

Empirical Approaches
to Language Typology

24

Editors

Georg Bossong
Bernard Comrie

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York

Evidentials

Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages

edited by

Lars Johanson
Bo Utas

Mouton de Gruyter
Berlin · New York 2000

corr. = see Addenda et corrigenda (last page)

Evidentiality in Georgian

Winfried Boeder

In spite of the rather small number of its speakers, Georgian as a whole is a well-known language in linguistic circles. Still, it might be reasonable to begin with a few words on the genetic classification of Georgian (Section 1) and, in view of the areal-linguistic emphasis of this volume, to give a short outline of Turkic–Georgian relations in history (2). To prepare the ground, I will then give a short survey of the verbal system of the Georgian literary language (3) and consider a few categories that are semantically similar to the Georgian evidential (4): the quotative, the future, and a particle which is said to have the same meaning as the evidential perfect. After a discussion of the different meanings registered by traditional native Georgian grammars (5–7) and a glimpse at non-literary variants (8.), I will submit a tentative hypothesis that tries to explain how these meanings relate to the well-documented resultative meaning the perfect had in Old Georgian (9.).¹

1. Genetic relationship

Genetically, Georgian is neither Turkic nor Indo-European, it is probably not even related to the autochthonous Northern Caucasian languages such as Abkhaz, Chekerz, Chechen-Ingush or Avar. Its close relatives are a few languages spoken in the western parts of the Southern Caucasus area: Svan in the mountains of the Caucasus, Mingrelian in the plains of ancient Colchis, and Laz in the Pontic regions of North-East Turkey. Georgian, Svan, Mingrelian and Laz form the so-called Kartvelian language family, and they all share the feature of “evidentiality”. This feature is not a common heritage from Proto-Kartvelian, but seems to be a rather recent phenomenon, because it is not attested in Old Georgian (see 5.9), the literary language that flourished for hundreds of years from the 5th century. On the other hand, evidentiality is one of the features shared by many (or most) lan-

guages of the different Caucasian language families.² It is one of the many areal phenomena in the Caucasus and Turkey that have been interpreted as resulting from “convergence”.³ Exactly which of the Caucasian languages have evidential forms and meanings remains to be determined. Note that Western Armenian, which used to be spoken in Eastern Turkey, has a morphologically distinct evidential form (Donabédian 1996), while in East Armenian, as in its immediate neighbour Georgian, the evidential is one of the meanings of the perfect.⁴ Inside the Kartvelian group, the western languages (Laz, Mingrelian, Svan) and some western dialects of Georgian have developed a more elaborate system of evidential verb forms (see 8), but I cannot go into detail here and will concentrate on the better-known variants of the Georgian Standard language. Anyway, what we may learn from the geographical distribution is not different from what we already know from the Balkans and many Northern Eurasian areas: evidentiality is an areal phenomenon that is easily taken up by speakers of different dialects and languages.

2. Contacts between Georgian and Turkish

Most Caucasian languages have been adjacent to, or historically in contact with, Turkic in the broader sense. In the case of Georgian, this contact has existed for at least⁵ several hundred years of Turkish domination in large parts of Georgia, in particular in its western and southern areas, which are also the areas with the richest system of evidential verb forms. Also, one part of present-day North-East Turkey was—and to a very limited extent still is—a Georgian-speaking area. It is not easy to assess the linguistic impact of the alternating Persian (or Safavid-Turkic) and Ottoman Turkish garrisons in Georgia and of other forms of the “all-pervading symbiosis” (Golden 1979: 203) between Georgians and the Turkish before the advent of the Russians around the year 1800, but from the sources, we know that the Georgian aristocracy in the southern parts of Georgia were bilingual from around the 17th century, in particular those who had converted to Islam, while large parts of the population still spoke Georgian. In addition, the cities of Transcaucasia have been multilingual since antiquity: people spoke,

for instance, Armenian, Persian and “Tatar”, i.e. some type of Azerbaijani Turkic. Georgia’s eastern neighbour, Azerbaijan, has become an almost exclusively Turkic-speaking country during the last few centuries, and there is a sizable Azerbaijani population in the southeastern part of the present-day Republic of Georgia. On the other hand, a small pocket of Georgian speakers survives in Azerbaijan.⁶ So we may say that there was plenty opportunity for contact between the languages, which manifests itself in a large body of Turkic loan-words in Georgian (see e.g. Golden 1979). In fact, the close similarity between Georgian and Turkish “evidential” forms was noticed a long time ago.⁷ However, two provisos are in order here. Firstly, the assumption of Turkish influence is not incompatible with the view that resultative verb forms like the Georgian perfect can easily and “independently” develop evidential meanings (Lohmann 1937): it is one of those cases of contact that is indeed “likely to have supported latent tendencies towards indirectivity” (Johanson 1996: 87). Second, phenomena arising from language contact can spread far beyond the zone of immediate contact: Svan was always remote from Ottoman Turkish domination, but its evidential forms may well be modelled after those of its influential neighbour language: Mingrelian in Western Georgia. In other words, if the Mingrelian system of evidentiality is partly due to Turkic language contact, it may have been a mediating model for Svan.

3. The verbal system of Georgian

One of the most important forms of coding evidentiality is the use of specific verb forms. Similar to most languages,⁸ literary Georgian has no such special morphological category,⁹ but one of the meanings of the so-called perfect tense is “evidential”.

Georgian has a very complex verb system, which I will not go into detail here.¹⁰ Suffice it to say that the perfect largely follows the morphological and syntactic patterns of the stative or of the resultative passive.¹¹ Compare (a) with (b) and (c) with (d):

- a. *ma-s is u-çer-i-a* (stative passive)
 (s)he-Dat it(Nom) 3IO-write-Marker-3S
 ‘It is written for/on him/her.’

- b. *ma-s is mi-u-çer-i-a megobr-is-tvis* (perfect active)
 (s)he-Dat it(Nom) Prev-3IO-write-Marker-3S friend-Gen-for
 '(s)he has written it to his/her friend.'
- c. *is da-çer-il-i-a* (resultative present)
 it(Nom) Prev-write-PP-Nom-it.is
 'It is written.'
- d. *is da-çer-il-a* (perfect passive)
 it(Nom) Prev-write-PP-3S
 'It has been written.'

The Georgian perfect is part of a verbal system that shows striking similarities to that of older Indo-European languages like Old Greek and Sanskrit (Lohmann 1937). It comprises three groups or series of tenses and moods, each series being characterized by distinctive morphological and syntactic properties: a present series, an aorist series and a perfect series.

- I. The **present series** (present stem system) comprising two sub-series in Modern Georgian:
- The imperfective subseries: present, imperfect, subjunctive present (= subjunctive Ia);
 - The perfective subseries: future, conditional, subjunctive future (= subjunctive Ib);
- II. The (mostly) perfective **aorist series** (aorist stem system):
 aorist, optative (= subjunctive of the aorist series, subjunctive II);
- III. The (mostly) perfective **perfect series** (perfect stem system):
 perfect, pluperfect, subjunctive perfect (= subjunctive III).

Note that case-marking in subjects and objects varies according to these series. In particular when reading the glosses, some rules of case alignment should be kept in mind: with present series verb forms, subjects are in the nominative and objects are in the dative (see e.g. (4)); with aorist verb forms, subjects of transitive and of some intransitive verbs are in the ergative, subjects of intransitive verbs and direct objects of transitive verbs are in the nominative, and indirect objects in the dative (see e.g. the second clause of (17)). With perfect series verb forms, subjects of transitive and of some intransitive verbs are in the

dative (see e.g. (54), (84)), subjects of intransitive verbs and direct objects are in the nominative, while indirect objects are demoted and marked by a postposition *-tvis* 'for' (see e.g. (78), (95)).

The indicative aorist is the unmarked narrative tense. The future subseries (Ib), in particular the future and conditional, and the perfect series III, in particular the perfect,¹² are most relevant for our purposes. The future and the conditional are, among other things, used for guesses, and therefore offer a good background with which to contrast the perfect (see 4.2). The perfect on the other hand, which was purely resultative in Old Georgian, has evidentiality as one of its meanings in Modern Georgian.

4. Semantically similar categories

Let me begin with some categories that are somehow similar to evidentiality and which allow us to better understand the specificity and linguistic embedding of the evidential perfect in the system of the Georgian language.

4.1. Quotative

Georgian has quotative particles to mark reported speech, e.g. *-o* for 3rd person "speakers", which in colloquial speech can occur on each constituent boundary:

- miça-ši-o okro-s kila iq'o-o* (I 47)
 earth-in-Quot gold-Gen jar(Nom) it.was(Aor)-Quot
 'In the earth, there was a gold jar, it is said.'
- ezo-s kar-ep-ši qaraul-i hqam-o am beg-sa-o* (I 41–42)
 courtyard-Gen door-PI-in guard-Nom he.has.him-Quot this(Obl) beg-Dat-Quot
 'This beg has a guard at the door of his courtyard, it is said.'
- çad-ze tit-eb-i daakaçuna, tu gamocxva-o* (N. Dumbaže)
 maize.bread-on finger-PI-Nom he.tapped.them.on.it(Aor), if it.was.baked(Aor)-Quot
 'He tapped with his fingers on the maize-bread, to see if it was baked.'

Note that speakers (or “thinkers”) are always recoverable in these contexts.—The quotative is almost obligatory with proverbs, i.e. “something that everyone knows” (Palmer 1986: 70):

- (4) *Tatar-i da Kartvel-i orive ert-s ambobdnen da ertmanet-isa ara gaegeboddat-ra-q*
 Tatar-Nom and Georgian-Nom both(Nom) one-Dat they.said.it(Impf) and one.an.other-Gen not they.understood.it(Impf)-something(Nom)-Quot
 ‘The Tatar and the Georgian both were saying the same thing, but did not understand one another.’

Even here, a generic speaker like “people” is understood: “People say...” or “it is said generally ...”.

4.2. Future forms

Georgian future forms can have an epistemic meaning of uncertainty, e.g. in:

- (5) *xel-is mixedv-it zegl-i X s. ganekutvneba* (C. Čanķievi)
 hand-Gen regard-Instr monument 10th cent. it.will.belong.to.it(Fut)
 ‘With regard to the handwriting, the text probably belongs to the 10th century.’
- (6) *tu ... ded-is amag-s apaseb, modi, karg-i adamian-i iknebi-o* (Γ 41)
 if...mother-Gen care-Dat you.appreciate.it(Pres), come, good-Nom human.being-Nom you.will.be(Fut)-Quot
 ‘If you make such a point of your mother’s care, well, you must be a good man, he said’.

This use is not confined to declaratives. In questions it expresses the uncertainty of their sincerity condition (namely, that the speaker does not know for sure):

- (7) a. *sa-idan iknebi-t ?*
 where-from you.will.be-Pl(Fut)
 ‘Where will you come from?’
- b. *rogora x-ar ?—rogor v-iknebi ?*
 how 2S-be(Pres) ?—how 1S-will.be(Fut) ?
 ‘How are you ?—How will I be ?’

For the past, the conditional, i.e. the past forms of the future, are used. Compare (8) with (9):

- (8) *axla v-iknebi-t as at-i kvaml-i* (I 85)
 now 1S-will.be-Pl(Fut) hundred ten-Nom household-Nom
 ‘We are perhaps a hundred and ten households now (I would say).’
- (9) *Amilaxvar-i ikneboda švid-i, rva kōml-i. glex-eb-i ikneboda sam-as-i* (I 26)
 A.-Nom it.would.be(Cond) seven-Nom, eight(Nom) household-Nom, peasant- Pl-Nom it.would.be(Cond) three-hundred-Nom
 ‘Amilakhvari comprised perhaps seven, eight households. Peasants there were perhaps 300 (, I would say...)’
- (10) *dainaxa ert-i moxuc-i kac-i romel-i-c as oc-i čl-is ikneboda* (B1 64)
 he.perceived.him one-Nom old-Nom man-Nom who-Nom-Rel hundred twenty-Gen year-Gen he.would.be(Cond)
 ‘He saw an old man who was perhaps 120 years old.’
- (11) *zalian ševçuxdi, magram ra-xa-s vizamdi !* (VI 21.1.96)
 very I.got.worried(Aor), but what-Part-Dat I.would.do.it(Cond) ?
 ‘I was very worried, but what could I do!’

Resultative forms are also possible (perfect passive participle + future of “to have”). Compare the conditional in (12) with the resultative future in (13):

- (12) *čem-s barat-s mii xebdi-t*
 my-Dat letter-Dat you.would.receive.it-Pl(Cond)
 ‘You will have received my letter.’
- (13) *ukve čem-i barat-i miyeb-ul-i g-ekneba-t* (MD 12.6.80)
 already my-Nom letter-Nom receive-PP-Nom 2O-it.will.be-Pl
 ‘You will have already received my letter (and it will be with you).’

The future, then, has a usual modal meaning and denotes “a degree of confidence” (Palmer 1986: 65).¹³

4.3. Particles

Georgian has many modal particles, among them *turme* ‘apparently’,¹⁴

which the leading native grammarian, Akaġi ŒaniŒe (1973: Œ 281) seems to interpret as a synonym of the evidential perfect:

(14) *ġasula* (perfect) = *ġavida* (aorist) *turme* ‘Apparently, s/he has gone.’

And indeed, this particle is necessary to express evidentiality with non-past events:¹⁵

(15) *sacġal gogo-s tavis-is tit-eb-it mogrov-il-is pul-it ert-i ġitmerdin-i uġidnia, ima-s* [sc. *Elisabed-s*] *unaxavs da ġaurtmevia. exla turme tav-zed ikravs* (Ili ĢavġavaŒe: *Ķacia adamiani?*)
poor girl-Dat her-Gen/Instr finger-PI-Instr collect-PP-Gen/Instr money-Instr one-Nom silk.kerchief-Nom she.has.bought.it(Perf), that-Dat [sc. Elizabeth- Dat] she.has.seen.it(Perf) and she.has.taken.it.away(Perf). now apparently head-on she.puts.it(for)herself(Pres)
‘The poor girl apparently bought a silk kerchief with the money she had collected with her fingers, Elizabeth apparently saw it and took it away. Now apparently she puts it on her head.’

(16) *turme samsaxur-Œi unda vġopilviġavi* (RK)
apparently office-in it.is.necessary I.had.been(pluperfect)
‘It seems I should have been in the office’.

