

Metarepresentation, tense, aspect and narratives: the case of Behdini-Kurdish and Estonian

Panel paper, International Pragmatics Conference 2003

Christoph Unger

1. Introduction

In this paper I look at three sets of data where a metarepresentational use analysis appears to enhance the linguistic analysis. These are the 'aspective' marker *da* in Behdini Kurdish, the future marker *dê* in Behdini Kurdish and the so-called 'quotative mood' in Estonian.

2. Interpretive use and metarepresentation

First, I want to say a few words about the kinds of metarepresentation with which this paper is concerned. Consider (1):

(1) John: The German economy is recovering.

Situation A: Mary has asked John what the newspaper reported.

Situation B: John is working as an analyst for a bank and is writing a report to the board.

An utterance gives evidence of mental representations (thoughts) that the communicator intended to convey. In situation B, the thought that John conveys must be a belief of his. In other words: he must believe that what is expressed in the utterance is a true description of a state of affairs. Were it not so, and would John's boss find out, then John would surely lose his job. In other words: John's utterance gives evidence of his thought THE GERMAN ECONOMY IS RECOVERING, which he intends to communicate and which he entertains as a true description of an actual state of affairs.

In situation A, things are different. For one thing, John could easily add 'but I don't believe this.' However, if Mary were to find out later that there was nothing in the newspaper that is about the German economy, then Mary would feel deceived. John's utterance gives evidence of that fact that he entertains a thought which represents the content of what the newspaper writers wrote. In other words: the explicature of John's utterance is a representation of another representation. This is what is called a metarepresentation.

Notice two things about this metarepresentation relation:

-(a) It is based on resemblance, not identity. We can be sure that the article John is metarepresenting is much longer and contains a lot more detailed information. However, there is no requirement that the metarepresentation reproduces the lower order representation: rather, it is based on resemblance in relevant respects. The relevance-theoretic comprehension procedure explains how these indeterminacies are resolved.

-(b) John's utterance resembles the newspaper article(s) in terms of their content. This means that the lower-order representation shares logical (semantic) properties with the original one. This kind of resemblance is called interpretive resemblance. If utterances are used to be relevant in virtue of resembling another representation in terms of interpretive resemblance, then we say that the utterance is used interpretively, or that it is a case of interpretive use. Wilson (2000) points out that metarepresentation may exploit resemblances of virtually any kind of features and is not limited to the exploitation of interpretive resemblance. Thus, what has been called 'interpretive use' in the (early) relevance-theory literature is a sub-type of what might be called the 'metarepresentational use' of utterances. In this paper I am mostly concerned with metarepresentation based on interpretive resemblance, so I do continue to use the term 'interpretive use.'

3. Markers for exploiting interpretive resemblance in Behdini and Estonian

3. 1 Distant habitual past and counterfactual present: the particle 'da' in Behdini

In Behdini-Kurdish, there is a particle 'da' which can be used in two ways:

- (2)a. Example from native speaker (Zakho dialect; elicited): my friend and I want to go to the field and sow wheat. But it started to rain, and we turned around before we got there. On our way back, you meet us and ask: 'where did you go?' and we answer:

em da genim-î çîn-in
we IUP wheat-OM grow-3P
'we wanted to sow wheat.'

- b. ew da genim-î çîn-in
they IUP wheat-OM grow-3P

'In old time they used to plant wheat.' (In a tape recorded text where the speaker tells about his home village.)

(The particle 'da' immediately follows the subject, there can be no intervening material between the subject and this particle. The particle furthermore requires the present stem of the verb without any prefixes.)

Note: I have recorded texts in which 'da' occurs unambiguously as meaning 2. In the elicitation session, the native speaker came up with meaning 1. first, and only after asking back did he confirm the 2nd meaning.

It seems that in (2a.) the speaker describes a state of affairs in a non-factual world whereas in (2b.) he represents a state of affairs with a complex internal temporal structure. In other words, the first use of 'da' seems to require a modal analysis and the second one an analysis in terms of (verbal) aspect. On such an account, the homonymy of the forms involved would be accidental. However, I suggest that there is another way of looking at these examples that makes a unified account possible.

