

# Chapter 5

## Emerging epistemic marking in Indo-Aryan Palula

Henrik Liljegren

University of Stockholm

While evidentiality is neither systematically nor obligatorily signaled in Indo-Aryan Palula [phl; phal1254] (Pakistan), it can be observed in so-called scattered coding. It is most obviously reflected in three sub-systems of the language: a) as a secondary effect of tense–aspect differentiation, mostly clearly seen in the use of the perfect for indirect evidence vis-à-vis the use of the simple past for direct evidence; b) by a set of utterance-final mood markers, involving an emerging three-way paradigmatic contrast: *thaní* as quotative, *maní* as hearsay and *ga* as inferred knowledge; and c) by (at least) one member of a set of second-position discourse particles, *xu*, marking surprise. Although evidentiality contrasts akin to the perfect vs. simple past were indeed part of the ancestral Indo-Aryan tense system, there are plenty of parallels in adjacent languages to the epistemic contrasts noted for Palula, suggesting that more recent language contact must have contributed to, or largely facilitated, the emergence of epistemic marking in the language.

### 1 Introduction

While evidentiality, mirativity and related notions have been discussed at length for Sino-Tibetan (DeLancey 1986; 2001) and for Turkic languages (Johanson 2000; 2003), relatively little attention has been given to similar phenomena in the multi-lingual Hindukush-Karakoram (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Kashmir), a mountainous region home to approximately 50 distinct – mostly Indo-Iranian – languages, lying at the crossroads of South Asia and the Tibetan and the Turkic worlds. Only some preliminary suggestions regarding evidentiality and its origin in the region have been offered, and a few language-specific studies focussing on epistemic



aspects have been carried out (see §2). While in a few languages, contrasts in the realm of evidentiality are actually part of verbal morphology, in others it is mainly indicated with particles, or else such distinctions are present in “scattered coding”, i.e. not as part of a single sub-system but instead encoded in various parts of the grammar. In the present study, texts belonging to a corpus resulting from recent fieldwork on Indo-Aryan Palula have been analysed, and some preliminary conclusions as well as open-ended questions are offered regarding various types of epistemic marking found in the language, their possible semantic scope and their relationship to other language-particular grammatical distinctions. It has been found that epistemic marking is entailed in some tense-aspect distinctions (§3); in the use of mood-markers (§4); and in the use of discourse particles (§5). In as much detail as possible, derivational paths will be discussed (see §6), and also language-contact effects, e.g. the possible influence of grammaticalized inferentiality in neighbouring languages or in languages of wider communication on Palula. The findings of the study are summarized in §7.

## 2 Background

Palula [iso 639-3: phl; glottocode: phal1254] is an Indo-Aryan language belonging to the Shina group. It is spoken by approximately 10,000 people in the southern part of Chitral district in northern Pakistan (35.38, 71.78; see Figure 5.1). Speakers are to a varying degree bilingual in Khowar, another Indo-Aryan language widely spoken in Chitral, and/or in Pashto, an Iranian language that is one of the most important *lingua francas* of northwestern Pakistan. Educated speakers also know Urdu, the nation-wide *lingua franca* of Pakistan, and to a lesser extent English. The author conducted linguistic fieldwork in this language, primarily in the period 1998 to 2006, with the compilation of a corpus of Palula narratives and other texts as one of its aims.<sup>1</sup> In the present study, that corpus has been consulted, along with various field notes and other types of language data, e.g. obtained experimentally or by means of direct elicitation.

The district as well as the surrounding region where Palula is spoken is linguistically highly diverse and multilingual. The mountainous north of Pakistan counts nearly 30 distinct ethnolinguistic communities, and another 20 or so can be added if we also include the adjacent, and equally diverse areas of northeastern Afghanistan and Indian-administered Kashmir. Those languages represent

---

<sup>1</sup>The interested reader is encouraged to consult the following works dedicated to the description and documentation of Palula: phonetics and phonology (Liljegren & Haider 2009); morphology and syntax (Liljegren 2010; 2016); vocabulary and semantics (Liljegren & Haider 2011; 2015a); glossed and translated texts (Liljegren & Haider 2015b).

six genera: Indo-Aryan<sup>2</sup> (to which Palula and above-mentioned Khowar belong), the dominant one as far as the number of languages is concerned; Iranian (apart from Pashto and Dari, the Afghan form of Persian, these are relatively small language communities in remote areas); Nuristani (concentrated in an area of Afghanistan just across the border from Chitral); Sino-Tibetan (represented by Balti, spoken in the eastern-most part of this region); Turkic (mainly in the borderlands between Afghanistan and the former Soviet republics of Central Asia); and the language isolate Burushaski.



Figure 5.1: Chitral district and the surrounding region. Language names (only those that feature in the article) in italics.

There are only a few studies discussing evidentiality in this region, if we do not consider the observations made regarding the general pervasiveness of it in the grammars of Turkic and Sino-Tibetan, two of the genera represented here – although in a rather peripheral way, as we saw above. In a master’s thesis, Jones (2009) analyses evidentiality and mirativity in Balti, and concludes that the language has a grammatical category of mirativity, reflected by present and past mirative markers, as well as a reportative verb suffix and some newly developed strategies for marking inference and supposition.

Although evidentiality seems a less pervasive or significant feature in Iranian languages in general than is the case in Turkic and Sino-Tibetan, there are nevertheless indications that certain verb forms in the Persian varieties spoken in or

<sup>2</sup>Indo-Aryan, Iranian and Nuristani are usually regarded as subgroups on the same level, subsumed under the Indo-Iranian branch of Indo-European.

near this region have epistemic uses. While the scope of epistemic uses is limited to past-time reference in Persian of Iran, Perry (2000) presents evidence of much wider uses in Dari, i.e. the variety spoken in Afghanistan, encompassing quotative, inference, presumptive and speculative functions, in the present and future as well as in the past. Bashir also notes the use of a so-called “distant perfect” in Iranian Wakhi as a marker of inferentiality or mirativity (2006; 2007b: 840) and a second-position clitic in Pashto carrying out certain evidentiality-related functions (2006).