Notice that in (16), *turme* refers to *unda* ‘it is necessary’, not to the pluperfect main verb that functions as a past subjunctive. *turme* does not occur with the subjunctive, the imperative or the conditional.¹⁶

Note the co-occurrence of both *turme* and the perfect in:

(17) *baliŒ-tan dakavŒireb-it gamaxsenda, rom turme ukve moxuc poeġ Akaġi Ģeretel-sa-c ert-ma lamaz-ma mandilosan-ma aġuka baliŒ-i. ama-ze Akaġi-s utkvams: ...* (MD)
pillow-at connection-Instr I.remembered(Aor), that apparently already old poet Akaki Tseretel-Dat-too one-Erg beautiful-Erg lady-Erg she.gave.it.to.him(Aor) pillow-Nom this-on Akaki-Dat he.has.said.it(Perf)
‘In connection with the pillow I remembered, that, as they say, one beautiful lady gave the already aged poet Akaki Tsereteli a pillow for a present. On this, Akaki is said to have said: ...’

turme is sometimes added to the perfect to underline its evidential meaning. They form a ‘‘harmonic combination’’, to use Palmer’s term (1986: 63). So (18) and (19) are essentially synonymous:

(18) *Œen turme axal-i saxl-i aġiŒenebia*
you apparently new-Nom house-Nom you.have.built.it(Perf)

(19) *Œen axal-i saxl-i aġiŒenebia*
you new-Nom house-Nom you.have.built.it(Perf)
‘You apparently built a house.’

4.4. Evidential particles in the dialects

There are Georgian dialects that use *ġopil(a)* ‘(etymologically:) it has been (3rd person perfect)’ as a particle in the sense of *turme*, e.g. Inġilo, a dialect spoken in an Azerbaijani surrounding:

(20) *e gada-j magra ġavlovs ġopil* (ŒangizŒe 1978: 85–86)
this(Nom) youth-Nom strongly he.learns(Pres) ‘‘it.has.been’’
‘This youth apparently learns well.’

(21) *pa xira cxovrovdnen ġopil* (ib.)
miserably they.lived(Impl) ‘‘it.has.been’’
‘They apparently lived miserably.’

(22) *ġem keġ-i, cxröv Œen giġami ġopila* (ib.)
my(Nom) goat-Nom, sheep(Nom) you you.have.eaten.it(Perf) ‘‘it.has.been’’
‘Apparently, you have eaten my goat and my sheep.’

(23) *er kac ġopil* (a), *pa xir kac ġopil* (b). *ver ucxovrni ġopil* (c), *ka-j tamsamoz ver icoms ġopil* (d) (D 237)
one(Nom) man(Nom) he.has.been(Perf) (a), poor(Nom) man(Nom) he.has.been(Perf). not.possible he.has.lived(Perf) ‘‘it.has.been’’ (c), good-Nom shirt(Nom) not.possible he.puts.on(Pres) ‘‘it.has.been’’ (d)
‘There was (a) a man, they say, he was (b) a poor man, they say. He couldn’t live, they say (c), they say, he cannot put on a good shirt, they say (d).’

ġopil occurs immediately after finite verbs to form evidentials. Notice that in the last example *ġopil* occurs with different functions: both as an evidential perfect of ‘‘to be’’ ([a]–[b]), and as an evidential particle ([c]–[d]) with a finite perfect and present verb form, respectively.—ImnaiŒvili (1955: 123) interprets *ġopil* as a calque of the Azerbaijani evidential copula form *imiŒ* ‘s/he / it is / was said to be’.¹⁷ However, ŒangizŒe (1978: 85) points out that there is a slight difference: *ġopil* is

an invariable particle, and while it is added to the inflected verb form in Georgian, it is the copula *imiš* that is added to infinite verb forms in Azerbaijani and other Turkic languages (see Johanson, this volume). On the other hand, *qopila-m*¹⁸ is also used in Khevsur, a dialect spoken in an East Georgian mountain area that used to be in close contact with North Caucasian Chechen-Ingush:

- (24) *ert xana-c qopila-m Arxvat-s Kist-eb-is laškar daec* (Arabuli 1980: 149)
 one time-Part 'it.has.been'-Part Arkhot-Dat Kist-Pl-Gen host(Nom) it.fell.on.it(Aor)
 'Once, they say, the host of the Kists fell upon the village of Arkhoti'.

Arabuli (1980), a native Khevsur from the village of žuta, observed this usage in his dialect. He points out that in several Kartvelian languages and dialects, the inflected copula is suffixed to certain finite verb forms, and he argues against Imnaišvili's calque theory. And indeed, there are several Georgian particles that go back to finite verb forms, and *qopil(a)* as a particle parallels Standard Georgian *ikneb* 'perhaps' < *ikneba* 'it will be (Future)'.¹⁹ Still, internal developments can easily reinforce contact-induced innovation. And there is good reason for considering *qopil* as an areal phenomenon due to "code copying" (Johanson): Ingush may have a counterpart of Khevsur,²⁰ and West Armenian, again a contact language of Turkish, seems to match Ingilo *qopil*.²¹ There is some indication that Turkish-Azerbaijani (*i*)*miš*, the most frequent and obviously very salient 3rd singular form of the copula, could be interpreted as a fixed evidential meaning indicator: Tat, an Iranian language spoken in North Azerbaijan, has borrowed the form *miš* as a "modal particle" with an inferential and quotative meaning.²² In addition, there are many exact or very close parallels of *qopil* in other languages.²³

4.5. Confirmative

In view of the opposition between evidential, confirmative and neutral forms in languages like Lak (Friedman 1984) and in some Balkan languages (Friedman 1986), it should be noted that in Western Georgia, which is the area with the most elaborated systems of evidential forms

(see 1. and 8.), some of the Kartvelian dialects have a confirmative particle *k(v)e-*, *ko-*:

- (25) *tu gadmogagdo, ke šekčams* (D 466)
 if it.threw.you, Particle it.will.eat.you(Fut)
 'If it [sc. the horse] throws you, it will definitely eat you.'
- (26) *ke gitxari, mara ar deižere*
 Particle I.told.it.to.you(Aor), but not you.believed.it(Aor)
 'I did tell you, but you didn't believe.'

It is an interesting question whether *ke/ko-* is in complementary distribution with the evidential perfect and or/the particle *turme*.

5. The evidential meaning of the perfect in Modern Georgian

Now let us look at what traditional native grammar has to tell us about the perfect.²⁴ The usual modern Georgian term for the morphological tense category, *turmeobiti*, was coined by A. Šaniže; it is derived from the particle *turme* described above.²⁵ Some of the Russian terms *neočevidnoe*, *zaočnoe*, *zaglaznoe* 'what is beyond eye-witnessing' go back to the 19th century.²⁶ They look like a translation of Pāṇini's concise rule *parokṣe* '[the perfect is used with something that is] out of eye-sight',²⁷ and are a probable source of A. Šaniže's semantic term *unaxavi* 'not-seen', *unaxaoba* '(lit.) not-having-been-seen-ness'. It is not by chance that it refers to the implicationally highest type of direct evidence, which is visual rather than, for example, auditory (Willett 1988: 59). Although this is by no means the only meaning of the perfect, the terms of this tradition suggest its high salience,²⁸ and it is appropriate to begin with this category of meaning.

5.1. Non-witnessedness

The perfect is used for events that the speaker hasn't witnessed and which he or she infers from a present state. An example is:

- (27) *tovl-i mosula* 'snow-Nom it.has.come(Perf)'

on which Šanize (1973: § 261) comments as follows: “In this case, I draw the hearer’s attention to the fact that I haven’t seen the snow coming. I know about it because I see the difference between the states of yesterday and of today: yesterday nothing was in my courtyard, but today it is covered with snow. This difference gives me the possibility to draw a conclusion about the coming of snow”. This conclusion is an interpretation²⁹ or inference of causes. As Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1986: 162) observe, “the speaker was in some sense not quite prepared for the event in question”. (27) contrasts with:

(28) *tovl-i movida* ‘snow-Nom it.came(Aor)’

where the aorist is neutral: it doesn’t tell whether the speaker witnessed the fact or not.³⁰ The aorist seems to be the unmarked member of the opposition.³¹

It is possible to combine *turme* ‘apparently’ with the perfect in this sense (cf. (18)):

(29) *turme tovl-i mosula* ‘Apparently, it has snowed (perfect).’

(30) *turme vmedarivar, torem gažobebdi* (Ilia Čavčavaže apud Peikrišvili 1974: 65)
apparently I.have.been.mistaken(Perf), otherwise I.would.be.better.than.you(Cond)
‘I must have been mistaken, otherwise I would be better than you’.

5.2. Inference

But this is only one variant of the inferential meaning. There is an additional type: the speaker comes to a “summarizing” (Pxaķaže 1984: 111), evaluative conclusion about something that he or she witnessed him- or herself. The perfect in this sense is not limited to the predication of processes, as Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1986: 161) claim for the Turkish inferential *-miş*; on the contrary, *qopila* ‘has been’ cannot refer to hearsay in:

(31) *es žalian šemaçuxebel-i da saķmaod xanğrğliv-i daavadeba qopila* (MD)
this(Nom) very worrying-Nom and sufficiently longlasting-Nom illness(Nom)
it.has.been(Perf)
‘[After relating that she has been ill for a long time, the writer says:] This was a very painful and rather long illness, I must say.’

(32) *ra gul-keṭil-i qopila is angeloz-i* (Myvimeli)
what heart-good-Nom he.has.been(Perf) that(Nom) angel-Nom
‘[At the end of a story about an angel who helped a child:] How kind-hearted that angel was !’

In this example, the perfect means: “I have come to the conclusion that such and such [has been and] is the case”, which is a kind of combination of evidential and existential meanings (see 6.4).³² Consider the following examples:

(33) *sibere ar qopila karg-i* (MD)
old.age(Nom) not it.has.been(Perf) good-Nom
‘[After describing her health problems, the writer says:] Old age is not good’ [in the sense of: ‘Old age really is no good, I must say’. The writer’s later comment was: “Old age is bad... that old age is bad, other people have known it before, too, but for me it became known now, when I grew old”; see note 23.]

(34) *-ho da šavic sçored eg aris, rasac hxedav ese igi, bindi, bneli, araperi, šavi.— šavi! araperi! šavi! maš šavi araperi qopila ... maš araperic šavi qopila* (M. Žavaxišvili)
‘[A blind girl asks her father what “black” means. The father says:] “Yes, and black is(Pres) also exactly this, what you see(Pres), that is: dusk, dark, nothing, black.”—“Black! Nothing! Black! Then black is (perfect) nothing ... Then nothing is (perfect) black, too.”’

(35) *mašasadame, martla gcodnia Kartul-i* (RĶ)
consequently, truly you.know.it(Perf) Georgian-Nom
‘So, you really know Georgian.’

(36) *mašasadame, martla žanmrtel-i vqopilvar* (M. Žavaxišvili apud Peikrišvili 1974: 65)
consequently, truly healthy-Nom I.have.been(Perf)
‘So, I am really in good health.’

(37) *me šen-i bed-i vqopilvar-o da gaiķeta beçed-i tit-ze* (Г 49)
I(Nom) your-Nom fate-Nom I.have.been(Perf)-Quot and she.did.it.to.herself(Aor)
ring-Nom finger-on
‘[A hero wants to gain a woman for his brother; after many difficulties he finds her. During the night she tries to put a ring on his finger, and is going to kill him. But he seizes her by her finger, and she says:] I am your fate, she said, and put the ring on her finger [i.e., from all that happened I come to the conclusion that you inevitably must be my future husband].’

In all these examples, the perfect does not mean: 'I have come to the conclusion that such and such was the case'. In general, the perfect of stative verbs like "to be, to have, to know, to love" etc. can have both past and present meanings (Rogava 1953: 30–31). So (36) also means: 'So, I was in good health'. Notice that the "conclusion" meaning is underlined by the additional use of the conjunction *maš(asadame)* 'so, then' in (34)-(36).

5.3. Admirative

The inferential and summarizing, and indeed all uses of the evidential perfect presuppose that the speaker "did not know before" (see comment in [33]). In many cases, this "unexpectedness" is connected with an emotional element, and results in a so-called "admirative" sense,³³ which expresses "surprise at a newly discovered and previously unsuspected fact" (Friedman 1988: 127), an "experience of surpassed expectations" (Aksu-Koç—Slobin 1986: 162), which need not, however, be a "pleasant" (ib.) one:

- (38) *es ra cecxl-ši čavvardnilvar* (Grigol Orbeliani apud Peikrišvili 1974: 65)
 this(Nom) what fire-in I.have.fallen.into(Perf)
 'Into what fire have I fallen !'

Note that "unexpectedness" in this sense refers to what has not been anticipated, not necessarily to what is contrary to expectation. Not every example of the hearsay use, for example, should be interpreted as an instance of a "contrary to expectation" use, unless we want it to be watered down to mean "newsworthiness".

The admirative usage is most frequent with stative verbs.³⁴ Again, the stative forms denote a generalizing conclusion³⁵ derived from past experience. Examples such as (32) are "summarizing" and "admirative" at the same time. They mean "that the speaker was, in some sense, not quite prepared for the event in question" (Aksu-Koç—Slobin 1986: 162):³⁶

- (39) *sičqva-s gazlev, dxe-is ik-it ačar davxvaro šen-i modgm-is sisxl-i, ra tčbil-i čopila adamian-is xma !* (Γ 22)
 word-Dat I.giv.it.to.you, day-Gen there-Instr no.more I.shall.shed.it(Opt) you-Gen
 race-Gen blood-Nom, what sweet-Nom it.has.been(Perf) human.being-Gen
 voice(Nom)
 'I give you my word, from this day on, I will not shed the blood of your race any more, how sweet is man's voice!'
- (40) *ra ka-i kac-i čopila*
 what good-Nom man-Nom he.has.been(Perf)
 'What a good man he is!'
- (41) *qočaχ šen-s važkacoba-s, rom mamac-i čopilxar da me ki sauğunot šen-i viknebi-o* (B1 104)
 cheers your-Dat manlihood-Dat, that man-Nom you.have.been(Perf) and I but for.ever
 your-Nom I.will.be-Quot
 'Praise to your manlihood, that you are a real man, therefore I will be yours forever!'

5.4. Irony

The "ironical" or "dubitative" use also occurs in Georgian.³⁷ There is "some previous statement which is being mocked by repetition, either real or implied" (Friedman this volume and 1988: 128):

- (42) *man šen-ze meč-i icis.—namdvilad meč-i scodnia !* (RK)
 (s)he(Erg) you-on more-Nom s/he.knows.it(Pres).—indeed more-Nom s/
 he.has.known.it(Perf)
 "'(S)he knows more than you.'"—"Indeed, s/he knows more!"
- (43) *moxuc-i xar !—aba, diax, moxuc-i včopilvar* (RK)
 old-Nom you.are(Pres) !—Just.so, yes, old-Nom I.have.been(Perf)
 "'You are old!'"—"Oh yes, of course, I am old."'

Again we have an inference: "(Oh, I did not know, but) if you say so, it must (of course) be true", which, given its blatantly unwarranted premise, can be taken as ironical.