I suggest that the speaker of both (2a.) and (2b.) does not intend to refer to a specific

state of affairs at all - because there just isn't one identifiable instance of such a state of affairs. If the inhabitants of a village used to grow wheat, it will have been done over a considerable span of time, possibly several generations, and this will have involved many activities of planting and sowing in a yearly rhythm. It's not just one or two instances of sowing wheat and therefore it may not be relevant to treat this as one event with a complex internal temporal structure. Likewise, if the speaker of (2b.) has been prevented by the rain to sow wheat then there just is no state of affairs to refer to. However, in both cases it is possible to think about events that would make the thought *We grow wheat* (or *They grow wheat*, respectively) true - events that are possible in the sense that the world might have been otherwise (in 2a), or events that instantiate just a part of the total state of affairs to give an idea of it (in 2b). This means that the speaker of both (2a) and (2b) requires the addressee to think about a possible thought. In other words, the particle 'da' is arguably best explained in metarepresentational terms as constraining the addressee's interpretation to a metarepresentation of the form in (2c.):

- (2c) It is possible for the addressee
to entertain a representation of an event that would make the
proposition expressed true.

The different 'meanings' demonstrated in the example above can be seen as different interpretations according to context:

- (2'a) In talking about events which are apparently in distant past (such as talking about the history of a village), a relevant interpretation of (1) according to the semantics of 'da' given above would be to consider a number of recurring events in the past instantiating the property expressed by the predicate.
- (2'b) Because of the apparent (contextually inferred) proximity of time, the hearer is encouraged to imagine a situation/event in which the speaker is doing the activity described by the predicate.

This analysis of 'da' as a marker of non-attributive metarepresentational use (interpretive

use) is in line with the suggestion in Wilson (2000) that modals as in *Maybe I'll leave* involve this kind of linguistic metarepresentation. My analysis goes beyond this suggestion in arguing that not clearly modal meanings can be analysed in this way.

3. 2 Future tense in Behdini: representation or metarepresentation?

The future tense in Behdini is formed with the particle 'dê' immediately after the subject (no element can come between the subject and the future marker) and the present tense verb forms without aspectual or subjunctive prefixe:

- (3) em dê ç-in mal-ê
we FUT go-1P home-OF
'we go home' - 'we'll go home'

The future marker 'dê' occupies the same syntactic position as 'da' and occurs with the same verb form. This gives rise to the question whether the future marker 'dê' might also be semantically parallel to 'da', i.e. indicating a metarepresentation of a possible thought. Future events can be said to be possible in the sense that they may become actual. Thus, the particle 'dê' could be analysed as prompting the addressee to construct a metarepresentation along the following lines:

- (3') It is possible for the addressee
to entertain a representation of an event that would make the
proposition expressed true and accept it as potential that this event
will occur.

This would amount to an analysis of future tense in metarepresentational terms. The idea is not too far fetched. Smith (1990) has argued that futurate uses of the present in English should be analysed as following from using the present interpretively. Also, consider the following examples from German:

- (4) Er wird nach Hause gehen. 'He will go home.'
(5) Er wird schon nach Hause gehen. 'He will likely be going home (now or in the near future).'

Whereas (4) can be analysed in descriptive or metarepresentational terms, it is clear that in (5) the speaker does not describe a state of affairs. Rather, the speaker pronounces an assumption of his. A semantics of 'periphrastic' future involving 'werden' as interpretive use marker just like 'dê' might shed light on the connection between (4) and (5).

Furthermore, there are languages that do not encode future tense, such as Estonian. In this language, the present tense is used instead, possibly with temporal specifications ('later', 'tomorrow', etc.). If the future tense can be seen as related to interpretive use, this might explain why present tense might be used for the future: interpretive use is a pragmatic phenomenon, and doesn't have to be indicated. Thus, morphological systems that do not distinguish between present and future simply do not procedurally encode the relevant metarepresentation relation.

In Estonian, there are 'work-around strategies' e.g. with 'hakkama P' "to start to P", which seem to include some explicit metarepresentation.