Evidentiality distinctions in Indo-Aryan are in general not particularly significant or easily identifiable (Masica 1991: 279–291; de de Haan 2013), but there are individual or areally significant exceptions, a fact noted by Bashir (2006). Khowar, the Indo-Aryan language mentioned above, and its closest relative Kalasha, are particularly interesting in this regard, as they may be part of an areal configuration, also including non-Indo-Aryan languages in the Hindukush-Karakoram region, where the semantic parameter of evidentiality to a varying extent has been grammaticalized (Bashir 1988; 1996; 2013; 2003: 823; 2010). In another degree work, Lubberger (2014) analyses a set of metarepresentation markers in Indus Kohistani — an Indo-Aryan language spoken in the central parts of the Hindukush-Karakoram region — of which at least two have a definite bearing on evidentiality.

Based on previously, but severely limited, published research, Bashir also presents evidence for what she refers to as “robust inferential/indirective systems” (2006) in several of the lesser-described Nuristani languages, as well as a special past-tense form only found in one of the dialects of Burushaski, which imparts an inferential-mirative meaning (2010: 14).

### **3 Evidentiality and tense–aspect differentiation**

The first evidential sub-system in Palula to be discussed, is that of verbal categories. Seven main TMA categories can be identified in the language (Liljegren 2016: 247–263): four (Future, Present, Simple Past, Imperative) that are purely morphological categories, and another three that are periphrastically formed by the addition of auxiliaries (Past Imperfective, Perfect, Pluperfect). Palula is, like most other languages of the surrounding region, verb-final, and most frequently SOV. Verb morphology is suffixal, whether related to tense-aspect or agreement marking, and auxiliaries occur subsequent to the main verb.

Evidentiality is not a primary category in this system. Instead, the use of Simple Past vis-à-vis Perfect in Palula narratives often entails a contrast between

direct and indirect evidence with events in the past. This is for instance reflected in the choice of verbal category when applying Dahl's (1985) TMA questionnaire. The event described in (1) is the speaker's eye-witness account, whereas in (2), it is what the speaker's brother experienced and told the speaker prior to the moment of speaking that is being described. In the first case, the Simple Past (morphologically expressed with the perfective and ergative person/number agreement) is used. In the second case, the Perfect category (morphologically expressed with the perfective and the present tense form of a 'be'-auxiliary, both agreeing in person/number with the O or S) is instead applied.

(1) Palula – Simple Past

*tíi áa báaṭ uḥ-i ba ḡhandra-í the uríit-u*  
 3SG.REM.OBL INDF stone lift-CVB TOP snake-OBL to let.go.PFV-MSG  
*so múr-u*  
 3.SG.REM.NOM die.PFV-MSG

[This happened to my brother, I saw it:] 'He took a stone and threw it at the snake. It died.' (PHL-TMAQ-NH:174–175)

(2) Palula – Perfect

*tíi áa báaṭ uḥ-í ba ḡhandra-í the uríit-u*  
 3SG.REM.OBL INDF stone lift-CVB TOP snake-OBL to let.go.PFV-MSG  
*hín-u ta so múr-u hín-u*  
 be.PRS-MSG SUB 3SG.REM.NOM die.PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG

[This happened to my brother, and he told me:] 'He took a stone and threw it at the snake. It died.' (PHL-TMAQ-NH:179–180)

The example in (3) is from an interview, where the narrator tells how, a long time ago, he went to his father-in-law who told him a story. Here, the tense is the Simple Past. This can be compared with the corresponding Perfect forms used in the lines of (4), belonging to a story about a boy named Katamosh who was told by his mother to go to his grandmother up in the high pastures. The latter is obviously part of a non-witnessed event with numerous components of fiction, such as animals acting and talking.

(3) Palula – Simple Past

*áa deés táa gúum ta, máathe qisá th-íil-u*  
 one day there.REM go.PFV.MSG SUB 1SG.DAT story do-PFV-MSG

'One day I went there, and [he] told me a story.' (PHL-Hunter:009)

(4) Palula – Perfect

*tasii yéei taste áak tiki th-íil-i hín-i kaṭamúš*  
 3SG.GEN mother 3SG.DAT INDF bread.cake do-PFV-F be.PRS-F Katamosh  
*tiki dóok-a pharé ghaṇḍ-í sóon-a dúši gúum*  
 bread.cake back-OBL along tie-CVB pasture-OBL toward go.PFV.MSG  
**hín-u**  
 be.PRS-MSG

‘His mother made a cake of bread for him. Katamosh tied the bread to his back and set out to the high pastures.’ (PHL-Katamosh:009-010)

However, it should be noted that this “extended” use of the Perfect is only a tendency, far from any obligatory marking of indirect evidence. It also seems that some authors or narrators are more prone than others to use it. In another, equally fantastic, story, an unnamed person in a distant past goes hunting, and while sitting down to eat the cooked meat of a markhor, a *ṭhaaṭáaku*, a hairy and frightening creature suddenly appears. Here, however, as can be seen in (5), the line of the narrative uses the Simple Past.

(5) Palula – Simple Past

*angóor jeel-í táa pačáá kh-ainií široó th-íil-u*  
 fire light-CVB there.REM cook.CVB eat-INF starting do-PFV-MSG  
*široó th-íil-u ta tii mají áa jhaṭil-u ṭhaaṭáaku*  
 starting do-PFV-MSG SUB 3SG.REM.OBL in INDF hairy-MSG ogre  
**yh-óol-u**  
 come-PFV-MSG

‘When he had made a fire, he cooked the meat and started eating. Meanwhile, a *ṭhaaṭáaku* suddenly appeared.’ (PHL-Thaataaku:004-005)

An even less predictable contrast is that between Present and Future, as in (6) and (7), respectively. Both can be used with future-time reference. However, the choice in this case does not necessarily have a bearing on evidentiality per se.