5.5. Hearsay

In some examples, a hearsay interpretation is plausible:

- (44) *ori tvīs čin me tkven vrceli barati gamogizavnet ... barati gamosagzavnad miveci čems natesav gogonas. im dves zalian čvinda da kariani amindi ičo. natesav gogonas barati xelidan gavardnia da kučaši çqlis da řalaxis gubeři řavardnia. řonverti ise dasvrila, rom misamarti sruliad řařlila da baratic gapuřebula. čemi natesavi gogo mas řemdeg čemtan ar mosula. moridebisa-gan es ambavi damimala ... guřin ři movida misi deda ... (MD)*
 ‘Two months ago, I sent (aorist) you a long letter. ... To mail it, I gave (aorist) it to a girl, a relative of mine. On this day, there was (aorist) a heavy rain and windy weather. The letter fell (perfect) from that girl’s hand, and in the street, it fell (perfect) into a puddle of water and mud. The envelope became wet (perfect), so that the address was effaced (perfect) and the letter was spoiled (perfect), too. The girl, my relative, didn’t come (perfect) to me after that. She hid (aorist) it from me out of embarrassment... Yesterday, however, her mother came (aorist)...’

We may infer that the source of hearsay was the girl’s mother in this case, but in fact, the speaker is not necessarily recoverable as it is with the quotative.

5.6. Tradition

As in other languages with evidential forms, the perfect is often used in narratives to underline that the speaker follows a tradition:³⁸

- (45) *čem-i řapi-eb-i ak dasaxlebulan sam řvaml-at (I 68)*
 my-Nom forefather-Pl-Nom here they.have.settled(Perf) three household-Adv
 ‘My forefathers settled here in three families, they say’.

The following example gives a historical account in the perfect, but adds a conjecture in the future:

- (46) *učin řopila erti řaci řopale, zalian didi mdidari řopila, řolia blomat purřamečoba, samoci su niřora purřameči řopila, danarčeni kide sxva ikne-boda. imas řolia erti řvili, utxovnia řaxetis tavadis kali. gamougzavnia imasa samoci uremi řvino. “...” utkvams im tavads. řopales is bočřebi dauclia ... (I 40)*

corr. ‘Formerly, there was (perfect) a man Kopale [in this area], he was (perfect) very rich, he had (perfect) many cows and buffaloes, three hundred all had

(perfect) a blaze, and he will have had (conditional) still others. He had (perfect) one son, [and] he asked (perfect) for the prince of Kakheti’s daughter’s hand. He sent (perfect) him sixty carts [loaded with] wine. “...” said (perfect) the prince. Kopale emptied (perfect) those casks...’

While the future expresses a modal attitude of uncertainty, the perfect **corr.** does not: it leaves no doubt as to the correctness of the report, but simply expresses the indirect source of it.

The usage in story-telling is divided: in contrast to Turkish (Aksu-Koç—Slobin 1986: 164), most fairy-tales have the aorist, but a few are in the perfect (e.g. D no. 17, p. 24: Khevsurian);³⁹ others have both perfect and aorist (e.g. D no. 260, p. 317: Kartlian) or even perfect, future, and aorist (e.g. D no. 2ř3, p. 366: Meskhian) or conditional, imperfect, /9 aorist (e.g. D no. 275, p. 338: Djavakhian from Akhalkalaki). The genre-specific usage remains to be investigated, but I would guess that the aorist is the unmarked “plot-advancing” (Johanson) tense of story-telling, while the perfect means (e.g. anecdotic) “tradition”, without, however, precluding temporal sequence.⁴⁰

5.7. Evidentiality in interrogative sentences

With a reservation to be specified below (5.8), the opposition between evidential and non-evidential forms is restricted to non-modal assertions (see Johanson in this volume).⁴¹ Interrogative sentences look like a breach of this constraint:

- (47) *xom řesařlebel-i řopila ? (G. Dočanařvili in Pxařaze 1984: 126)*
 Particle possible-Nom it.has.been(Perf) ?
 ‘This is possible, isn’t it?’
- (48) a. *ra momsulia ?*
 what it.has.come.to.me(Perf) ?
 b. *ra mogsvlia, řaco ?*
 what it.has.come.to.you(Perf), man ?
- (49) a. *es ra řit-i moprinda ?*
 this what(Nom) bird-Nom it.flew.here(Aor)
 b. *es ra řit-i moprenila ?*
 this what(Nom) bird-Nom it.has.flown.here(Perf)

However, (47) means that somebody had said it is not possible, but it turns out to be possible. The particle *xom* gives the question an epistemic bias toward the affirmative: “I am (only somewhat) in doubt whether to infer that it is possible”. But this interrogativity does not impair the essentially assertive character of the question.—(48a) is not a “real” question, but an “admirative” exclamation: “That’s a fine mess I’ve got into!”. Similarly, (48b) is exclamatory, and it means that somebody told me about “your misfortune”. (49) is a minimal pair that, according to Šanize (1973: § 261), resists any differential translation into Russian. (49a) is a real question: “What kind of bird is this that came flying here?”, but (49b) expresses unexpectedness and is again “admirative”: “What a bird this is that came flying here!” is perhaps a possible translation.

5.8. Embedded evidentials

Notice the use of the perfect in embedded clauses, where evidentiality is not a property of the primary speaker’s (or author’s) inference:

- (50) *zal-ze gamixarda, rom karg-ad, qovel-gvar-i problem-eb-is gareše gimgzavria* (VG)
force-on it.became.happy.for.me(Aor), that good-Adv, all-kind-Gen problem-Pl-Gen outside you.have.travelled(Perf)
‘I was very glad to hear that you travelled well, without any problem.’
- (51) *mixvda, rom karg-i sakme ar uknia* (BI 118)
he.understood.it(Aor), that good-Nom thing(Nom) not he.has.made.it(Perf)
‘He understood that what he had done wasn’t good.’
- (52) *xelmçip-is kališvil-ma rom gaigo, mama-s karg-i vašl-eb-i uqidia-o, adga da gamoartva* (BI 82)
king-Gen daughter-Erg when she.understood.it(Aor), father-Dat good-Dat apple-Pl-Nom he.has.bought.them(Perf)-Quot, she.rose(Aor) and she.took.it(Aor)
‘When the king’s daughter heard: “Father has bought good apples”, she went to take one.’

In (50), the inferring person is the writer and recipient of hearsay (or rather of the addressee’s letter), in (51) it is the subject of the matrix

clause who summarizes his reasoning. (52) contains a mixture of “direct speech” (with the quotative *-o*) and hearsay which owes its evidential perfect to the king’s daughter being the recipient of the news, and not to the “original” speech of her informants. Similarly, Pxaqaze (1984: 118) rightly points out that the “hearsay” facts are not always “unknown” to the speaker, but rather to the listener:⁴²

- (53) *tavis-i megobar-i kal-is—Lena-s ambav-s hqveboda: igi turme am dil-it, vinme Griša xel-ši auqacnia, țansacml-ian-ad z rva-ši šeuqvania* (O. Ioseliani) corr.
her-Gen friend-Gen woman-Gen—Lena-Gen matter-Dat she.told.it.to.her- (Impf): she(Nom) apparently this(Obl) morning-Instr, somebody(Nom) Grisha(Nom) hand-in he.has.carried.her.away(Perf), clothes-having-Adv sea-in he.has.led.her.into(Perf)
‘She was telling her friend Lena’s story: apparently, some Grisha had carried her off with his hands this morning, had brought her into the sea with her clothes on.’

With this example of free indirect speech compare the following example, where a perception (“he sees”) of the protagonist or “recipient” is only implied:

- (54) *modis dapikrebul-i. ert çrel gvel-s tqav-i gauxdia da gza-ze gdia* (Г 37)
he.comes(Pres) lost.in.thought-Nom. one colourful snake-Dat slough-Nom it.has.cast.it(Perf) and way-on it.lies(present stative passive)
‘[A peasant goes on his way, worried. Here] he comes in deep thoughts [and he sees:] One colourful snake has cast its slough and it lies on his path.’

Embedding offers crucial insight into the semantics of the perfect:⁴³

- (55) *darçmunebul-i ara var, rom es çeril-i daçera*
convinced-Nom not I.am, that this(Nom) letter-Nom s/he.wrote.it(Aor)
‘I am not convinced that s/he wrote this letter.’
(* ... *rom es çeril-i dauçeria* ‘... that this(Nom) letter-Nom (s)he.has.written.it(Perf)’)
- (56) *eçv-i makvs rom es çeril-i daçera*
doubt-Nom I.have.it that this(Nom) letter-Nom (s)he.wrote.it(Aor)
‘I doubt it that s/he wrote this letter.’
(* ... *rom es çeril-i dauçeria* ‘...that this(Nom) letter-Nom (s)he.has.written.it(Perf)’)

- (57) *damaviçqda, rom es çeril-i daçera* (* ... *rom es çeril-i dauçeria*)
I.forgot.it(Aor), that this(Nom) letter-Nom (s)he.wrote.it(Aor) (*...that this(Nom) letter-Nom s/he.has.written.it(Perf))
'I forgot that s/he wrote / had written this letter.'
- (58) *gavige, rom es çeril-i daçera*
I.understood.it(Aor), that this(Nom) letter-Nom (s)he.wrote.it(Aor)
'I have heard that s/he wrote this letter.'
gavige, rom es çeril-i dauçeria
I.understood.it(Aor), that this(Nom) letter-Nom s/he.has.written.it(Perf)
'I have heard that s/he wrote this letter' (in the sense of: 'Somebody told me').
- (59) *vici, rom es çeril-i daçera*
I.know.it, that this(Nom) letter-Nom s/he.wrote.it(Aor)
'I know that (s)he wrote (aorist) this letter.'
vici, rom es çeril-i dauçeria
I.know.it, that this(Nom) letter-Nom (s)he.has.written.it(Perf)
'I know that s/he wrote this letter.'
(in the sense of: 'I already know because somebody told me').⁴⁴

If we assume that assertion is a main clause privilege, embedded clauses as in (55)–(57) conform to this restriction (see 5.7). With possible truth, as in (55)–(56), the perfect is unacceptable (similarly after *šesaçlebelia* 'it is possible (that)',⁴⁵ etc.). Similarly, the presupposed complement clauses of factive verbs, as in (57), do not allow the perfect (similarly with *mçqenia* 'it offends, bothers me', *ucnauria* 'it is strange', etc.).⁴⁶ But these sentences contrast with others that do allow a contrast between evidential and non-evidential forms. Consider the evidential perfect forms in (41), (50)–(52) and (58)–(59): embedded evidentials seem to be possible where they are in consonance with, form a "harmonic combination" with, the semantics of their matrix clause: admiration in (41) ("I admire you for..."), hearsay in (50), (52) and (58)–(59), conclusion in (51).

5.9. Summary of the evidential types of meaning

a. The evidential perfect denotes one or the other kind of conclusion or "inference" from what the speaker or "recipient" (see 5.8) experienced him- or herself or what s/he heard from others.

b. The evidential perfect occurs in non-modal, main clause assertions (see 5.7) or in semantically "harmonic combinations" of matrix and embedded clauses (see 5.8).

c. Although "the source of a speaker's information can skew the relation between his/her conception of the truth of a situation and the strength of his/her assertion about that situation" (Willett 1988: 86), the Georgian perfect does not by itself denote a (low) degree of "confidence" or "strength of commitment of the speaker" (Palmer 1986: 64),⁴⁷ nor does the speaker (necessarily) deny responsibility for the statement.⁴⁸

d. The evidential perfect always has a specific relation to the present situation. The inference is based on evidence the speaker or the protagonist has (irrespective of the time when it came to his or her attention), and its result is current knowledge of something the speaker did not know before s/he drew the conclusion.

e. The evidential meaning is perfectly compatible, though rare (Kavtaraze 1956: 180), with 1st person subjects: not only with actions achieved in a state of drunkenness or the like,⁴⁹ but with each of the uses mentioned above (see [36]–[38]).

f. Perfect forms differ from the non-evidential forms mentioned in section 4. In contrast to the future forms, the evidential perfect does not express uncertainty by itself (see 5.8), although this modal meaning may be a concomitant phenomenon in some contexts: the interpreter of the snow in (27) can be quite sure that it snowed, the lady speaking of her illness in (31) is sure that it was rather long, the admirer in (40) has no doubt about his judgment, and the king's daughter in (52) can certainly rely on the news that her father bought a good apple.⁵⁰ Similarly, the hearsay meaning does not imply that the speaker has any particular teller of the event in mind. Hearsay is just one source of information from which the speaker may draw his conclusion, i.e. "the evidence on which it is based" is not "crucial in determining the choice of forms" (Friedman 1986: 185–186).

g. The particle *turme* is combinable with every type of evidential perfect. With its evidential meaning, *turme* comes close to the perfect, but it is different from it in that it may be combined with any tense (see [15]–[18]), and has no particular connection with the present. Take, for instance, the example interpreted by Kavtaraze (1956: 183):

- (60) a. *miça-ze balax-eb-ši maxe q̇opila dadgm-ul-i*
 earth-on grass-Pl-in snare(Nom) it.has.been(Perf) set-PP-Nom
 ‘On the earth in the grass a snare was set.’
 b. *miça-ze balax-eb-ši [...] maxe turme iq̇o dadgm-ul-i* (Iaḳ. Gogebašvili)
 earth-on grass-Pl-in [...] snare(Nom) apparently it.was(Aor) set-PP-Nom
 ‘On the earth in the grass apparently a snare was set.’

Most speakers of Georgian consider (60a) and (60b) to be completely synonymous. But there could be a difference. The evidential perfect variant a. says that the speaker or the “recipient” (see 5.8) comes to the conclusion now (or at the time of perception with embedded clauses in a broad sense) that this is what happened or what the case was. The particle version b. also characterizes a fact as gained by inference. But it is my impression that this version does not necessarily imply a present conclusion: that the snare was there may have become apparent at any time.⁵¹ However, I leave it to the native speakers to decide on the subtle difference between perfect and particle use (or their combination, for that matter).⁵²

Historically, *turme* is independent of the perfect, and it remains to be established if it predates clear cases of the evidential perfect.⁵³

h. Finally, in contrast with its non-evidential uses, the evidential uses of the perfect do not exclude definite temporal localization by time adverbials:⁵⁴

- (61) *gušin-çin možamagire-eb-is k̇reba q̇opila* (K. Lortkipanize apud Megrelišvili 1986: 143)
 yesterday-before workman-Pl-Gen gathering(Nom) it.has.been(Perf)
 ‘The day before yesterday, there was a meeting of the workmen, they say.’

