marker. Our study here supports this definition. *{-Ar}* and *{-AcAk}* are other modal suffixes associated with epistemic modal meanings, which is why the high frequency rates are not unexpected at all. *{-DI}*, on the other hand, has been recorded in an unexpectedly high rate. This use may be explained by use of *bence* (According to me/ I guess) adverbial in assumptive contexts. We used *bence*

5 The two questions that speakers use *{-DI}* and *{-DI}* in inferred evidential contexts are the ones with verbs *vazgeç-* (to give up) (2.3 %) and *sat-* (to sell) (1,5 %). Detailed frequency analyses of the results can be found in Corcu-Gül (2010).

(according to me/ I guess) to clarify the assumptive meaning in sentences. However, this may have led the native speakers to get a direct evidential reading of the sentence.

The findings of our study guide us to a revised definition of Turkish evidentiality, where the system is not defined in a binary distinction. To highlight the relevant results, our findings show that, contrary to the general idea, *{-DI}* is not the only direct evidential marker in Turkish. *{-Iyor}*, *{-Ar}*, *{-mAlI}* and other suffixes may well be used in direct evidential contexts. Since, *{-Ar}*, *{-mAlI}*, *{-Abil}* or *{-AcAk}* requires highly defined modal meanings, they urge certain contexts to fit in. If no propositional or event modality is defined in context, speakers choose between *{-DI}*, *{-Iyor}*, *{-mAktA}*. It is perfectly explanatory to associate direct evidential contexts with these markers since they are aspect markers in the language. This conclusion is in accordance with definitions of Sezer (1990, 2012) and Uzun (1998; 2004) who define *{-mIş}* as the only evidentiality marker. Uzun (2004) adds to this definition that *{-mIş}* codes indirect evidentiality. That is to say, *{-mIş}* does not mark the predicate in the sentence with indirect evidentiality: Any suffix other than *{-mIş}* in final position shows that the sentence expresses direct evidential meaning<sup>6</sup>.

Most of the studies would define *{-DI}* and *{-mIş}* in contrastive distinction, the former being direct past and the latter being the indirect past tense marker. The present data gathered by testing the native speakers, however, outlines a different distinction, which is not necessarily binary.

This revised version of Turkish evidentiality marking is shown in Table 5.

**Table 5:** Revised definition of Turkish evidentiality system and related markers

Direct	Indirect		
	Inferred (synchronous/retrospective)	Reasoning	Reported
Any suffix except for final <i>{-mIş}</i>	<i>{-Iyor}+{-muş}</i> <i>{-mIş}</i>	Epistemic Modal Markers	<i>{-mIş}</i>

As *{-DIr}* codes reasoning (or assumption as it is called in certain studies) is defined as an epistemic category (Faller, 2002) we can distinguish reasoning from the evidential system.

Such a change in the categorical distinction of evidential meanings and the associated verbal suffixes- makes it necessary to revise the typological categorizations defined on Turkish evidentiality system.

Aikhenvald (2004) presents a contemporary typological research on evidentiality where she analyses 500 languages. In her work, Aikhenvald (2004) categorizes Turkish among the languages where a binary distinction is made within two different evidential meanings usually direct vs. indirect. Table 6 summarizes the typological categories and degree of grammaticalization of the evidential meanings in 4 main categories, namely A, B, C and D. A. To sum we can say that A type of languages use two grammatical markers to code different evidential meanings, B type of languages use 3, D languages use 4 and D languages use 5 or more grammatical markers for different evidential meanings.

<sup>6</sup> The claim was supported in Gül (2009) and Corcu-Gül (2010) as well.

**Table 6:** Aikhenvald's (2004: 65) typology of evidentiality.

I. VISUAL	II. SENSORY	III. INFERRED	IV. ASSUMED	V. HEARSAY	VI. QUOTATIVE
A1 Firsthand		Non-firsthand			
A2 Firsthand	Non-firsthand				
A3 Firsthand	Non-firsthand				Different system or <no term>
A4 <no term>	Non-visual	<no term>			Reported
B1 Direct		Inferred			Reported
B2 Visual	Non-visual	Inferred			
B2 Visual	Non-visual	Inferred			
B3 Visual	Non-visual	<no term>		Reported	
B4 <no term>	Non-visual	Inferred		Reported	
C1 Visual	Non-visual	Inferred		Reported	
C2 Direct		Inferred	Assumed	Reported	
C3 Direct		Inferred		Reported	Quotative
D1 Visual	Non-visual	Inferred	Assumed	Reported	

Turkish is said to belong to A2 category, since it is defined in terms of the binary distinction between  $\{-DI\}$  and  $\{-mI\}$ , assumptive being defined as a part of evidential system. Aikhenvald (2004) bases this categorization of Turkish on the description presented by Aksu-Koç (1988) and Johanson (2000, 2003).