(6) Palula – Future

*ma nis aáj kh-úum ta rhootašii-a ba kanáa*  
 1SG.NOM 3SG.PROX.ACC today eat-1SG SUB morning-OBL TOP what  
**bh-úum**  
 become-1SG

‘If I eat it today, what should I then do tomorrow?’  
 (PHL-HunterMonkey:005)

(7) Palula – Present

*uth-í            maníit-u    hín-u        ki    éé lhénđu góoi*  
 stand.up-CVB say.PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG COMP o bald(M) where.from  
*yh-óol-u        ma        tu            kha-áan-u, muştú ma        thúi*  
 come-PFV-MSG 1SG.NOM 2SG.NOM eat-PRS-MSG first 1SG.NOM 2SG.GEN  
*ráat pil-áan-u    théeba ma        thúi    lhénđ-i kakaríi*  
 blood drink-PRS-MSG then 1SG.NOM 2SG.GEN bald-F scalp  
**čap-áan-u**  
 gnaw-PRS-MSG

‘I will eat you. First I will drink your blood, and then I will gnaw on your bald scalp.’ (PHL-Katamosh:030–032)

When on the other hand two present-time referring utterances are being contrasted as in (8) and (9), there is a clearer correspondence between the use of Present and direct evidence, on the one hand, and the use of Future and indirect evidence, on the other.

(8) Palula – Present

*faríd teeníi ghooşt-á    hín-u*  
 Farid REFL house-OBL be.PRS-MSG

‘Farid is at home [I was there and saw him].’ (PHL-20157027-elic:007)

(9) Palula – Future

*faríd teeníi ghooşt-á    hóons-a*  
 Farid REFL house-OBL be-3SG

‘Farid is at home [he is usually at this time].’ (PHL-20157027-elic:008)

## 4 Evidentiality and utterance-final mood markers

Palula has a closed set of markers that one way or another specify the relationship between an utterance as a whole and the speaker and/or hearer, e.g. signaling a polar question or a request. Almost exclusively, such mood markers occur utterance-finally, i.e. in most cases following the finite verb. At least three of those markers have functions related to, or partly related to, evidentiality.

The most frequent (in my corpus) of the three, *thaní*, is a quotative (Liljegren 2016: 267, 377–387). In Palula narratives, it usually marks – or closes – directly quoted speech, as in (10).

- (10) Palula – quotative

*so ba maidoon-a=wée be ba áa khur raál the ba*  
 3MSG.NOM TOP field-OBL=into go.CVB TOP one foot High do.CVB TOP  
*kar kar kar gír-a koó hín-ee yh-óoi thaní*  
 around around around turn-3SG who be.PRS-MPL.Q come-IMP.PL QUOT  
 ‘He was spinning around and around in the field, holding up one leg,  
 [and he was calling out, saying,] “Is there anyone here [brave enough]?  
 Come on!”’ (PHL-JangibazKhan:037–038)

However, it may occasionally extend into (non-uttered) reported thought, as shown in (11), here used along with a preposed *ki*-complementizer.

- (11) Palula – quotative

*ghrast-á karáar-a asíi xiaál ki góo mheer-íl-u heentá*  
 wolf-OBL leopard-OBL 1PL.GEN opinion COMP maybe kill-PFV-MSG CONDL  
*kh-óol-u thaní*  
 eat-PFV-MSG QUOT  
 ‘We thought that perhaps a leopard or a wolf had killed and eaten him.’  
 (PHL-GhaziSamad:011)

If an explicit PCU (perception-cognition-utterance) predicate precedes the complement, the use of the quotative is more variable. In (12), where the utterance predicate *teekílu* ‘called (out)’ is used, there is no closing *thaní*, while in (13), the quotative *thaní* is co-occurring with the preceding predicate of knowledge acquisition, *búda hína* ‘(have) understood’.

- (12) Palula – utterance without quotative

*áak šúma teek-íl-u ée kúri thúi míiš-i paanṭí*  
 INDF parrot.OBL call-PFV-MSG o woman 2SG.GEN man-GEN clothes  
*ṣ-éel-i hín-i tu míiš ba na*  
 dress-PFV-F be.PRS-F 2SG.NOM man TOP NEG  
 ‘A parrot called out: “O woman, you have dressed like a man, but you are not a man.”’ (PHL-WiseMinister:012-013)

- (13) Palula – utterance with PCU predicate and quotative

*búd-a hín-a ki phaí wíi-a gúi thaní*  
 understand.PFV-MPL be.PRS-MPL COMP girl water-OBL go.PFV.FSG QUOT  
 ‘They understood that the girl must have thrown herself into the water.’  
 (PHL-ShepherdBoy:060)



Another, highly grammaticalized, function of *thaní* is when it occurs post-posed to a proper noun and carries the meaning ‘called, thus named’, referring to the immediately preceding noun. An example is provided in (14).

- (14) Palula – ‘name’

*miir thaní áak míš heens-íl-u de*

Mir QUOT INDF man exist-PFV-MSG PST

‘There was a man *called* Mir.’ (PHL-GhaziSamad:051)

Hearsay can be (but is not necessarily) marked with an utterance-final *maní*. The reported content, preceding it, is in such cases often mythical or unexpected, as in (15).

- (15) Palula – hearsay

*daçh-áan-u ta eeteen-ú=ee áak šay yh-óol-u maní*

look-PRS-MSG SUB such-MSG=CONJ INDF thing come-PFV-MSG HSAY

*maaxustán de maní áa šay yh-óol-u babár*

evening be.PST HSAY INDF thing come-PFV-MSG furry.thing

*búd-u ki na*

understand.PFV-MSG OR NEG

‘Then a creature appeared, it is said, in the evening, it is said, a furry one, you know, don’t you.’ (PHL-AyanMir1:065)

However, the use of *maní* is not restricted to narrative discourse. It is also used in everyday conversation, as in (16), an excerpt from an online chat conversation. It should be noted that it is only the first of the two clauses that is hearsay-marked.