5.10. Old Georgian

The question of when the “evidential” variants of the perfect arose in Georgian is controversial. In part this is because some authors take factual non-witnessedness as evidence for an evidential meaning. While e.g. Kavtaraze (1956: 183) denies any evidential use of the Old Georgian perfect, Ninua and Saržvelaze (1985) adduce many examples from the oldest texts which “express such actions where the speaker was not present.” An example is a passage from a 5th century text, Jacob of Tsurtaŕi’s “Martyrdom of Saint Shushanik”:

- (62) *šen čem-i xaḥ-i damqu da sagebel-sa čem-sa nacar-i gardaasx da šen-i adgil-i dagiḥvebies da sxu-ad çarsul-xar* (Šušaniḳis çameba IV)
 you my-Nom icon-Nom you.turned.it.down(Aor) and bed-Dat my-Dat ash-Nom
 you.strew.it(Aor) and your-Nom place-Nom you.have.left.it(Perf) and other-Adv
 go.off-PP-you.are(Perf)
 ‘You turned down my icon and strew ashes on my bed and you have left your place and have gone elsewhere.’

Now it is clear from the context that the speaker, Saint Shushanik, hasn’t “seen” her husband’s leaving, but has heard about it (Ninua and Saržvelaze 1985: 79). But this is an insufficient criterion because aorists are also used the same way.⁵⁵ Nothing prevents us from giving the perfect forms a resultative interpretation. In fact, apart from some examples with an “existential” present perfect meaning (cf. ad (73) below and Pxaḳaze 1984: 97, 100, 102) and a performative meaning (see (96)), this is the meaning that seems to account for Old Georgian perfect forms in general (Deeters 1930: 178; Pxaḳaze 1984: 37–77):

- (63) *me vitar micnobies, col-i šen-i gandgom-il-ars šen-gan* (Šušaniḳis çameba IV)
 I as I.have.got.to.know.it(Perf), wife-Nom your-Nom separate-PP-Nom-she.is(Perf)
 you-from
 ‘As I have got to know, your wife has separated from you.’

It is not at all clear to me when the first cases of evidential perfect forms are attested. It remains to be established if late medieval examples such as the following require a hearsay or admiring interpretation (Pxaḳaze 1984: 112; 115)—a problem connected with considerable problems of philological and linguistic methodology:

- (64) *au xia kalak-i da uxocia čem-i žar-i* (Moses of Khoni: *Amirandarežaniani*, 12th century)
he.has.taken.it(Perf) city-Nom and he.has.killed.it(Perf) my-Nom army-Nom
 ‘He has taken the city and killed my army [they say ?]’
 (65) *magram aset-is paḥron-is me q̇opilvar q̇mobil-i* (ib.)
 but such-Gen lord-Gen I I.have.been(Perf) vassal-Nom
 ‘But I am (perfect) the vassal of such a lord.’

For the time being, the hypothesis that the evidential meaning of the Georgian perfect developed or was reinforced under the influence of

Turkish-Georgian bilingualism is a real possibility, as far as we know.

In Modern Georgian, the resultative meaning is largely covered by analytic constructions: *daçer-il-i-a* 'write-PP-Nom-it.is' = 'it is/has been written', *daçeril-i makvs* 'written-Nom I.have.it' = 'I have written it' (Boeder, to appear). But 19th and 20th century Georgian still preserves resultative perfect forms with a meaning "between aorist and present":⁵⁶

(66) *es cxen-i švil-i-vit gamizrdia* (M. Šavaxišvili in Peikrišvili 1974: 64)
this(Nom) horse-Nom child-Nom-like I.have.brought.it.up(Perf)
'This horse I have brought up like a child.'

(67) *deda-čem-is saplav-tan mimicia m-is-tvis siqva* (B. Čxeiže in Peikrišvili 1974: 57)
mother-my-Gen tomb-at I.have.given.it(Perf) she-Gen-for word(Nom)
'At the tomb of my mother I have given her my word.'

However, the development of a non-resultative "past" meaning (Pxaḳaḳe 1984: 79–89) of the perfect and its relation to the meanings of the periphrastic forms remains to be clarified.

6. Non-evidential uses of the perfect

As in so many languages of the "Balkan-Pontic-Caspian area" (Friedman 1984: 145), there are several types of non-evidential use of the perfect. I will list them here without discussing them in detail. In the native grammatical tradition, the fundamental distinction between evidential and non-evidential uses is not drawn. An interesting question could be which of the following non-evidential types of meaning are found with Turkish *-miş*-forms, but I feel unable to deal with this problem.

The following three meanings (6.1–6.3) can all be subsumed under the so-called "existential" meaning known from the English present perfect (McCawley 1971). All varieties mean that something occurred at least once ("ever") or repeatedly or never during a relevant period of time leading up to the present ("so far", "yet"⁵⁷) or to some point in time specified in the context.

6.1. The "at least once" meaning

Many authors⁵⁸ mention a perfect of "repetition":⁵⁹

(68) *bevr-žer usagno-d, bevr-žer azr-it avelvebula* (I. Čavčavaḳe in Pxaḳaḳe 1984: 98)
many-time causeless-Adv, many-time reason-Instr he.has.been.worried(Perf)
'Often he was worried without reason, often for some reason.'

(69) *es ambav-i me gamigonia mama-čem-iz-gana da moxuc-i xalx-iz-gana* (I 79)
this(Nom) matter-Nom I I.have.understood.it father-my-Gen-from and old-Gen
people-Gen-from
'I have heard this from my father and from old people.'

(70) *çut-i sopel-i ese-a,—
xame dxe-s utenebia,
ra-c mṛoba-s daukcevia -
siqvarul-s ušenebia* (folk-song, possibly going back to I. Čavčavaḳe)
moment-Gen-world-Nom this(Nom)-it.is, -
night(Nom) day-Dat it.has.lighted.it.up(Perf)
what-Rel hostility-Dat it.has.destroyed.it(Perf)
love-Dat it.has.built.it.up(Perf)
'This is the world of fleeting life:
the day has lighted up the ~~day~~,
what hostility has destroyed
love has built it up.'

It night

The meaning is: "this has happened again and again", and, by a "gnomic" generalization of the past, "it happens as a rule". As the evidential perfect has a near-synonym particle + aorist equivalent (4.3), so the "iterative" perfect has a counterpart: aorist + *xolme* 'frequently, used to'.⁶⁰ Disregarding its textual specificity (see below 6.6), (69) is a near-equivalent of: *es ambavi me gavigone xolme mamačemizgana* 'I used to hear (aorist) this from my father'.⁶¹

This type of perfect is not at all restricted to "repeated action". The "at least once" meaning is obvious in:

(71) *tu ar vcdebi, me tkven sadxac minaxixar-t* (Droša 1970 apud Peikrišvili 1974: 54)
if not I.err(Pres), I you somewhere I.have.seen-you-PI(Perf)
'If I am not mistaken, I have seen you somewhere.'

Corr.

- (72) *tu vitqvi rom am-gvar-i krebul-i odesme čamoemula* (ZK)
if I.will.say.it(Fut) that this-kind-Nom collection-Nom ever it.has.been.edited(Perf)
'If I say that such a collection has appeared ever before.' CORR.
- (73) *odes qop-il-ars akamomde, tumca mama-ta da deda-ta ert-ad ečama pur-i ?*
(Jacob of Tsurtavi: *Šušaniķis čameba* VI)
ever be-PP-it.is(Perf) till.now, that man-PIObl and woman-PIObl one-Adv they.had.eat-
en.it(pluperfect) bread-Nom
'Whenever has it been the custom for men and women to dine together?'
(transl. D. M. Lang)

The Old Georgian example (73) shows that the “existential”, non-re-sultative perfect, in contrast to the evidential perfect (see 5.10), goes back to the time of the oldest literary tradition.

6.2. Yes-no-questions; temporal localization

With yes-no-questions, the perfect is “almost the norm” (Vogt 1971: 193):

- (74) *pariz-ši qopilxar ?*
Paris-in you.have.been(Perf) ?
'Have you (ever) been to Paris?'

The perfect is used “where there is no concrete time reference” (Pxaķaze 1984: 126). But the aorist is possible:

- (75) *pariz-ši iqavi ?*
Paris-in you.were(Aor) ?
'Were you in Paris?'

This form is used, for example, if I know that the addressee planned to go to Paris at a specific time.

In general, the lack of temporal localization is a well-known characteristic of the existential perfect, which distinguishes it from the evidential perfect (cp. 5.9h):

- (76) *šen kac-i ar mogiklavys, kac-isa-tvis ar mogiparavs [...] ra-c unda gekna, is ar giknia?*—*diax*, [...] *misvams da mičamia*, ar-c ert-i dxe mšier-i ar vqopilvar
(I. Čavčavaže apud Kavtaraže 1956: 188)

you man-Nom not you.have.killed.him, man-Gen-for not-too you.have.stolen.it [...] what(Nom)-Rel it.is.necessary you.had.done.it(pluperfect), that(Nom) not you.have.done.it.(Perf)?—yes, [...] I.have.drunk(Perf) and I.have.eaten(Perf), one-Nom day(Nom) hungry-Nom not I.have.been(Perf)
'Have you ever killed anybody, you have not robbed anybody [...] Have you not done what you were supposed to?—Yes, [...] I have always drunk and eaten, on no day have I been hungry.'⁶²

6.3. Negation

All grammars mention the use of the perfect with negatives:

- (77) *uķan dabruneb-ul-i ara-vin unaxavi* (Γ 21)
back return-PP-Nom no-one they.have.seen.him(Perf)
'Nobody has ever seen anybody who returned [from there].'
- (78) *[katam-i] čamoiqvana saxl-ši. saxl-ši misvl-isa-s katam-i ara-vine-s-tvis ar učvenebia, ise daamqvdia* (B1 76)
[hen-Nom] he.brought.it.with.him(Aor) house-in. house-in going.there-Gen-Dat
hen-Nom no-one-Gen-for not he showed it to him(Perf), so he.locked.it.up(Aor)
'He took the hen into his house. On going to his house, he didn't show it to any- body, he locked it up so.'
- (79) *kal-s zalian-i gauķvirda, magram ara-per-i ar utkvams* (B1 112)
woman-Dat very-Nom it.was.surprising.to.her(Aor), but no-thing-Nom not she has said it(Perf)
'The woman was very surprised, but she said nothing.'
- (80) *Kacia čabarbacda, magram ar dakceula* (D. Kldiašvili apud Pxaķaze 1984: 129)
Katsia he.reeled(Impf), but not he fell down(Perf)
'Katsia reeled, but did not fall down.'
- (81) *qvela-n-i vir-eb-at gadiknen, xelmcip-is meṭ-i imiṭom, rom ima-s ar učamia*
[sc. vašl-i], *radgan sxva-s umaspinzdeboda* (B1 82)
all-PI-Nom ass-PI-Adv they.became(Aor), king-Gen additional-Nom therefore, that that.one-Dat not he.has.eaten.it(Perf) [sc. apple-Nom], because other-Dat he.treat-ed.them(Impf)
'All became asses, except the king, for the reason that he had not eaten [an apple], because he treated the others [sc.with apples]'. CORR.

Grammars and native speakers unanimously say that the negated perfect contrasts with the negated aorist in that the latter denotes a refusal to do something, a “purposeful non-performance of the action” (Friedman 1988: 132):

- (82) *dedaber-ma utxra: aket nu mixval, torem cocxal-i ver dabrundebi-o !*
qmaçvil-ma ar daužera (BI 112)
 old.woman-Erg she.said.to.him: here.wards not.imperative you.will.go(Fut), otherwise
 living-Nom not.possible you.will.return-Quot ! young.man-Erg not he.be-
lieved.her(Aor)
 ‘The old woman told him: Don’t go this way, otherwise you will not be able to
 return alive! The young man did not believe her.’

- (83) *roto dro-ze ar mitxari ?* (BI 56)
 why time-on not you.told.it.to.me(Aor) ?
 ‘Why didn’t you tell me in time?’

Compare the following minimal pair a. vs b.:

- (84) a. *im xame-s ik darçnen, magram Irmisa-s ar daszinebia* (Γ 51)
 that(Obl) night-Dat there they.stayed(Aor), but Irmisa-Dat not he.has.fall-
en.asleep(Perf)
 ‘That night they stayed there, but Irmisa did not fall sleep.’
- b. *Irmisa-m im xame-s ar daižina* (Γ 52)
 Irmisa-Erg that(Obl) night-Dat not he.went.to.sleep(Aor)
 ‘Irmisa did not go to sleep that night [because a dragon was expected to
 come].’

However, this meaning is needs absent from non-volitive verb forms:

- (85) *saq̄varel-is-tvis vaxš(a)m-is mirtmeva surda magram katam-i ki ar dauřça,*
radganac švil-eb-ma šeçames (BI 78)
 lover-Gen-for supper-Gen offering(Nom) she.wanted.it but chicken-Nom however not
it.was.left.for.her(Aor), for child-Pl-Erg they.ate.it.up(Aor)
 ‘She wanted to offer her lover a supper, but there wasn’t left any chicken for
 her because her sons had eaten it.’
- (86) *saxamo-s rom deda dabruna da kališvil-eb-i saxl-ši ar daxvda, țiril-i morto*
 (BI 88)
 evening-Dat when mother(Nom) she.returned(Aor) and
 daughter-Pl-Nom house-in not she.met.them(Aor), weeping-Nom she.raised.it(Aor)
 ‘In the evening, when the mother returned and did not find her daughters at
 home, she began to weep.’

- (87) *zroxa-s rka ar amouvida da koçikoçi-s ezaxoden-o* (BI 2,5; a proverb)
 cow-Dat horn(Nom) not it.came.up.to.her(Aor) and little.calf-Dat
 they.called.her(Impf)-Quot
 ‘A cow did not get a horn, and they called her “little calf”.’

Taken as a whole, the opposition between negated aorist, as in (85)–(87), and negated perfect, as in (80), seems to be that the negated aorist is more “concrete” and “categorical”, as informants usually say.⁶³ It is more “concrete” in the sense that it is temporally located, while the negated perfect is temporally indefinite. The aorist is “categorical” in the sense that it does not leave undecided the possibility of occurrence (as with the “not yet” of the negative perfect). But the opposition between negated aorist and negated perfect probably has to be differentiated according to the volitional vs. non-volitional semantics of the verb.

With non-volitional verb forms, the opposition simply mirrors the semantics of non-negated forms. The negated aorists in (85)–(87) are unmarked. They mean that something was not the case at a specific time: in (85), the disappearing of the chicken meat is a “dynamic” event that occurred at a specific time, namely when the children ate it (which is a fact mentioned in the preceding context). Negation in general means defeated expectancy,⁶⁴ but the negated aorist in (86)–(87) specifically means that the participants expected it to happen at that time, but it did not:⁶⁵ the woman did not see her children who were supposed to be there; the horn did not come out as nature would make the observer expect. The corresponding perfect forms, on the other hand, would have either an evidential or an existential meaning. Depending on the respective context,

- (87) a. *rka ar amosula*
 horn(Nom) not it.has.come.up(Perf)

can mean either: ‘the horn apparently has not come forth’ or ‘the horn has not yet / never come forth’. The latter meaning is the “perfectum nondum facti” (Johanson, forthcoming), which simply states “that the possibility of occurrence is not excluded, but it has not occurred yet”⁶⁶ (Talaqvaže 1959: 169, note 1) during the relevant period of time.