The results of the native speaker judgement test have shown that the binary distinction needs revision. The data summarized in this study shows that  $\{-mI\}$  is the only marker denoting evidential meaning. Its inexistence has the implication that the speaker presents the information depending on what s/he knows. Additionally, data indicates that Turkish has certain epistemic modal markers to code reasoning. That is Turkish uses a system other than evidentiality to code reasoning. Accordingly, in the light of the data Aikhenvald's (2004) typological categorization would look like the one in Table 7.

**Table 7:** Turkish evidential system revised in typology of evidentiality (Corcu-Gül, 2012: 236).

I. VISUAL	II. SENSORY	III. INFERRED	IV. ASSUMED	V. HEARSAY	VI. QUOTATIVE
<b>A2</b> First-hand		Non-first hand	Different system	Non-first hand	

In Table 7, we see that Turkish marks first-hand information and non-first-hand information grammatically with verbal suffixes. However, the native speakers do not categorize visual or other sensory evidence differently. There is no difference in terms of which sense is used to get the first-hand information. Turkish native speakers mark the sentence as direct evidential. The suffix,  $\{-mI\}$ , marks the inferred and hearsay/quotative evidence. Assumed evidence is categorized separately.

Above, we present a revised analysis of Turkish evidential system. We present native speaker data which supports the idea that Turkish evidentiality is not to be defined in binary distinction of  $\{-mI\}$  and  $\{-DI\}$ . It is highly possible that if the event/situation is reported, it is already over, i.e. in the past. Still, it is almost equally possible that a speaker reports an ongoing event/situation. Indirect evidentiality may be in collocation with past time reference or perfectivity, but they are not even close to belonging to the

same category.

It was in many cases difficult to define a suitable context for different evidential meanings. Nevertheless, the results were double checked with other questionnaire where the speakers were asked to choose from certain conjugations in defined contexts. The process and results of a second questionnaire, which is not presented here, can be found in Corcu-Gül (2010).

### References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aksu-Koç, A. 1988. *The Acquisition of aspect and modality: The case of past reference in Turkish*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Banguoğlu, T. 1959. *Türkçe'nin Grameri*. Ankara: TDK
- Bybee, J. ve S. Fleischman 1995. *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Cinque, G. 2001. A note on mood, modality, tense and aspect affixes in Turkish. In E. Erguvanlı Taylan (Ed.) *Verb in Turkish*, 45-59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Corcu-Gül, D. 2010. *Tanıtıcılığın Durum Anlambilimsel Sunumu: Türkçede Tanıt Türleri [A situational Semantic Analysis of Evidentiality: Evidentiality in Turkish]* Unprinted PhD Dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.
- Csáto, E. E. 2000. –miş and –İmiş items. Dimensions of a functional analysis. In U. Bo ve Johanson, L. (eds.) *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*, 29-44. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Faller, M. 2002. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Unprinted PhD Dissertation. Stanford University.
- Frawley, W. 1991. *Linguistic Semantics*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Gencan, T.N. 2001. *Dilbilgisi*. Ankara:TDK
- Göksel A. and C. Kerslake 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Gül, D. 2009. Semantics of Turkish evidential –(I)mış. In Ay, S. & Ö. Aydın & İ. Ergenç & S. Gökmen & S. İşsever & D. Peçenek (Eds.) *Essays on Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, August 6-8, 2008, 177-186*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
- Ifantidou, E. 2001. *Evidentials and Relevance*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Johanson, L. 2000. Turkic indirectives. In L. Johanson & B. Utas (Eds.) *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages* (pp. 61-88). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Johanson, L. 2003. Evidentiality in Turkic. In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. V. Dixon (Eds.) *Studies in evidentiality* (pp. 273-290). USA: John Benjamins.
- Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish*. New York: Routledge
- Lewis, G. 1967. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics, Volume II*. Cambridge, Cup.
- Palmer, F. R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Plungian, V. 2001. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33. 349-357
- Sezer, A. 1990. A new approach to the conjugation of the Turkish verb. *Current issues in Turkic linguistics*.
- Sezer, A. 2012. Türkçe'nin Köşeleri. In M. aksan and A. Uçar (Eds.) *Proceedings of 5th International Conference on Turkish Teaching*, 10-20. Ankara: Şafak Matbaası.
- Sweetser, E. E. 1990. *From etymology to pragmatics: Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tura Sansa, S. 1986. DIR in Modern Turkish. In: Aksu-Koç Ayhan, Eser E. Taylan (eds.) *Türk Dilbilimi Konferansı Bildirileri, 9-10 Ağustos 1984, İstanbul*, 145-158.

- Underhill, R. 1985. *Turkish Grammar*. Londra: MIT.
- Uzun, N. E. 1998. Türkçede görünüş/kip/zaman üçlüsü. *Dil Dergisi*, 68. 5-22.
- Uzun, N. E. 2004. *Dilbilgisinin temel kavramları: Dünya dillerinden örnekleriyle*. İstanbul: Mehmet Ölmez Yayınları.
- Willett, T.L. 1988. A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticization of Evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12, 51-97.
- Yavaş, F. 1980. *On the meaning of tense and aspect markers in Turkish*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Kansas University.