- (16) Palula – hearsay

*asíi atshareet-á bíið-u kir díť-u hín-u maní*

1PL.GEN Ashret-OBL much-MSG snow fall.PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG HSAY

*hiimeel-í bi whéet-im hín-i*

glacier-PL SEP come.down.PFV-FPL be.PRS-F

‘[I have been told that] a lot of snow has fallen in our [village] Ashret, and there have been avalanches as well.’ (PHL-CHN070320)

Finally, a third, and in the present corpus much more infrequently occurring marker, *ga*, signals inferred, presumed or assumed knowledge, as in (17).

(17) Palula – assumption

*anú dhút-a de baajá bhanja-áan-a eetáai*  
 PROX.NOM.MSG mouth-OBL give.CVB harmonium beat-PRS-MPL from.there  
*aawaáz yh-áand-u eh rueeleé hín-a ga*  
 sound come-PRS-MSG oh government.official.PL be.PRS-MPL ASS  
*rueeleé ba aní sarkaarí sipaahi-aán hóons-an de*  
 government.official.PL TOP PROX official soldier-PL exist-3PL PST  
 ‘I heard a sound like a harmonium being played. “Oh,” I thought, “These  
 must be government officials, such professional soldiers they are.”’  
 (PHL-Hunter:067-068)

## 5 Evidentiality and second-position discourse particles

Palula discourse markers are second-position clitics that specify the discourse role of a preceding unit (often a noun phrase) in relation to adjacent units. A secondary effect of some discourse markers is that they indicate how larger units (e.g. clauses) are interrelated, especially when used in pairs, or when the same marker is used repeatedly in two adjacent clauses. The latter use overlaps with the function of conjunctions.

The particle *xu* is such a second-position clitic. It signals surprise, as in (18), or emphasis, occurring postposed to the first-position constituent that is thus being focused. While it is often difficult to find good translation equivalents in English, it is strikingly similar in meaning to the Swedish modal particles *ju* or *visst*.

(18) Palula – assumption

*ée mii xudaáyaa ni xu ux-íi rhaíi hín-i*  
 o 1SG.GEN my.God 3PL.PROX.NOM EMPH camel-GEN footprints be.PRS-F  
 ‘O my God, it’s the footprints of a camel.’ (PHL-Hunter:061) [Swedish:  
 ‘Men herregud, det är ju kamelspår!’]

Other members of the set of second-position discourse particles are: *bi* (separation marker, see 16 for an example), *ba* (switch-topic marker), *ta* (contrast marker), *ee* (amplification marker). The extremely frequently occurring switch-topic marker *ba*, is for instance used to make a contrast with an immediately preceding subject explicit, as in (19), but has a number of other functions, some of them challenging to define exactly (Liljegren 2016: 419–425). (See 6 for another example of the contrastive function.)

(19) Palula – contrast

*mīi*      *ghoósṭ lookúri*      *hín-u,*      *iskuúl ba asīi*  
 1SG.GEN house Lokuri [place] be.PRS-MSG school TOP 1PL.GEN

*kaṇeeghaá*      *hín-i*  
 Kanegha [place] be.PRS-F

‘My house is in Lokuri, while our school is in Kanegha.’ (PHL-Our school:004)

## 6 Origins and grammaticalization paths

As for the contrastive use of tense-aspect categories to signal indirect vs. direct evidence, there is evidence of a similar-functioning differentiation in Old Indo-Aryan, i.e. in the ancestral language (or a closely related language to that) of Palula and other modern-day Indo-Aryan languages. In the system described by the Indian grammarian Pāṇini, there were three categories with past-time reference: Aorist, Imperfect and Perfect. Of these three, the Perfect was used with special reference to reported, less recent, events, that is excluding the speaker’s direct witnessing the event reported, while the Imperfective had the same time reference as the Perfect but implied that the speaker was indeed a direct witness. The Aorist, which functioned as a more general past tense, was the only one of the three that could refer to recent events (Cardona 2002: 235). Deshpande (1981: 62) summarizes, in the same vein, this three-way contrast as: a) [+past +recent +/-seen] (Aorist), b) [+past -recent +seen] (Imperfective), and c) [+past -recent -seen] (Perfect), thus making the presence or absence of a [seen] feature the minimal contrast between the latter two, a distinction that Bashir (2006) argues has been passed on to some of the descendant languages, the two Chitral languages Kalasha and Khowar in particular.

In Khowar, which is locally influential in the district where Palula is spoken, and also is the second language of many Palula speakers, the distinction between indirect evidence [+past -seen] and direct evidence [+past +seen] is upheld in the tense-aspect system (which has retained forms that were lost in most other Indo-Aryan languages), as can be seen in comparing (20) with (21). Here, the [-seen] value of the Past Inferential is further specified with a *birai* (a past participle of ‘become’ whose epistemic function has developed later) which adds a mirative meaning to the reported event. The encoding of such evidentiality-related differentiation, is non-optional in Khowar (Bashir 2007a: 221–222).

- (20) Khowar – Past Actual

*hase boht-o gan-i ayi-o tek-o lak-it-ai*  
 3SG.REM.NOM stone-OBL take-CVB snake-OBL TOP-OBL let.go-PST-3SG  
*hase o-br-it-ai*  
 3SG.REM.NOM PST-die-PST-3SG

[This happened to my brother, I saw it:] ‘He took a stone and threw it at the snake. It died.’ (KHW-TMAQ-AA:174-175)

- (21) Khowar – Past Perfective Inferential

*hase boht-o gan-i ayi-o tek-o lak-iru*  
 3SG.REM.NOM stone-OBL take-CVB snake-OBL TOP-OBL let.go-PPTC  
*bir-ai hase birdu bir-ai*  
 become.PST.INFER-3SG 3SG.REM.NOM die.PPTC become. PST.INFER-3SG

[This happened to my brother, and he told me:] ‘He took a stone and threw it at the snake. It died.’ (KHW-TMAQ-AA:179-180)

Very similar distinctions are being made in the Kalasha tense-aspect system. For instance, two distinct past-time referring forms of ‘were’ are used. In (22), the past actual *asini* is used as the speaker points to the domestic animals as witnessed entities in the real world. In (23), the past inferential *asta* instead is used, as a means for the narrator to portray the participants in the story as the creations of fiction.