With volitional verbs, the specific meaning of the negated aorist (“did not want to”) results from the fact that the participants and ob-

servers of the situation expected somebody to act in the specified way, and if he or she did not, it is natural to impute a refusal to act. The perfect, on the other hand, has two meanings again: *ar uçamia* (cf. [81]) can mean either: 's/he apparently has not eaten it' or simply: 's/he did not eat it'. With the latter meaning, the perfect of volitional verbs seems to be the unmarked member of the opposition between negated aorist and negated perfect. And while the "existential" perfect meaning of negated non-volitional verbs has a present-time reference ("not yet"), the relevant period of time with the perfect of volitional verbs can, but need not, lead up to the time of speaking: while it does so in (77),⁶⁷ it leads up to the moment of coming home in (78), to some moment in the past, for instance the end of wondering in (79), and to that of reeling in (80). In (81), the relevant period is probably the time between the king's treating the others with apples and a reference time in the past, namely the moment when the "witness" of the story saw that they became asses.

6.4. Compatibility of meanings

The factual features of the "existential perfect" described above, for instance its "iterative meaning", are compatible with evidentiality. Pxaḳaḳe (1984: 119) points out that "rarely, a form denoting "non-witnessed" can also denote repeated action":

- (88) *da šen ki ramden-žer-me šesulxar saxl-ši* (A. Qazbegi)
and you however some-time-Part you.have.entered(Perf) house-in
'But apparently you entered the house several times.'

This sentence allows the use of the evidential particle *turme* and of temporal localization (e.g. "yesterday"). Similarly, evidentiality (hearsay in (89) and inference in (90)) can be combined with negation:⁶⁸

- (89) *ver gauḳviat bina, ar ḳopila sakm-ian-i adgil-i* (I. Abašige Pxaḳaḳe 1984: 134)
not.possible they.have.divided.it(Perf) flat(Nom), not it.has.been(Perf) matter-hav-
ing-Nom place-Nom
'They could not divide the flat, there was no place of work.'

- (90) *tkven ḳac-eb-i axara ḳopilxart* (A. Qazbegi ib.)
you(Pl) man-Pl-Nom not.anymore you(Pl).have.been(Perf)
'You are no men anymore.'

And, as V. Friedman has pointed out to me, admirative usage, which refers to the unexpected discovery of a preexisting state, combines evidentiality and existentiality (see 5.2).

However, these cases do not necessarily mean that the evidential perfect and the existential perfect are combined in the sense that in some languages, for instance, perfectivity is hierarchically "superimposed" on imperfections (Comrie 1976: 32). The perfect in a sentence like (88) is evidential, not existential.

6.5. Meanings, variants and ambiguities

Note that some meanings of the English present perfect mentioned by McCawley (1971) are not rendered by perfect forms in Georgian: "hot news" (*Malcolm X has just been assassinated*) are in the aorist.⁶⁹ Also, a translation of English: *I've known Max since 1960* will be in the present (*vicnob* 'I know him'), as in German:

- (91) *amden-i xan-i-a ḳqidulob da ver miḳidnixar* (A. Čereteli apud Pxaḳaḳe 1984: 133)
so.much-Nom time-Nom-it.is I.buy.you(Pres) and not.possible I.have.bought.you(Perf)
'I have been buying you for a long time, and yet I have not been able to buy you'.

Finally, results as in: *I've caught the flu* are expressed by aorist forms (*gavcivdi* lit. 'I got cold').

The existential presupposition of the famous sentence: *Einstein has visited Princeton* (McCawley 1971: 106) is absent from both the aorist and perfect variants:

- (92) a. *Lenin-i Pāriz-ši iḳo*
Lenin-Nom Paris-in he.was(Aor)
'Lenin was in Paris (at that time).'
- b. *Lenin-i Pāriz-ši ḳopila*
Lenin-Nom Paris-in he.has.been(Perf)
'Lenin has been in Paris (at least once).'

Neither of these variants seems to imply that Lenin is still alive.

It should be noted that a sentence like (92b) is ambiguous: it either means that Lenin was in Paris at least once or that I come to the conclusion that he was (or is said to have been there). I have no ambiguity tests as they are used in lexical semantics to offer, and the important question of what “invariant meaning”, “chief contextual variant” and “other contextual variants” in the Jakobsonian sense are in the case of the Georgian perfect cannot be answered here (Friedman 1988: 121–122). But we may perhaps say that the existential and evidential readings are two different meanings, they are not just contextual possibilities of interpretation, as for example in (18)–(19), which means either ‘(I was told/I hear) you have built a new house’ or ‘(I was a guest in your house and saw your new house, so apparently) you built a new house’ (Keķelia and Davitiani 1973: 198). The evidential perfect is vague in this respect: “the source of the evidence itself is not in focus in an inferential assertion” (Willett 1988: 63; cf. 5.9a). In (92b), on the other hand, the choice between an “evidential” and an “existential” reading *is* relevant in a sense to be determined below.

6.6. Pragmatic properties

The existential uses of the perfect do not presuppose that the speaker “did not know before” (cp. 5.3; 5.9d). On the contrary, they denote something “that happened in the past, was so to speak forgotten, but under specific conditions can be called back to one’s memory” (Talakvaże 1959: 170).

What are these conditions? Although its embedding in coherent discourse remains to be analyzed, the Georgian “existential perfect” may safely be assumed to have a textual function specifying “the relevance of including a past event within the present”, as Leinonen (1996: 139) puts it. She points out that “A sentence with an existential perfect [...] should always be textually subordinate to some claim made about the topic at hand”, and she gives the following paraphrase: “There exists an event ‘X V-ed’ in the history, classifiable as evidence, instantiation or counterargument to the topic concerning the present situation.” (ib. 142), which is the “stage-setting function” of the perfect (ib. 147). In-

deed, in example (70), the perfect forms “instantiate” the “present situation” expressed in the first line, and they illustrate the repeatability that is typical of facts expressed by the existential perfect.⁷⁰ Similarly, negative sentences as in (76) are statements that there does not exist, in the speaker’s experience, “such a thing” (Leinonen 1982: 262): they are “counter examples”, and expected facts in general (see 5.3 and 6.3, and the notes 34 and 63) may well play the role of “topics concerning the present situation”.

As noted at the beginning of section 5, the existential meaning seems to be less salient for native speakers. Its difference from the aorist meaning is probably more subtle than the evidential meanings.

7. Additional meanings of the perfect related to the present

7.1. Performative meaning⁷¹

This seems to be the only case where the Modern Georgian perfect has a “present meaning”:⁷² On a season’s greetings card you may write either (93) or (94):

(93) *gilocavt axal čel-s*
I.bless(Pres).it.to.you(Pl) new year-Dat
‘A happy New Year !’

(94) *momilocavs axali čeli*
I.have.blessed(Perf).it new-Nom year-Nom
‘A happy New Year !’

(95) *es čem-i samepo šen-tvis mičukebia-o* (Bl 70)
this(Nom) my-Nom kingdom(Nom) you-for I.have.made.a.present(Perf)-Quot
‘[The king says, dying after single combat:] ‘I hereby give you my kingdom, he said.’

This is the “fait-accompli” meaning, to use a term coined by Spitzer (1928) in a somewhat different context:⁷³ by uttering a proposition which anticipates its becoming true, the speaker makes it become true. This idiomatic use has parallels in Azerbaijani and Turkish (Friedman

1979: 342), but notice that this use is already attested for Old Georgian:

- (96) *zma-ta šen-ta dxe-sa šina ert-sa ra-j mkon. mimicemia.* (Giorgi Merčule: *The Life of Grigol of Khandzta* 47,2–3, ed. N. Marr; 10th cent.)
 brother-PIObl your-PIObl day-Dat in one-Dat what-Nom they.will.harvest.it(Opt=Fut).
 I.have.given.it(Perf).
 '[Prince Abulsad gives the following promise:] What your brethren will harvest within a day, I hereby give them.'

7.2. Wishes

The perfect is also used as a kind of optative in wishes, curses and the like.⁷⁴ Again, the event in the perfect is considered to be already true if the condition is met. These instances occur mostly in the context of conditionals, as in (94)–(95):

- (97) *kud-i ar gyxuria, tu ver šegananebt-o* (Akaqi Čereteli apud Peikrišvili 1974: 59) **Corr.**
 hat-Nom not it.has.been.put.on.us.as.a.cover(Perf), if not.possible we.will.make.you.regret.it(Fut)
 'We shall have no hat on (= we shall not be men), if we cannot make you pay for it'.
- (98) *ušeno-d ert dxe-sa-c nu micocxlia* (B. Čxeiže apud Peikrišvili 1974: 59)
 without.you-Adv one day-Dat-even imperative.not I.have.lived(Perf)
 'May I not live even one day without you.'
- (99) *ui, damidga tval-eb-i, ama-s sicxe akvs! axla amšenebia-ožax-i* (T. Raziškašvili apud Peikrišvili 1974: 56) **Corr.**
 oh.dear, they.stood.still(Aor) eye-Pl-Nom, this-Dat heat(Nom) he.has.it(Pres)! now
I.have.built.it.up(Perf)-Quot family-Nom
 'Oh dear me, may I lose my sight [= a curse], this one has fever! Now my family will be happy (ironical) !'
- (100) *aba gvinaclirnia dxes !—tkva Papuna-m* (A. Beliašvili apud Peikrišvili 1974: 59)
 now! we.have.hunted(Perf) today !—he.said.it(Aor) Papuna-Erg
 'Now, let us hunt today !—said Papuna.'

The meaning of (100) is: as the necessary conditions are met or are favourable, it is already decided that we will go hunting.

Besides the "fait-accompli" meaning, the optative reading could be connected with the archaic optative use of the aorist (Vogt 1971: 197), as in the first clause of (99). It is traditionally explained by the loss of the optative particle *-mca*,⁷⁵ which may be used explicitly (Pxačaze 1984: 133):

- (101) *ara-mc gamobrunebulxar!* (L. Gotua)
 not-Particle you.have.returned(Perf)
 'May you not return!' (a toast addressing a deceased person)

7.3. Conditionals

The perfect is often used in negative conditionals:

- (102) *kac-i ar vqopilvar, tu gazapxul-ze škola ar gykonია* (B. Čxeiže apud Peikrišvili 1974: 59)
 man-Nom not I.have.been(Perf), if spring-on school(Nom) not we.have.had.it(Perf)
 'I shall not be a man, if we have no school in spring.'

but also in positive conditional clauses, which parallels the normal use of the aorist in the protasis:

- (103) *tu ert-i luḡma gagišvia, kiser-s mogčrit-o* (Meskhian apud Peikrišvili 1988: 55) **Corr.**
 if one-Nom morsel(Nom) you.have.let.it.drop(Perf), neck-Dat
 we.will.cut.it.(to)you-Quot
 'If you let drop one single morsel, we will cut your neck, they said.'

8. Evidentials in the dialects and in genetically related languages

The system described above is essentially that of Modern Literary Georgian. Laz, Mingrelian and Svan and their Georgian neighbour dialects in Western Georgia and some adjacent central dialects have developed a richer system which provides special evidential verb forms as counterparts not only for the non-evidential aorist but also for the present, imperfect, and future.⁷⁶ Another possibility is to extend the use of the perfect to cases where the present, the imperfect etc. are used

in Standard Georgian, as, for example, in a sub-dialect of Kartlian described by Kaxaḡe (1979):

- (104) *vašl-i mihkonebiat, Ruset-ši midian*
 apple-Nom they.have transported.it(Perf). Russia-in they.go(Pres)
 'Apparently, they transport (perfect ~ present) apples, they go to Russia.'
- (105) *ra gvian ḡasulxar*
 what late you.have gone.off(Perf)
 'How late you go (admirative perfect ~ present) [to the office] !'
- (106) *čven venax-ši ubariat*
 our vineyard-in they.have spaded(Perf)
 'They used to dig (hearsay perfect ~ imperfect) in our vineyard, they say.' *კორ.*

These formations follow a pattern known from other languages: evidential forms refer first of all to the past. In some languages, the marking of evidentiality is optional with non-past tenses (Kozinceva 1994: 100), in others it is secondary from a historical point of view.

9. A tentative hypothesis

For the rest of this paper, I will venture a tentative explanation of how the evidential meanings of the Georgian perfect relate to the resultative meaning that we know from Old Georgian (5.10).

Let me start with Comrie's (1976: 110) observation on perfects and evidentials. He says that "the semantic similarity [...] between perfect and inferential lies in the fact that both categories present an event not in itself, but via its results, and it is this similarity that finds formal expression in languages like Georgian, Bulgarian, and Estonian". I would like to specify the relation between these two types of result, namely between "postterminality" and "indirectivity" (Johanson 1996: 86), by pointing out that results imply a causal relation and that causality occurs in two variants: one external and one internal. Compare the type of examples described by Rutherford (1970) and others:

- (107) He's not coming to class because he's sick
 (external causality: X is the case because Y)

He's not coming to class, because he just called from San Diego
 (internal causality: I say X because Y)
 Mary isn't here because she has to work in her office (external causality)
 Mary isn't here because I don't see her (internal causality)

The point is that internal causality gives the reason for my saying something or, to be more precise, for my judgment (Keller 1993: 242). In other words, the clause of reason has an epistemic meaning ("The fact that Y causes me to think that X"). By contrast, the old resultative perfect simply expressed the fact that a present, unspecified state X is due to a past event Y:

- (108) X because Y

For example, "you have left your place" (see (62)) means: "your place [is empty because] you left it". These resultatives refer to a kind of conditional relation: "X because Y" is warranted because of a rule: "if A then B". If the use of resultatives is extended to an internal meaning, the kind of justification is very different:

- (109) I think X because there is evidence Y for X

which is not justified by a simple rule of the type: "if A, then B". Rather, all sorts of justification come into play. In other words, there are many different "indirect types of evidence" (Willett 1988: 57) which make (109) a valid argument. It is true that the rule: "if A, then B" is still a good reason for thinking (109): saying that you have left your place is well justified by pointing out that I see that you are not here. In fact, it seems that every assertion of the type (108) can be substituted for by an assertion of the type (109) with an epistemic clause of reason (Keller 1993: 245). But saying that you have left your place (= X in [109]) may also be justified by the fact that somebody else told me (= Y in [109]), which is the hearsay use of the perfect. And there are other reasons: saying that the illness has been painful (see (31)) may be justified on reflection, summarizing the details of the course of the past events from which I derive my conclusion; saying that old age is bad (see (33)) may be justified on reflection, again summarizing the details of past events; and saying that you are fantastic (see (40)) may

be justified because there was unexpected evidence for it. All these are the meanings of the Georgian evidential perfect, which are based on different “sources of evidence” like inference, hearsay etc. Note, however, that Y is left unspecified (see 6.5), as is X in (108). In a similar vein, one may speculate whether an analogous description could be given for the “existential” meaning of the perfect. Leinonen’s paraphrase (see 6.6) can perhaps be assimilated to (109): “I say X, because X is evidence for Y”, where Y is “the topic concerning the present situation”.