- (22) Kalasha – Past Actual

*tara as-ini gak tara gordok hãš*  
 there.REM.SPC be.PST.ACT-3PL cow there.REM.SPC donkey horse  
 ‘There were cows, donkeys and horses there.’ (Heegård Petersen 2015: 136)

- (23) Kalasha – Past Perfective Inferential

*ek ławak ek šara malgiri asta*  
 one fox one markhor friend be.PST.INFER.3  
 ‘Once a fox and a markhor were friends.’ (Heegård Petersen 2015: 182)

Kalasha is not a common second language of Palula speakers. However, considerable interaction apparently took place between the communities in the past, and there is reason to believe that Kalasha, at least in part of what is now Palula-speaking territory, is exerting substratal influence, as conversions from the traditional Kalasha religion often resulted in a gradual language shift from Kalasha to one of the surrounding languages spoken by a Muslim majority population,

Palula in those days being one of the main candidates (Cacopardo & Cacopardo 2001: 117–118; Decker 1992: 55–60).

Although the distinction in Palula also could have been inherited, it is equally probable to have been areally influenced and/or reinforced. Apart from evidentiality-related distinctions in the verbal systems of Khowar and Kalasha, a few other languages in the immediate region reflect similar contrasts in their TMA systems. There are for instance epistemic verb forms in regionally influential Persian varieties (Perry 2000; Windfuhr & Perry 2009: 461). Bashir (2010: 14–15; 2007b: 839) also mentions the perfect in the Iranian language Wakhi as well as in Tajik Persian as specifically correlated to indirect evidence. Another possible parallel is the contrastive use of a proximate vs. a distal perfect in Pashai, another Indo-Aryan language (or perhaps more correctly, group of related language varieties), spoken across the border in northeastern Afghanistan (Lehr 2014: 295–297). Perhaps this, in turn, is part of a considerably larger areal configuration in Western and Central Asia, something that Dahl (1985: 152) is hinting at, when he describes the extension of perfects into the realm of quotatives as an areal phenomenon with an approximate geographical correlation with the former Ottoman Empire (including e.g. Kurdish and Turkish), but it goes without saying that the secondary use of perfects for such functions has indeed been verified cross-linguistically much farther afield (Aikhenvald 2004: 112).

As for the mood markers described in Section 4, they are to a varying extent grammaticalized in Palula, which is reflected in the textual occurrence of these markers (Table 5.1). It should be noted, however, that identical forms may occur in other uses in the material.

Table 5.1: Text occurrences of *thaní*, *maní* and *ga*, and of forms related to them. (In a text corpus consisting of 76 transcribed and annotated Palula texts, mainly narrative.)

	Utterance-final	In other uses	As other verb forms	Total
<i>thaní</i>	117	51	109	277
<i>maní</i>	61	14	351	426
<i>ga</i>	20	117	-	137

The quotative marker *thaní* is the most frequent of the three. The relatively frequent occurrence of the same form but in other uses is largely accounted for by its post-nominal “naming” function, as shown in example (14) above. It is highly grammaticalized as a quotative, but its co-occurrence with a preposed (and “borrowed”) *ki*-complementizer, on the one hand, and the alternative construction

with *ki* altogether lacking an quote-final *thaní*, as in (24), on the other hand, points to an ongoing competition with the “new” Persian-derived *ki*-strategy (further reinforced by the corresponding construction in Urdu), in which the *thaní*-less construction most likely is winning out in the long run: ...*thaní* (as in 10) > *ki...thaní* (as in 11) > *ki...* A similar development has been observed in neighbouring Kalasha with regard to the indigenous utterance-final *ghōi* and the “imported” utterance-initial *ki* (Bashir 1988: 266–324).

(24) Palula – quotative

*dun-áaṭ-u      bh-íl-u                      hín-u              ki      aní                      ba*  
 think-AG-MSG become-PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG COMP 3FSG.PROX.NOM TOP  
*kateeeṇ-í      júánd*  
 what.kind-F life

‘He started thinking, “What a life!”’ (PHL-Katamosh:057)

Formally, *thaní* is a converb form (or conjunctive participle) of the verb *thané*-‘call, say’. In contemporary Palula, few other forms of that verb are in fact in use, once more confirming the level of grammaticalization that this converb has reached. Bashir (1996) found in a study of SAY-quotatives, and similarly derived markers, that they are present in many of the region’s languages (and beyond), and argues for areal convergence. Examples of such markers include: Indus Kohistani (Indo-Aryan) *karee* (Lubberger 2014: 67–69); Kalasha (Indo-Aryan) *ghōi* (Heegård Petersen 2015: 67); Khowar (Indo-Aryan) *reé* (Bashir 1996: 225–235); Gawri (Indo-Aryan) *ār(o)* (Baart 1999: 147–149); Dameli (Indo-Aryan) *gani* (Perder 2013: 176–177); Gilgiti Shina (Indo-Aryan) *theé* (Radloff & Shakil 1998: 28); Balti (Sino-Tibetan) *zer/zere* (Bashir 1996: 270; Jones 2009: 64); and possibly Burushaski (isolate) *nusé(n)* (Bashir 1996: 262), although a pre-posed *ke* is the preferred marker of direct speech (Berger 1998: 193). While many of them are indeed grammaticalized forms of a verb with the meaning ‘say’, a number of them are instead ultimately related to a ‘do’-verb; that is likely the case with Palula *thaní* (cf. *the*-‘do’), the corresponding markers in other Shina varieties, as well as Indus Kohistani *karee* (< *kar*-‘do’).

Dameli is another geographically close neighbour of Palula, spoken in the next valley to the south. Here, too, the quotative, which is derived from a converb of ‘say’, is extended to predicates of cognition, as in (25), and additionally is postpositioned to a noun phrase with the meaning ‘called, thus named’, as in (26), just like in Palula.

- (25) Dameli – quotative

*māātēē daçi-na māā-i tukuri kii gig-een gani*  
 around see-IPFV.3MSG 1SG.POSS-F basket who take-PFV.3PL QUOT

‘He looks around, thinking, “Who took my basket?”’ (Perder 2013: 176)

- (26) Dameli – ‘called’

*aats-i baloo daaš gani ek baaṭ daro*  
 come-CVB big rock QUOT one stone COP.INAN.IPFV.3

‘Having come there, there is a big stone called the great rock.’ (Perder 2013: 177)

The Palula hearsay marker *maní*, is of lower frequency in the text corpus, and is possibly grammaticalized to a lesser extent than *thaní*. When it is used it is often in order to emphasize the non-witnessed, and often questionable (in the mind of the speaker), character of the particular event or situation thus marked, rather than to signal just any instance of reported speech or hearsay. Note that *maní* in (27) only occurs after the second finite verb of this utterance, not after the first.

- (27) Palula – hearsay

*eesé baačaá-ii bóoš zára kuṛína heens-íl-im de tasíi*  
 REM king-GEN twelve thousand.PL women.PL live-PFV-FPL PST 3SG.GEN  
*áaṣṭ zára kuṇaak-á heens-íl-a de maní*  
 eight thousand.PL child-PL live-PFV-MPL PST HSAY

‘This king had twelve thousand wives, and is said to have had eight thousand children.’ (PHL-AboutAKing:007-008)

The marker *maní* is like *thaní* derived from a converb, in this case of the verb *mané*- ‘speak, recite, say’. In the corpus, quite a number of other uses of this verb occur, including a few instances of it as a non-grammaticalized converb, entirely homophonous with the hearsay marker. An example of the latter is seen in (28), where *maní* heads a subordinate clause with a subsequence reading, thus repeating the preceding lexical finite verb ‘said’ in its converb form ‘having said’, simply corresponding to ‘then’ in English.

- (28) Palula – *maní* as converb

*inç-a maníit-u hín-u ki šóo ba tu thulí*  
 bear-OBL say.PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG COMP good.MSG TOP 2SG.NOM fattened

*wháat-u heentá ma tu kh-úum eendáa man-í*  
 come.down.PFV-MSG CONDL 1SG.NOM 2SG.NOM eat-1SG like.that say-CVB  
*ba inç áak keeṇ-í šíṭi the gúum hín-u*  
 TOP bear INDF cave-OBL inside to go.PFV.MSG be.PRS-MSG  
 ‘The bear said: “Good, if you come down fattened I will eat you.” Then [lit.  
 Having said that,] the bear went into a cave.’ (PHL-Katamosh:025-026)

Reportative markers with similar functions (and in many cases with a similar history) have been noted for other languages in the region, e.g. Indus Kohistani *lee* (Lubberger 2014: 22–23); Kati (Nuristani) *mem* (Strand 2016); Waigali (Nuristani) *-le* (Degener 1998: 173–182); and Balti/Purik (Sino-Tibetan) *-lo* (Jones 2009: 57–62; Zemp 2013: 776–792).

In the example from Indus Kohistani in (29), the speaker quotes one of her sons speaking to her at the time when he had come home after the big earthquake in 2005. The reportative *lee* cliticizes to the finite verb in each of the two clauses.

- (29) Indus Kohistani – reportative  
*iskul-āi kūr-mur bazithe=lee hãã maasmá búṭ bác*  
 school-GEN.F wall.FPL-ECHO go.PRS.PFV.MPL=HSAY and child.PL all saved  
*hu-úthe=lee*  
 become-PRS.PFV.MPL=HSAY  
 ‘The walls of the school and stuff went down, but the children all  
 escaped.’ (Lubberger 2014: 26–27)

There are only a few, and in some cases rather dubious, instances of *ga* as an utterance-final marker of inferentiality in the Palula corpus. It is most likely related to the homophonous indefinite-interrogative pronoun *ga* ‘what, any, what kind of, any kind of’. Probably, it was first used in the utterance-final position as a tag. The assumption here is that it is even less grammaticalized or established than *maní* and remains somewhat varying in its application: as a request for confirmation, marking suspense or surprise, etc. The particle *bo* in Kohistani Shina, see example in (30), has similar semantics and distribution (Schmidt & Kohistani 2008: 204).

- (30) Kohistani Shina – presumption  
*mi qææs jo kudí múṭho khári níiz-iṣ-aan-o bo*  
 my guess some where tree under sleep-ABSP-is-3MSG ASS  
 ‘I guess he must be asleep under a tree somewhere.’ (Schmidt & Kohistani 2008: 204)



Careful elicitation (in 31), in which imaginary situations were described, confirms the emerging paradigmatic contrast ZERO vs. *maní* vs. *ga* as corresponding to a) an event directly observed by the speaker, b) an event heard about but not seen by the speaker c) an inference/assumption on the part of the speaker.

- (31) Palula minimal contrasts: direct (a) vs. hearsay (b) vs. inference/assumption (c)

- a. *kir dít-u hín-u*  
snow put.PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG  
'It has snowed.' [directly observed] (PHL-20157027-elic:001)
- b. *kir dít-u hín-u maní*  
snow put.PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG HSAY  
'It has snowed.' [not seen but heard from sb else]  
(PHL-20157027-elic:002)
- c. *kir dít-u hín-u ga*  
snow put.PFV-MSG be.PRS-MSG INFER  
'It has snowed.' [not directly observed but inferred from other evidence, e.g. snow on somebody else's boots]  
(PHL-20157027-elic:003)

Interestingly, the same elicitation task resulted in a two-way differentiation in neighbouring Khowar (32).