I do not claim that the formula in (109) is the whole story, but I think that it is an abstract representation of part of its meaning. Among other things, the performative formula (109) accounts for the fact that evidentials are restricted to assertions (see 5.7–8),⁷⁷ and for the present time meaning of the perfect (“there is evidence”) (see 5.9d).—Now if this is correct, the change from (108) to (109) is the historical change from a purely resultative Old Georgian perfect to one of the uses of the Modern Georgian perfect, namely its evidential use. The change from (108) to (109) would then be another example of what Traugott (1988: 409) has described as a general tendency of semantic change, namely the change from external relations to internal, speaker-dependent relations, from external causality to internal causality in this case. In the languages that I know, causal relators can always be used in both senses. This may explain the relative ease with which the new, evidential meaning of the Georgian perfect could arise—regardless of whether language contact contributed to the development of this meaning or not.

Notes

1. I owe many thanks to the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul for inviting me to participate in its stimulating conference on evidentials, and I am very grateful for the kind encouragement of L. Johanson, É. Csató and Chr. Schroeder to work on a topic from which I had kept away before. I wish to express my gratitude to Rezo Kiknadze (Lübeck/Tbilisi) for his generous and patient assistance as a native speaker consultant. He should not, however, be held responsible for any misinterpretation.—I am also indebted to Guram Topuria (Georgian Academy of Sciences, Tbilisi), Johannes Heinecke (Humboldt University, Berlin), Michael Job (University of Marburg), Bernard Outtier (University of Geneva),

Florian Panitz (University of Oldenburg), Christoph Schroeder (University of Essen) and Victor Friedman (University of Chicago) for many clarifications and valuable suggestions; and to Robert McLaughlin (University of Oldenburg) for correcting the English of an earlier version of this paper.

2. Šaniže (1941 [1981: 423, footnote 1]); (1973: § 261, note 2).
3. Vogt (1945).
4. Kozinceva (1995: 299).—For Šilakaže (1971: 46–47 § 64), the meanings of the East Armenian perfect “correspond almost exactly to those of the Georgian perfect, except that the Armenian perfect has a wider range of use.” The East Armenian perfect seems to cover both the Georgian perfect and its analytic resultative forms (“to be” / “to have” + PP). Vogt (1945: 217–218) denies that the Modern Armenian perfect has an evidential meaning: “C’est curieux que le parfait de l’arménien moderne n’ait rien du sens particulier du parfait géorgien, lorsque cette nuance de sens se retrouve exactement dans les formes turques en *-miş*.”
5. Earlier contacts with different Turkic tribes that invaded Georgia in medieval times, or the 40,000 Qipchak Turkic warriors who settled in Georgia with their families under the reign of David II (1089–1125), are neglected here because their linguistic impact is even more difficult to assess. For a historical survey of Turkic in the Caucasus see Gadžieva (1979).
6. Their strongly Turkicized dialect has been well described by Grigol Imnaišvili and by Venera Žangize (1978), among others.
7. Vogt (1934: 249); Šaniže (1941 [1981: 423], 1973: § 261, footnote 2).
8. See Willett (1988: 64).
9. It is a “purely functional category” (Pxağaže 1984: 109).
10. See, for example, Vogt (1971: 163–172); Deeters (1931: 166–177) for Old and Modern Georgian, Svan, Mingrelian and Laz.
11. See Nataže (1955), Arabuli (1984), Harris (1985 (chapter 13)).
12. According to Šaniže (1941 [1981: 423–424]), the pluperfect can have an evidential meaning, for example in: *monadire gadačva kldzed da ise dainaxa žixvi, romelsac varžiši mosčqenoda, gasuliqo kldis napirad, amoedo sami pexi kveš, meotxe ki pirdapir gačšvira da ise dačoliliqo* (A. Qazbegi) ‘The hunter lay down leaning over the rock, and so could see the ibex that had become weary of its exercise, had gone to the edge of a rock, had put three legs under it, but had stretched out the fourth and had thus laid down.’ Šaniže argues that the hunter had not seen all these actions of the ibex and that the (underlined) pluperfect forms denote a conclusion about unwitnessed events. While this is factually correct in this context, it does not prove that the pluperfect as such has this meaning.—In his later writings, Šaniže seems to have dropped this interpretation.
13. In Abkhaz, this type of future seems to have developed into an evidential (Hewitt 1979).
14. Russian *okazyvaetsja*.—*tu-r-me* (older form *tu-re*; Kavtaraže 1956: 179–180) contains the particles *-re* ‘somewhat, a little’ and *-me* ‘indefinite particle’ (cf. *vin*

- 'who' : *vin-me* 'somebody'; *rogor* 'how' : *rogor-me* 'somehow') and *tu* 'if, probably, German *wohl*'). The Eastern Georgian Mountain dialects use *tu* in the sense of *turme* (Arabuli 1980: 153): *samn mtxovaran tu ariana' sxen riqēši* 'There were ("are", praesens historicum) three beggars, it is said, and they sat ("sit") on a stony riverside'.—On an early gloss of *turme* see note 23.
15. Šaniže (1973: § 281); Peikrišvili (1988: 56).
 16. Vogt (1971: 195).—Kavtaraze (1956: 182) is rather cautious with respect to non-occurrence ("titkimi arc ixmareba"), but gives no counter-example.
 17. For example: *čamodis qopil* 'apparently, s/he comes (present) here' = *kālir imiš*; *akawroba begebs da xanebs učerīa qopila* 'apparently, the begs and the khans have the people here under control' = *buralary bejlar vā xanlar tuturlar imiš*.
 18. with *-m* as in *tur-me*? (See footnote 13.) If so, *qopila-m* has a close parallel in the Komi Zyryän evidential particle *völöm-kö*, which is the perfect ("second past") form of "to be" plus (interrogative >) indefinite particle (M. Leinonen, this volume).
 19. *qopil* and *ikneb* remotely resemble *do-ren* 'Prev(?)-it.is' in the Laz dialects of Viçe and Arhavi which is suffixed to finite verb forms: *b-zum-um-ṭi-doren* 'IS-measure(verb)-Impf-doren' (= 'I apparently measured it') (Čikobava 1936: 141; Arabuli 1980: 151). Today, Laz is surrounded by Turkish and has quite a few grammatical formations due to bilingualism. (See for instance Žikia 1967, Brendemoen 1996.) However, B. Brendemoen (April 23rd, 1998) pointed out to me that the archaic Turkish Black Sea dialects around Trabzon lack the evidential use of *-miş* in the literary language. On the other hand, Laz formerly had Armenian and Greek neighbours, and it would be interesting to know if their dialects had similar evidential forms.
 20. Arabuli (1980: 151) thinks that Chechen-Ingush does not offer a good model for *qopila*. But in his source, D. Imnaišvili's analysis of Nakh (Chechen, Ingush, Bats) evidential perfect forms (1954), one possible model is omitted: the past participle *χANNƏ* 'been' of *χALAR* 'to be, stay'. Brillanta Buraževa (Akmola/Kazakhstan), whose ancestors came from a village not too far from Žuta, (although separated from it by a mountain ridge), provided me with the following examples: *a:ra v-eammə χANN-u:* 'on vyxodil/vyšel, okazyvaetsja' (where *a:ra* is 'out', *v-* class prefix for males, *eammə* the converb form of 'to go', *χANN-* 'been', *-u < -v-a* class marker + copula); *sa vošə-z ja leattə eaxə χANNə-d* 'my brother-İrg this field ploughed been-inanimate.class.marker[of the dropped copula]' ('apparently, my brother has ploughed the field'). Notice that *χANN-u/χANN-d* differs from *qopilam* as Azerbaijani *imiš* differs from Ingilo *qopil*: it bears the inflection marker (the copula). However, I must leave this question to the specialists of the Nakh languages. (One of them, J. Heinecke, kindly provided me with the transcription of Ingush as proposed by J. Nichols. It does not necessarily reproduce my informant's phonological system.)
 21. The Armenian particle *ezer* has developed from the inferential participle of "to be" (Donabédian 1996: 95)—and the basis of the perfect form *qopila* is *qopil-*, which is the past participle of "to be". Like *qopil* and *turme*, *ezer* is used with all tenses, the perfect included. See Donabédian (1996: 95–97) for an analysis of the subtle meanings of *ezer*.
 22. "Podobno tadžikskomu perfektu tatskij perfekt možet takže upotrebljat'sja v predložnijax, predstavljajuščix soboj logičeskoe zaključenie, vyvod iz kakix-libo sdelannyx govorjaščim nabljudenij, a takže esli vyskazyvanie v celom javljaetsja predačej s čužix slov. Pri ètom v pervom iz ukazannyx slučaeč často, a vo vtorom—kak pravilo posle perfekta stavitsja modal'naja častica miš" (Grjunberg 1963: 88). Friedman (this volume and 1994) shows that an Aromunian dialect of Macedonia has borrowed the 3rd singular Albanian admirative marker *-ka* in exactly the same way.
 23. See Johanson (1996: 92–93) for a discussion of Bulgarian *bil* and its parallels in Kiptchak, Latvian etc. For the Uzbek particles *emiš* and *ekan* (both derived from copula forms), see Nasilov (1983). Tajik *budaast*, which is again the 3rd singular perfect form of "to be", seems to have similar functions (Friedman 1979: 343), and resembles Turkish and Azerbaijani *imiš* in its quotative function (Friedman 1979: 344). Similar forms seem to occur in Yukaghir, a Siberian language ("verb suffix *-lel*, derived from the existential verb *le-*"; Willett 1988: 78), Finno-Ugric Chermis (*ul-maš* verbal noun of *ul-* 'to be'; Perrot 1996: 160) and American Indian languages (Willett 1988: 82).
 24. See e.g. Šaniže (1973: §§ 261, 281).—The earliest paraphrase of evidential meaning I know of is found in the lexicon of prince Teimuraz Bagrašioni (1782–1846) under the entry *turme* (see 4.3): *es leksi danišvneli aris, odes sakmej rajme ara vučqodet da šemdgomad ra vscnobl mas, mašin vičqvit, turme es sakme ase qopila da čven ara vučqodito* (Teimuraz 1979: 63) 'This word is a designation when we did not know something, and afterwards when we consider it, then we will say: "Apparently (*turme*) this must have been (perfect!) so, and we did not know".'
 25. Vogt (1934: 248).
 26. See e.g. Schuchardt (1895: 37).—The "witnessed" vs. "non-witnessed" terminology in recent articles seems to go back to the native (Persian-)Turkish *māzi i naqli* 'preterite of tradition' for the *-miş*-forms and *māzi i šuhūdi* 'preterite of witness' for the *-di*-forms (Grünenthal 1936: 134).
 27. See Grünenthal (1936: 138), Lohmann (1937: 42; 43 footnote 1). Pāṇini (Renou 1947: 131) uses this term to describe the meaning of the Old Indian perfect; notice that the commentaries (in square brackets below) mention negation and question as additional contexts of the perfect ((c), (e); cp. 6.2–3), and that there are "synonymous" particles comparable to *turme* ((d), cp. 4.3) and to the iterative use ((d)śāśvat, cp. 6.1): a) Pāṇini III 2,115 *parokṣe* "Les désinences du "lit" (= parfait) (valent quand il s'agit d'un passé qui n'est pas d'aujourd'hui, pour exprimer quelque chose situé) hors la vue (du sujet parlant). [*jaḡāma* 'il est allé