- (32) Khowar minimal contrast: direct (a) vs. hearsay (b)/assumption (c)

- a. *him arer / him kor-i šer*  
snow do.PST.3SG snow do-CVB be.INAN.PRS.ACT  
'It has snowed.' [directly observed] (KHW-20157027-elic:001)
- b. *him kardu bir-ai*  
snow do.PPTC become.PST.INFER-3SG  
'It has snowed.' [not seen but heard from sb else]  
(KHW-20157027-elic:002)
- c. *him kardu bir-ai*  
snow do.PPTC become.PST.INFER-3SG  
'It has snowed.' [not directly observed but inferred from other evidence, e.g. snow on somebody else's boots]  
(KHW-20157027-elic:003)

The discourse particle *xu* is most likely a loan from Pashto. In Pashto, *xo* is used as an emphatic particle (a second position clitic), with the approximate meaning ‘in fact’. In Pashto as well as in Palula *xo/xu* is homophonous, or alternatively polysemous, with a clause-initial adversative conjunction ‘but’. The examples in (33) and (34) illustrate the strikingly similar uses and clause positions of the particle in the two languages.

- (33) Palula – use of the particle *xu*

*lo tu keé kh-óo lo xu thii*  
 3MSG.DIST.NOM 2SG.NOM why eat-3SG 3MSG.DIST.NOM EMPH 2SG.GEN  
*bhróo atshariit-u thii qóom*  
 brother Ashreti-MSG 2SG.GEN tribe  
 ‘Why would he eat you? He is your Ashreti brother and of your own tribe.’ (PHL-GhaziSamad:019-020)

- (34) Pashto – use of the particle *xo*

*dā xo zmā wror day dā bel sar-i wror*  
 this.DIR EMPH 1SG.GEN brother be.PRS.3MSG of other man-OBL brother  
*na*  
 NEG

‘He is in fact my brother, not some other man’s brother.’ (David 2013: 375)

A parallel pattern of use has also been reported for *xu* in Dameli, another neighbouring Indo-Aryan language (Perder 2013: 168), and similar sets of particles in many languages in the region (especially to the west) have been described, for instance in Nuristani Waigali by Degener (1998: 166–188) and Indo-Aryan Gawri (Baart 1999: 159–166). Degener describes one of the particles in Waigali, *be*, as for instance signalling empathy or some pre-understanding for a particular situation that has arisen. In the example in (35), there is also a component of reproach, again difficult to find a good equivalent for in English but somewhat easier in German (which like Swedish has its own set of modal particles); *be* frequently corresponds to German *doch*, but in individual examples Degener also offers the translations *bloß*, *aber*, *bestimmt*, *also*, *nun*. Some of those uses seem to overlap with Palula *xu*, others with *ba*.

- (35) Waigali – use of the particle *be*

*yi manaša be āmeba pūt sūrāy*  
 this man EMPT 1PL.GEN way blocked  
 ‘This man has apparently blocked our way. [Dieser Mann hat *doch* unseren Weg versperrt!]

<sup>3</sup>No morpheme glossing is provided in the source, only a free translation of the sentence as a whole. The glossing and the English translation are my own.

There is evidence for a relatively high degree of “borrowability” across languages (Svård 2014; Liljegren & Svård 2017; Perder 2013: 183–184) with these types of markers, pointing e.g. to a possible diachronic link between Waigali *be* and Dameli/Palula *ba*. Probably, the use of such modal or discourse particles is a relatively new strategy of signalling evidentiality and inferentiality as far as Palula is concerned.

## 7 Summary

Evidential marking and evidentiality-related distinctions in Palula are, like in many Indo-Aryan languages, observable in so-called scattered coding. It is not forming an independent system, and it is often optional or comes about as a secondary effect of the coding of other main functions. It is most obviously reflected in three separate parts of the language system, namely a) as a component, or byproduct, of tense—aspect differentiation, b) by a subset of utterance-final mood markers, and c) by (at least) one member of a set of second-position discourse particles. In the case of tense—aspect, the choice between a simple past and a perfect, when referring to a past-time event, is at least partly correlated with direct (witnessed) vs. indirect (non-witnessed) evidence. A less stable correlation for present-time reference can be observed between the use of present tense and direct evidence, and between the use of future tense and indirect evidence. Three mood markers have epistemic functions: *thaní* is a quotative; *maní* is a hearsay (or possibly mirativity) marker; and *ga* indicates inferred or assumed knowledge, although the latter seems only marginally grammaticalized. The second-position discourse marker *xu* signals surprise or emphasis.

As for tense-aspect and its correlation with direct vs indirect evidence, a similar contrast was already part of the ancestral Indo-Aryan tense system. There are also plenty of modern-day parallels in the immediately surrounding region, in which the use of a perfect serves as a marker of indirect evidence. That has for instance been noted in regional varieties of Persian as well as in Iranian Wakhi and Indo-Aryan Pashai. A highly grammaticalized evidentiality differentiation that is an integral part of the tense-aspect system, has been described for neighbouring Khowar and Kalasha, two languages that even in other respects have exerted influence over Palula, in the first case mostly as a superstrate, and in the latter as a substrate.

The mood markers—involving an emerging three-way paradigmatic contrast—are to varying degree grammaticalized in Palula. Two of them are derived from converbs meaning ‘to call, to say’ and ‘to speak, to say’, respectively, another

tendency with numerous parallels in the wider region, and in several other Indo-Aryan languages. The third, and possibly less grammaticalized, marker is probably derived from an indefinite-interrogative pronoun ‘what, any’.

The discourse particle *xu* is most likely a (relatively recent) loan from Pashto, a language of wider communication, but has become part of a set of discourse particles that seem to be particularly important and extensive in a subareally defined group of languages in the Pakistan-Afghanistan borderland to which Palula belongs.

## Acknowledgements

This work is part of the project Language contact and relatedness in the Hindu Kush region, supported by the Swedish Research Council (421-2014-631).