- (avant aujourd'hui, et je n'en ai pas été témoin'). b) [La Ire personne ne sera en usage que si le sujet relate une action qu'il a faite durant le sommeil ou l'ivresse.] c) [Värttika: le "li" vaut aussi quand il y a dénégation absolue: *nāham kapitthim jagāma* 'non, je ne suis point allé à K.')] d) III 2,116 [le parfait et l'imparfait valent ... pour exprimer quelque chose situé hors la vue, s'il y a (pour mots complémentaires les particules) *ha* et *śaśvat* [*iti hākarot / cakāra* 'voilà ce qu'il a fait' (*ha* 'of course, to be sure (expressing the author's agreement with a view)'; *śaśvat* 'perpetually, always; it is true, certainly' (A. A. Macdonell)).] e) III 2,117 [le parfait et l'imparfait valent ...] aussi pour désigner une période proche, dans une interrogation."
28. Note, however, that in his grammar (1906), Mose Žanašvili used the term "iterative preterite" ("namqo mravalgzisi", after Pxaqaze 1984: 8), thus highlighting one non-evidential use of the perfect (see 6.1), while the 18th century grammarians seem to underline its Old Georgian resultative meaning (see 5.9). For example, the Georgian patriarch Anṭon I writes: "this tense is called "more (?) complete preterite" (*namqo usrulesi*) because a verb with these endings denotes not only the completed and delimited action and suffering of an agent or patient, but also the past time elapsed after its completion" (Babunašvili 1970: 141). Anṭon's term could be a translation of "plus quam perfectum" (*hypersyntélikos*, the "long ago (*pálai*) past" of ancient Greek grammar). The Italian missionaries, whose Georgian grammars seem to have influenced Anṭon's grammatical concepts and who probably did not fully understand the meaning of the Georgian perfect, called it "secondo perfetto" or "più che perfetto", in contrast to "perfetto" = "aorist". See Babunašvili and Uturgaize (1991: 37–41).
29. "interprétation, une glose de l'énonciateur" (Donabédian 1996: 92).
30. Meṭreveli (1969; see also Kavtaraze 1956: 191) rightly points out this unmarked character of the aorist—in spite of Šaniže's term *naxavi* 'seen' to denote the "category" of non-perfect (present and aorist series; see 3.): "witnessed" (or "confirmative", Howard Aronson in Friedman 1988: 121) is not a category of Georgian grammar ("Kartulši ar dgindeba", Meṭreveli 1969: 65) and the aorist occurs in contexts of both "witnessedness" and "non-witnessedness" (thus also Šaniže 1973 § 261, footnote 1).—For similar observations on Macedonian and Bulgarian see Friedman (1986: 171–172; 1988: 122–123).
31. Friedman (1988: 133; 135; 137, footnote 9). For a different distribution of markedness in the Balkans, see Friedman (1986: 173; 1988: 125).
32. I owe this interpretation to Victor Friedman.
33. See Friedman (1979: 341), (1988: 133); Job (1994: 47) for parallels in the languages stretching from the Balkans to Tajikistan.—M. Job has helped me to clarify the admirative use.
34. See Friedman (1988: 127) on Bulgarian and Macedonian.
35. Cp. Nasilov's observation on Uzbek: "Esli v rezul'tate analiza dannyx govorjaščij ustoverjaetsja v nesomennosti soobščаемого fakta, to voznikaet ottenok neožidannosti ili udivlenija" (1983: 180). Donabédian (1996: 93) points out that "admiration ou surprise" does not exclude inference. Indeed, I have the impression that "admirative" perfects always contain an inference from what the speaker has witnessed in the (immediate ?) past.
36. "refers to a state whose veracity the speaker would have been unwilling to confirm before the moment of discovery" (Friedman 1988: 127, 133).
37. For Turkish, Aksu-Koç and Slobin (1986: 162) call this "metaphorical" or "feigned surprise" and cite Kononov (1956: 232): "an ironical attitude toward the carrying out of an action ("Ah, so you think we went!")."
38. Donabédian (1996: 93) speaks of "vérité consensuelle" connected with an "effacement de la subjectivité".
39. Friedman's (1988: 132) restriction that "Georgian shows a marked difference from all the other languages in that it does not use the perfect in connected narratives" or "extended narratives (e.g. tales [...])" (Friedman 1988: 133) is too strong. (For the distribution of narrative perfect forms see Friedman 1979: 341.)—On the other hand, it is true that Georgian never uses the perfect in the idiomatic opening of fairy-tales (Friedman 1988: 132): *iqo da ara iqo ra* 'it was and no(t) it was something' = 'it was and was nothing' ~ 'once upon a time'. For discontinuous *ara ... ra* 'nothing' see also example (5) and Šaniže 1973 § 142).
40. Johanson (1996: 88) extends the concept of "plot-advancing" to evidential forms: "In narratives, accounting for unwitnessed past events, they [sc. event-oriented indirectives] may serve as propulsive ("plot-advancing") units of the discourse basis." See also Johanson (2000).
41. Cp. the incompatibility of *turme* with non-indicative moods in 4.3.—On the "mood" interpretation see also Friedman (1986: 169); (1988: 137 footnote 3).—According to Vogt (1934: 249), a modal ("conjunctive") meaning is assigned to the perfect by unsophisticated Georgians: "Ein Georgier ohne besondere grammatische Kenntnisse wird bei der Erklärung der Bedeutung dieses Perfekts oft sagen, es sei ein *Konjunktiv*. Aus dieser Färbung erklärt sich auch der häufige Gebrauch dieser Formen in negativen und fragenden Sätzen."
42. In his semantic analysis of the Archi (East Caucasian) evidential, Kibrik (1977: 230) observes: "V rjade slučae v govorjaščij učastvuet v situacii, sodержanie kotoroj neizvestno slučajuščemu. V etix slučajax takže vozmožna kategorija zaglaznosti. [...] "Ja tebja nenavižu" [...] Slučajuščij ne znaet, čto govorjaščij ee nenavidit: zaglaznost' podčerkivaet noviznu soobščeniya dlja slučajuščego." As far as I can see, this use is not possible in Georgian non-embedded clauses (or outside free indirect speech).
43. See Friedman (1979: 345).
44. I owe these judgments on grammaticality to Rezo Kiknaže, who is somewhat hesitant about the idiomaticity of expressions like *darčmunebuli ... var* in (55) and *ečvi makvs* in (56), which are probably calques. According to Friedman (1979: 345), clauses such as (55) "normally require the perfect", while "native

- speakers will accept aorists in subordination to clauses of doubt". Friedman is silent on the ungrammaticality of the perfect in (56), and his informants think that clauses such as (59) "require the aorist".
45. The appropriate form after "it is possible" is the pluperfect with subjunctive function: ... *rom es çerili daeçera*
 46. For the distribution of the evidential with different modes of truth see Givón (1982); Kozinceva (1994: 98).
 47. In this sense it would be less appropriate to speak of "the speaker's attitude toward the reliability of the truth-value of the information" (Friedman 1986: 185) or even of "subjective evaluation" (Friedman 1988: 137, footnote 3).
 48. Which is what Friedman (1988: 128) found in Macedonian and Bulgarian. See also B. Comrie's introduction to this volume.
 49. This is the use allowed by the Indian grammarian Patañjali for Sanskrit (Grünenthal 1936: 138; 134 and footnote 6). See note 26, b).
 50. See Donabédian (1996: 91) for this point in Armenian.
 51. This is what Kavtaraze (1956: 183) seems to imply. He rightly insists that the perfect refers to a *present* result. According to him, however, the *turme* + aorist variant sometimes means that the speaker was present at the event as a "passive observer", but didn't notice the relevant fact at that time and later came to the conclusion expressed by the verb; whereas the perfect means that the speaker was not present but drew his conclusion later on on the basis of a result.
 52. Donabédian (1996: 97; 106) thinks that the Armenian counterpart particle has a "valeur emblématique" and refers "à un autre garant", while the perfect is characterized by "effacement du garant". I do not see this difference in the case of Georgian *turme* vs. perfect. However, I wonder if, for example, Donabédian's "admirative" examples with Armenian *eçer* ~ Georgian *turme* refer to any other "garant" than the speaker him or herself (or the "recipient", see 5.7).
 53. It occurs in Šota Rustaveli's epos "The Man in the Panther Skin" (around 1200): *vera hpoveb, dağıžereb, iqo ture ućinari* (132,3 in Kavtaraze 1956: 179) '[For three years try to find the knight who was reported to have been seen in the wilderness.] If you cannot find him, I believe you that he must have been a vision' (lit. 'not.possible you.find.him, I.believe.you, he.was(Aor) apparently invisible').
 54. See Johanson (2000), Vogt (1934: 248; cp. 1971: 191) obscures this difference by incorrectly establishing a link between non-localization and evidential (instead of non-evidential) use: "Das Perfekt drückt aus, daß die Verbalhandlung stattgefunden hat, ohne daß man den genauen Zeitpunkt berücksichtigt, sei es weil man nicht bestimmt weiß, ob die Handlung wirklich stattgefunden hat, sei es daß man es nur vom Hörensagen kennt." Surprisingly, Megrelišvili (1986: 143) posits a "seme" "non-localization" for the evidential use of the perfect.
 55. Metreveli (1969); see footnote 29.—For a similar problem with the pluperfect, see note 11.
 56. Kavtaraze (1956: 188); Peikrišvili (1974: 57).
 57. See Johanson (2000) and footnote 65.
 58. For example Kavtaraze (1956: 190); Pxaķaze (1984: 94–107; 132).
 59. Pxaķaze (1984: 106–131) adds "continuation, durativity", but her examples are not convincing: *mama-ćem-i ar ğopila saldat-i da babua-ćem-i* (N. Lortkipanize) father-my-Nom not he.has.been(Perf) soldier-Nom and grandfather-my-Nom 'my father and my grandfather never have been soldiers'.
 60. See Pxaķaze (1984: 98).
 61. The "iterative" perfect form is perhaps attested in Rustaveli (410/412,3 apud Pxaķaze 1984: 103): *me tu zepir micinia, kve-kve mitkvams idumal va* I if on.face I.have.laughed(Perf), below-below I.have.said.it(Perf) secretly alas 'when I laughed on my face, deep under it I secretly said: "alas!".—Old Georgian had a specific iterative verb form ("Permansiv", "Perpetualis", Georgian "xolmeobiti").
 62. Cp. (44): 'The girl did not come to me after that' = 'She never came to me'.
 63. Kavtaraze (1956: 191). Šaniže (1973: § 281) suggests a semantic connection between negation and evidential: "one cannot see an action that has not occurred, been performed. We say this only on the basis of results or hearsay and this is the reason why the simple negation of an action is usually expressed by this tense form." However, a sentence such as (69) has no evidential meaning in itself.
 64. Cp. Heidolph's observation (1970: 99, 100) that negated sentences, like generic sentences, "entsprechen nicht der Verarbeitung von Beobachtungen und der Aufnahme neuer Erkenntnisse. Sie entsprechen vielmehr Operationen auf bereits vorhandenen Kenntnissen."—"Die negierten Sätze blockieren Prädikationen aus Bekanntem. Die Folge einer solchen Blockierung können zum Beispiel Teilrevisionen im Kenntnisstand oder Überprüfung von Beobachtungen sein."—For a detailed analysis of discourse presuppositions in negative clauses see Leinonen (1982: 254–269).
 65. Kavtaraze (1956: 191).
 66. Friedman (1979: 348, footnote 10) rightly compares the meaning of the negative aorist vs perfect with "the feeling in the English *I didn't do it* and *I haven't done it (yet)*."
 67. Pxaķaze (1984: 130) stresses this current relevance meaning. She says that the negative perfect forms "have the function of a present and render the result of the action, because the negated action denoted by the perfect is relevant (akťualuri) just at the moment of speaking." But "current relevance" and "present" are quite different things. Some of Pxaķaze's examples indeed have a kind of present time reference (for example: *šen-tan salaparakod ki ar movsulvar* (D. Ķldiašvili) you-near in.order.to.speak however not I.have.come(Perf) 'it is not you with whom I have come to speak'), but the scope of negation cannot be discussed here. Rezo Ķiķnaže points out to me that the following examples with *ver* 'not (possible)', *veġar* 'not (possible) any longer' have present-time reference,

- too: *ena ſeiſleba problemaſur-i aſmočndes maſina-c, roca emigrant-s is ve var gamouqenebia* language(Nom) it.is.possible(Pres) problematic-Nom that.it.should.turn.out(Opt) then-too, when emigrant-Dat it(Nom) not.any.longer he.has.used.it (Perf) 'language can also become problematic when an emigrant cannot make use of it any longer', *ver gadamičqveſia, ſait čavide* not.possible I.have.decided.it(Perf), where.to I.should.go(Opt) 'I cannot make up my mind where to go' (cp. *ver gadamečqveſia, ſait časul'i qavi* not.possible I.had.decided.it(pluperfect with subjunctive function), where.to I.had.gone.off (pluperfect with subjunctive function) 'I could not make up my mind where to go. Is this the present-time reference of (77)?
68. Pxaqaze (1984: 133) contra Peikrišvili (1974: 65).
69. The same is true for many other languages: Armenian (Kozinceva 1995: 29), Modern Greek, Bulgarian etc. (Johanson, forthcoming).
70. Leinonen (1994: 138), based on K. Inoue's work on the perfect.
71. Friedman (1979: 342), (1988: 133); for more examples see Peikrišvili (1974: 55).
72. Kavtaraze (1956: 189); Vogt (1971: 195). *corr.*
73. See also Jensen (1929), Spitzer (1930) and Havers (1931: 41–43). Johanson (2000) speaks of a "fictive accomplishment of an event": *I have already gone = I am going now.*
74. Kavtaraze (1956: 189–191); Pxaqaze (1984: 132–133).
75. Peikrišvili (1974: 59); (1988: 55).
76. Rogava (1953); Peikrišvili (1988: 56–57); Harris (1985: 296–300).
77. As far as I can see, only (108) can be substituted for by (109). In non-assertive structures like interrogative "X because Y?", "because" is in the scope of the question operator, which it is not in the counterpart of (109): "I ask you if X, because (there is evidence) Y (for X)". For the asymmetric behaviour of assertive and non-assertive speech acts, again see Keller (1993: 242).
- ## References
- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan A.—Dan I. Slobin
1986 "A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish", in: W. L. Chafe—J. Nichols (eds.), 1986: 159–167.
- Arabuli, Avtandil
1980 "Turmeobiti analizuri čarmoebis tavisebureba Kartvelur enata zog dialekſi / Osobennosti analitičeskogo obrazovanija zaočnosti v nekotoryx kartvel'skix jazykax [Résumé 174–182] [A peculiarity of analytic forms of the evidential in some dialects of the Kartvelian languages], *Macne. Enisa da literaturis seria* 1980/1: 149–154.
- Babunašvili, Elene
1970 *Anton Pirveli da Kartuli gramatiķis ſakitxebi / Antonij i voprosy gruzinskoj grammatiki [Résumé 260–280] / Anthony and the problems of Georgian grammar [Résumé 281–187] (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Aķademia, Xelnačerta Inſtiťuti). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.*
- Babunašvili, Elene—Tedo Uturgaizze
1991 *Anton Pirvelis "Kartuli xramatika" da misi erovnul-iſtoriuli mnišvneloba / "Gruzinskaja grammatika" Antonija Pervogo i ee nacional'no-iſtoričeskoe značenie [Résumé 80–85] [The "Georgian Grammar" of Anthony I and its national and historical significance] (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Aķademia, Enatmecnierebis Inſtiťuti). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.*
- Bleichsteiner, Robert
1931 "Beiträge zur Sprach- und Volkskunde des georgischen Stammes der Gurier", *Caucasica* 7: 87–110; 9: 63–87.
- Boeder, Winfried
1980 "'Haben' in den Kartwelsprachen", in: Gunter Brettschneider—Christian Lehmann (eds.): *Wege der Universalienforschung. Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 145). Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 207–217.
to appear "Some notes on the Georgian resultative".
- Brendemoen, Bernt
1996 "Case merge in the Black Sea dialects—a Kartvelian substrate feature?", in: Á. Berta—B. Brendemoen—C. Schönig (eds.): *Symbolae Turcologicae. Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions* 6: 41–59.
- Chafe, Wallace L.—Johanna Nichols (eds.)
1986 *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology (Advances in Discourse Processes 20)*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.
- Comrie, Bernard
1976 *Aspect* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deeters, Gerhard
1930 *Das kharthwelische Verbum. Vergleichende Darstellung des Verbalbaus der südkaukasischen Sprachen* (Sächsische Forschungsinstitute Leipzig. Forschungsinstitut für Indogermanistik, Sprachwissenschaftliche Abteilung. Band 1). Leipzig: Markert & Petters.
- Donabédian, Anaïd
1996 "Pour une interprétation des différentes valeurs du médiatif en arménien occidental", in: Z. Guentchéva (ed.), 1996: 87–108.
- [Žangizze, Venera] Džangidze, Venera
1978 *Ingilojskij dialekt v Azerbajdžane. Voprosy grammatičeskoj i lek-*