## Abbreviations

ABSP	ablative-superessive	EMPT	emphathy
ACT	actual	HSAY	hearsay
AG	agentive	INAN	inanimate
ASS	assumption	INFER	inferential
CONDL	conditional (low)	PPTC	past participial
CONJ	conjunction	REM	remote
DIR	direct	SEP	separative
ECHO	echo formation	SPC	specific
EMPH	emphasis	SUB	subordinator

## References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baart, Joan L. G. 1999. *A sketch of Kalam Kohistani grammar*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies & Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Bashir, Elena. 1988. *Topics in Kalasha syntax: An areal and typological perspective*. University of Michigan. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Bashir, Elena. 1996. Mosaic of tongues: Quotatives and complementizers in Northwest Indo-Aryan, Burushaski, and Balti. In William L. Hanaway & Wilma Heston (eds.), *Studies in Pakistani popular culture*, 187–286. Lahore: Lok Virsa Pub. House & Sang-e-Meel Publications.

- Bashir, Elena. 2003. Dardic. In George Cardona & Danesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages*, 818–894. London: Routledge.
- Bashir, Elena. 2006. Evidentiality in South Asian languages. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG06 Conference*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Bashir, Elena. 2007a. Contact-induced change in Khowar. In Heather Bolton & Saeed Shafqat (eds.), *New perspectives on Pakistan: Visions for the future*, 205–238. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bashir, Elena. 2007b. Wakhi. In Gernot Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian languages*, 1st edn., 825–862. London; New York: Routledge.
- Bashir, Elena. 2010. Traces of mirativity in Shina. *Himalayan Linguistics* 9(2). 1–55.
- Berger, Hermann. 1998. *Die Burushaski-Sprache von Hunza und Nager 1. Grammatik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Cacopardo, Alberto & Augusto Cacopardo. 2001. *Gates of Peristan: History, religion and society in the Hindu Kush* (Reports and Memoirs 5). Rome: Istituto Italiano per l’Africa e l’Oriente (IsIAO).
- Cardona, George. 2002. The old Indo-Aryan tense system. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122(2). 235.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- David, Anne Boyle. 2013. *Descriptive grammar of Pashto and its dialects*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Decker, K. D. 1992. *Factors affecting language maintenance and shift in Chitral, Pakistan*. University of Texas at Arlington. (MA thesis).
- Degener, Almuth. 1998. *Die Sprache von Nisheygram im afghanischen Hindukusch*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- de Haan, Ferdinand. 2013. Semantic distinctions of evidentiality. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/chapter/77> (3 March, 2016).
- DeLancey, Scott. 1986. Evidentiality and volitionality in Tibetan. In Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, 203–213. Norwood, NJ: Praeger.
- DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3). 369–382.
- Deshpande, Madhav M. 1981. Pāṇini and the Vedic evidence: A peep into the “past”. In T. N. Dharmadhikari (ed.), *Golden jubilee volume*, 52–65. Poona: Vaidika Samsodhana Mandala.

- Heegård Petersen, Jan. 2015. Kalasha texts: With introductory grammar. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 47. 1–275.
- Johanson, Lars. 2000. Turkic indirectives. In Lars Johanson & Bo Utas (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*, 61–87. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Johanson, Lars. 2003. Evidentiality in Turkic. In Alexandra Aikhenvald & Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Studies in evidentiality*, 273–290. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins.
- Jones, Eunice. 2009. *Evidentiality and mirativity in Balti*. London: School of Oriental & African Studies, University of London. (MA thesis).
- Lehr, Rachel. 2014. *A descriptive grammar of Pashai: The language and speech community of Darrai Nur*. Chicago: University of Chicago. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Liljegren, Henrik. 2010. Where have all the verbs gone? On verb stretching and semi-words in Indo-Aryan Palula. *Himalayan Linguistics* 9(1). 51–79.
- Liljegren, Henrik. 2016. *A grammar of Palula*. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Liljegren, Henrik & Naseem Haider. 2009. Palula. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 39(3). 381–386.
- Liljegren, Henrik & Naseem Haider. 2011. *Palula vocabulary*. Islamabad: Forum for Language Initiatives.
- Liljegren, Henrik & Naseem Haider. 2015a. Facts, feelings and temperature expressions in the Hindukush. In Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (ed.), *The linguistics of temperature*, 440–470. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Liljegren, Henrik & Naseem Haider. 2015b. *Palula texts*. Islamabad: Islamabad.
- Liljegren, Henrik & Erik Svärd. 2017. Bisyndetic contrast marking in the Hindukush: Additional evidence of a historical contact zone. *Journal of Language Contact* 10(3). 450–484.
- Lubberger, Beate. 2014. *A description and analysis of four metarepresentation markers of Indus Kohistani*. Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota. (MA thesis).
- Masica, Colin P. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perder, Emil. 2013. *A grammatical description of Dameli*. Stockholm University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Perry, John R. 2000. Epistemic verb forms in Persian of Iran, Afghanistan and Tajikistan. In Lars Johanson & Bo Utas (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*, 229–257. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Radloff, Carla F. & Shakil Ahmad Shakil. 1998. *Folktales in the Shina of Gilgit: Text, grammatical analysis and commentary*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistan Studies & Summer Institute of Linguistics.

- Repp, Sophie. 2013. Common ground management: Modal particles, illocutionary negation and verum. In Daniel Gutzmann & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Common ground management: Modal particles, illocutionary negation and verum*, 231–274. Karachi: Brill.
- Schmidt, Ruth Laila & Razwal Kohistani. 2008. *A grammar of the Shina language of Indus Kohistan*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Strand, Richard F. 2016. Nurestâni languages. *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/nurestani-languages> (2 March, 2016).
- Svärd, Erik. 2014. *Discourse markers in Dardic languages: Palula ba and ta in a comparative perspective*. Stockholm: Stockholm University. (MA thesis).
- Windfuhr, Gernot & John R. Perry. 2009. Persian and Tajik. In Gernot Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian languages*, 416–544. London: Routledge.
- Zemp, Marius. 2013. *A historical grammar of the Tibetan dialect spoken in Kargil (Purik)*. Berne: University of Berne. (Doctoral dissertation).