- sičeskoj interferencii [The Ingilo dialect in Azerbaijan. Questions of grammatical and lexical interference] (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Akađemia, Aymosavletmcdneobis Instiṭuṭi). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.
- Žikia, Sergi
1967 "Turkul-Lazuri enobrivi urtiertobidan. 2. Turkuli sintaksuri kałkebi Lazurši" [Turkish-Laz linguistic interrelation 2: Turkish calques in Laz], in: *Orioni*. Akađi Šanizes / Akakiju Šanidze. Tbilisi: Tbilisis uniwersiteṭis gamomcemloba, 367–377.
- Friedman, Victor A.
1979 "Toward a typology of status: Georgian and other non-Slavic languages of the Soviet Union", in: Paul R. Clyne—William F. Hanks—Carol L. Hofbauer (eds.): *The Elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels, April 20–21, 1979; Including Papers from the conference on non-Slavic languages of the USSR, April 18, 1979*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 339–350.
1984 "Status in the Lak verbal system and its typological significance", *Folia Slavica* 7: 135–149.
1986 "Evidentiality in the Balkans: Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Albanian", in: W. L. Chafe—J. Nichols (eds.) 1986: 168–187.
1988 "The category of evidentiality in the Balkans and the Caucasus", in: Alexander M. Schenker (ed.): *American contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 121–139.
1994 "Surprise! Surprise! Arumanian has had an admirative!", *Indiana Slavic Studies* 7: 79–89.
- Gadžieva, Ninel' Zejnalovna
1978 *Tjurkojazyčnye arealy Kavkaza* [Turkic-speaking areas in the Caucasus] (Akademija nauk SSSR, Institut jazykoznanija). Moskva: Nauka.
- Flonti, Aleksandre
1974 *Kartuli zaxprebi*. Šeadgina, šesavali da šenišvnebi daurto Aleksandre Flontma [Georgian fairy-tales, edited with an introduction and notes by A. Ghlonti]. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.
- Giginešvili, Ivane—Varlam Topuria—Ivane Kavtaraze (eds.)
1961 *Kartuli dialektologia* I. Kartuli enis kilota mokle ganxilva. Ťekštebi. Leksikoni / Gruzinskaja dialektologija I. Kratkij obzor dialektov gruzinskogo jazyka. Teksty. Slovar' [Georgian dialectology I. A short survey of the dialects with texts and a lexicon] (Axali Kartuli enis kaťedris šromebi 3). Tbilisi: Tbilisis uniwersiteṭis gamomcemloba.
- Givón, Talmy
1992 "Evidentiality and epistemic space", *Studies in Language* 6: 23–49.
- Golden, Peter B.
1979 "The Oğuz Turkic (Ottoman/Safavid) elements in Georgian: background and patterns", in: Abraham Ascher—Tibor Halasi-Kun—Béla K. Király (eds.): *The Mutual Effects of the Islamic and Judeo-Christian Worlds: the East European pattern*. New York: The Brooklyn College Press, 183–202.
- Grjunberg, Aleksandr L.
1963 *Jazyk severoazerbajdžanskix tatov* [The language of the Azerbaijanian Tats] (Akademija nauk SSSR, Institut jazykoznanija). Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- Grünenthal, O.
1936 "Zum Perfekt", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 63: 133–140.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka (ed.)
1996 *L'énonciation médiatisée* (Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale 35). Louvain—Paris: Peeters.
- Harris, Alice C.
1985 *Diachronic Syntax: The Kartvelian case* (Syntax and Semantics 18). Orlando: Academic Press.
- Havers, Wilhelm
1931 *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax. Ein Versuch zur Erforschung der Bedingungen und Triebkräfte in Syntax und Stilistik* (Indogermanische Bibliothek, 1. Abteilung, 1. Reihe, 20. Band). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Heidolph, Karl Erich
1970 "Zur Bedeutung negativer Sätze", in: Manfred Bierwisch—Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.): *Progress in linguistics. A collection of papers* (Janua Linguarum. Series Maior 43). Den Haag—Paris: Mouton, 88–101.
- Hewitt, B. George
1979 "The expression of 'inferentiality' in Abkhaz", *Journal of Linguistics* 15: 87–92.
- Imnaišvili, Davit
1954 "Turmeobiti Kišuri žgupis enebši" / Zaočnye formy glagola v jazykax kistinskoj grupy [Résumé 342] [The evidential in the Nakh languages], *Kartvelur enata strukturis saktixebi* 6: 327–342. *Corr.*
- Imnaišvili, Grigol
1955 "Pirveli turmeobitisa da staṭiķur zmnata čarmoeba Ingilourši" / Obrazovanie zaglaznyx form i staťičeskix glagolov v ingilojskom narečii gruzinskogo jazyka [Résumé 123–124] [The formation of the perfect and of static verbs in Ingilo], *Iberul-kačkasiuri enatmecniereba* 7: 119–124.
1974 *Kartluri dialekti II: Ťekštebi* [The Kartlian dialect I: Texts] (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Akađemia, Enatmecnierebis instiṭuṭi). Tbilisi: Mecniereba.

Nasilov, Dmitrij M.

- 1983 "Konstrukcii s modal'nymi slovami *ėkan* i *ėmiš* v uzbekskom jazyke" [Constructions with the modal words *ėkan* and *ėmiš* in Uzbek], in: V.S. Xrakovskij (ed.): *Kategorii glagola i struktura predloženiya*. Konstrukcii s predikatnymi aktantami (Akademija nauk SSSR, Institut jazykoznanija). Leningrad: Leningradskoe otdelenie, 175–186.

Nataze, Nodar

- 1955 "Mesame seriis dro-ķilota ĉarmoebisatvis Kartulši" / K voprosu ob obrazovanii vremen i naklonenij tret'ej serii v kartvel'skix jazykax [Résumé 99–100] [On the formation of the third series of tenses and moods in Georgian], *Iberiol-ķavķasiuri enatmecniereba* 7: 81–100.

Ninua, Gulnara—Zurab Saržvelaze

- 1985 "Unaxaobis gamoxatvisatvis žvel Kartul ĉerilobit žeglebši" / Vyraženie zaočnosti v drevnegruzinskix pis'mennyx pamjatnikax [Résumé 85] [On the expression of non-witnessedness in the written monuments of Old Georgian], *Macne. Enisa da literaturis seria* 1985,1: 79–85.

Palmer, F. R.

- 1986 *Mood and Modality* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pxakaze, Darežan

- 1984 *I turmeobitis punkciebi Kartulši / Funkcii I rezul'tativnogo v gruzinskom jazyke* [Résumé 142–147] [The functions of the present perfect in Georgian] (Tbilis saxelmĉipo universiŉeti). Tbilisi: Tbilis universiŉetis gamomcemloba.

Peikrišvili, Žužuna

- 1974 "Turmeobitis mnišvneloba da gamoĉeneba Axal Kartulši" [Meaning and use of the perfect in Modern Georgian], *Kartvelur enata štrukturis sakitxebi* 4: 53–70.
- 1988 "Pirveli turmeobitis ĉarmocba da mnišvneloba Kartul dialektėbši" [The formation and the meaning of the present perfect in the Georgian dialects], *Dialektologiuri ĉrebuli* 1987. Masalebi Kartuli dialektologiuri aŉlasiatvis (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Aķademia, Enatmecnierebis Instiŉuti). Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 43–51.

Perrot, Jean

- 1996 "L'auditif en samoyède nenets", in: Zl. Guentchéva (ed.), 1996: 157–168.

Renou, Louis

- 1947 *La grammaire de Pāṇini* traduite du Sanskrit avec des extraits des commentaires indigènes. Fascicule I. Paris: Klincksieck.

Rogava, Giorgi

- 1953 "Dro-ķilota meotxe žgupis naķvtebi Kartvelur enebši" / Formy četver-

toj gruppy vremen i naklonenij glagolov v kartvel'skix jazykax [Résumé 31–33] [The fourth series of tenses and moods in the Kartvelian languages], *Iberiol-ķavķasiuri enatmecniereba* 5: 17–31.

Rutherford, William E.

- 1970 "Some observations concerning subordinate clauses in English", *Language* 46: 97–115.

Šaniže, Aķaķi

- 1941 "Kategorija rjada v glagole. Obščie voprosy formoobrazovanii glagolov na primerax gruzinskogo jazyka (predvaritel'noe soobščenie)" / Mĉķrivis ķategorija zmnaši / Catégorie verbale de la série. *ENIMĶIs moambe* 10: 209–229 [= Aķaķi Šaniže: *Kartuli enis štrukturis da istoriis sakitxebi* (Txzulebani tormeŉ tomad. Ţomi II) (Sakartvelos SSR Mecnierebata Aķademia / Tbilis saxelmĉipo universiŉeti). Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1981, 400–430].

- 1973 *Kartuli enis gramaŉikis sapuzvlebi* I: Morpologia. Meore gamocema [Fundamentals of Georgian grammar I: Morphology. Second edition] (Txzulebani III; žveli Kartuli enis ķatedris šromebi 15). Tbilisi: Tbilis universiŉetis gamomcemloba.

Schuchardt, Hugo

- 1895 *Über den passiven Charakter des Transitivs in den kaukasischen Sprachen* (Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philologisch-historische Classe 133,1). Wien: Tempsky.

Šilakaze, Ivane

- 1971 *Axali Somxuri enis gramaŉika*. Krestomatiita da leksikonit [A Grammar of Modern Armenian. With a chrestomathy and a lexicon]. Tbilisi: Tbilis universiŉetis gamomcemloba.

Spitzer, Leo

- 1928 "'Fait-accomplí'-Darstellung im Spanischen (Ein Versuch der Erfassung von Wesenszügen eines Sprachstils)", in: Leo Spitzer: *Stilstudien* 1. *Sprachstile*. München: Hueber, 258–294.
- 1930 "Vergangenheitstempus in futurischem Sinn (zu Bd. 47, S. 293 Anm.)", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 48: 45.

Talakvaze, Mariam

- 1975 *Kartuli enis gramaŉikis ŉavlebis metodika* [Methods for the teaching of Georgian grammar]. Meore gamocema. Tbilisi: Ganatleba.

Teimuraz Bagraŉioni

- 1979 *ĉigni leksikonni*. Masalebi ŉekriba, anbanze gaaĉĉo, ĉinasitĉvaoba da ŉenišvnebi daurto Guram Šaražem / Knigi slovari. Tbilisi: Sabĉota Sakartvelo.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs

- 1988 "Pragmatic strengthening and grammaticalization", *Berkeley Linguistics Society: Proceedings* 14: 406–416.

Vogt, Hans

- 1934 Review of Deeters 1930. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 52: 245–250.
- 1945 "Substrat et convergence dans l'évolution linguistique. Remarques sur l'évolution et la structure de l'arménien, du géorgien, de l'ossète et du turc". In: *Studia Septentrionalia* 2, 213–228 [= H. Vogt: *Linguistique caucasienne et arménienne*. Edited by Even Hovdhaugen and Fridrik Thordarson (Studia Caucasologica ii = The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture Oslo, Serie B 76). Oslo: Norwegian University Press / The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture 1988, 177–192].
- 1971 *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne* (Instituttet for sammenlignende kulturforskning. Serie B: Skrifter 57). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Willett, Thomas

- 1988 "A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality", *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.

Abbreviations

Adv = adverbial case; Aor = aorist; Bl = Bleichsteiner 1931; Cond = conditional / past of the future; D = I. Gigineišvili—V. Topuria—I. Kavtaraze (eds.) 1961; Dat = dative; Erg = ergative; Fut = future; Γ = Γlonji 1974; Gen = genitive (reduced form in italics); I = G. Imnaišvili 1974; Impf = imperfect; Instr = instrumental; IO = indirect object; Nom = nominative; O = object; Obl = obliquus; Opt = optative / subjunctive of the aorist series / subjunctive II; Part = particle; Perf = perfect; Pl = plural; PP = participle perfect passive; Pres = present; Prev = preverb; Quot = quotative particle; Rel = particle attached to the relative pronoun; S = subject; 1 = 1st person, 2 = 2nd person, 3 = 3rd person; other abbreviations refer to private letter writers.

Addenda and corrections

p. 299 below: “As the evidential my father”: This is perhaps a misrepresentation of what Pxaḳaḳe (1984: 98) means: she only says that the “iterative” perfect of verbs without objects (“absolute verbs”) corresponds to the Old Georgian iterative aorist (“xolmeobiti II”), and that “a replacement [of an iterative perfect form] by a non-resultative form requires the use of the aorist with the particle *xolme*”. Pxaḳaḳe does not seem to consider the question of possible replacement any further. The problem is that the presumed equivalent of (69): *es ambavi me gavigone xolme mama-čemizgana* ‘I have heard (aorist) this occasionally from my father’ is “not good” or even unacceptable to native speakers, the imperfect with or without *xolme* being used instead: *vigonebdi (xolme)* ‘I used to hear’. (Notice that the imperative, which is an aorist form, is perfectly acceptable (Rezo Kiknaḳe): *utxari xolme!* ‘tell him from time to time!’) There is some disagreement, however, among speakers of Georgian, which seems to result from dialect differences: Z. Sarḷvelaḳe (a native of Guria) kindly informs me that some dialects do not use *xolme*.

p. 320, note 73: cp. Jacob Wackernagel: *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Erste Reihe. Zweite Auflage. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1926, p. 170-171, on the “anticipatory use” of “rhetorical” perfect forms such as: πέπαυμαι instead of the present form: παύομαι in Greek oratory: by using this form as a concluding expression, “der Sprecher drückt gleich schon die Fertigstellung der Handlung aus, um deren Vollzug es sich handelt... Es ist dies eigentlich mehr eine Stilisierung des Ausdrucks, als dass damit eine neue Bedeutung in das Perfekt eingeführt wäre.”

p. 323 Imnaišvili, David 1954 ... *Iberiul-ḳavḳasiuri enatmecniereba* 6: 327-342

Corrections provided by George Hewitt (London, SOAS):

p. 290: (46) ‘he had many cows and female water-buffaloes, sixty were female water-buffaloes with blazes...’

p. 291: “While the future....uncertainty” replace by: “While the future tenses (e.g. the conditional in (46)) expresses a modal attitude of uncertainty”

p. 291: Meskhian example: D no 253

p. 293: (53) *Griša* ‘Grisha(Nom)’ replace by: *Griša-s* ‘Grisha(Dat)’

p. 294: “the perfect is unacceptable”

p. 299: (70) ‘the day has lighted up the **night**’

p. 299: (72) ‘appeared ever before’ replace by: ‘has ever appeared’

p. 301: (78) ‘He took the hen into the house’ replace by: ‘He brought the hen into the house’

p. 301: (81) ‘he treated the others’ replace by: ‘he was playing the host to the others’

p. 308: (97) *gvxuria* replace by: *gvxurvia*

p. 308: (99) *amšenebia* ‘it has been built for me’

p. 309: Examples such as (103) always seem to be threats.

p. 309 (106): In other contexts, forms like *baraven* can probably refer to the past (imperfect), but according to O. Ḳaxaḳe, it refers to the present in (106).

p. 320, note 67: *čaysuliḳavi*