- (6) a. Varsti hakkame vanaema poole sõitma.
Soon begin.1P grandmother.GEN to.place travel.INF1
'Soon we will go to grandmother's.'
- b. Kui me hakkame sõitma, siis paneme joppe selga.
When we begin.1P travel.INF1, then put.1P jacket on.back
'When we'll go, then we'll put on the jackets.'
- c. Ma hakkan kartma, kui sa nii kõvasti karjud.
I begin.1S be.afraid.INF1, when you so loudly cry.2S.
'I'll be afraid, when you shout so loud.'
(examples from Külvi Unger)

The verb 'hakkama' is in a matrix clause which is complemented by a subordinated infinitival clause ('-ma' infinitive) and cannot be seen as conveying its literal meaning of 'starting to' or 'beginning to'. Rather, it seems that 'hakkama' functions as a constraint to indicate a future tense interpretation. Why should such a verb that subcategorises

for infinitival complementation be chosen for such a work-around strategy, rather than an adverbial or prepositional phrase? If I am right in analysing future tense in metarepresentational terms, the metarepresentational nature of such verbs may be the answer. (I will say more about the infinitives in Estonian and metarepresentation in the next subsection.)

Turning again to Behdîni, a synchronic argument for treating the future marker 'dê' in interpretive use terms may be the following: the future form can be used even for activities that start in the present, or at least in the very near future. As a guest, I may indicate my intention to go home in this way:

- (7) Vêca ez dê ç-im mal-ê.
So I FUT go-1S home-OF.
'So I will go home.'

If 'dê' indicates an interpretive use in the way described above, the temporal interpretation is based on inference only. As described above. However, in contexts such as the one in (7), the additional processing cost involved in the metarepresentation over and against the use of present tense can be offset in a different way: to construe the state of affairs as an indication of the communicator's resolve, to mitigate the possible offense inherent in the proposition expressed, etc.

This account raises some questions:

1. Is future tense always, in all languages, involving interpretive use? Or do some languages encode futures descriptively whereas other use markers of interpretive use to encode future? Are there languages which make use of both options?
2. If languages encode future tense descriptively as well as interpretively, are morphological future forms descriptive use devices and periphrastic futures as in German and Behdîni (and English) interpretive use markers?

I don't know how to answer these questions. But one thing is interesting about them: these are novel questions that arise from applying relevance theory to some cross-

linguistic evidence which can lead to new empirical research. This shows something about the theoretical value of the relevance-theoretic approach to interpretive use.

3. 3 The Estonian quotative mood

The expression of information from hearsay obviously lends itself to an analysis in terms of metarepresentation (Wilson 2000). Blass (1989; 1990) and Itani (1996) have analysed hearsay particles as encoding procedural information about higher-level explicatures: that the utterance containing these particles indicates echoic interpretive use (Blass 1989; 1990: Sissala re) or attributive interpretive use (Itani: Japanese sentence final particle *-tte*).

Estonian has a verb form - the so-called 'kaudne kõneviis' ("indirect speech-mode" or 'quotative mood') - which indicates information received from hearsay. I want to claim that treating this 'quotative mood' as a procedural indicator of attributive interpretive use sheds interesting light on the use of this form, about the exact treatment of which there is some disagreement in traditional grammars of Estonian.

3. 3. 1 The paradigm of the Estonian quotative and basic use

The quotative in Estonian is formed with the suffix *-vat* which can be added to the stem (e.g. example (9b.) 'saa-*vat*') or the impersonal suffix *-ta* (e.g. example (9a.) 'luba-*ta-vat*') to form the present personal and impersonal forms of the quotative. The quotative marker doesn't inflect for person or number. There is also a periphrastic tense, the perfect, which is formed with the auxiliary 'olema' 'to be'. See example (8a.) below, 'olevat...näinud':

Especially in folk traditions and spoken dialects, an elliptic form of the quotative is used where the auxiliary 'olevat' is omitted, as in examples (17) and (18) to be discussed in more detail below.

There is widespread agreement that this form is used basically to indicate that the speaker doesn't have first-hand experience of the information (i.e. hasn't witnessed it himself) and that the information is therefore less than certain.

- (8) a. Naabrinaine olevat oma silmaga näinud
Female.neighbour was.QUOT own eyes.with seen.PCP

lendavat taldrikut.
flying.PCP.PAR saucer.PAR

'The lady next door has reportedly seen a flying saucer with her own eyes.' (EKG II § 500, p. 36)
- b. Mina ei oskavat naelagi seinä lüüa.
I not be.able.QUOT nail.even wall.in beat.INF2
'I am reportedly not able to drive a nail into the wall.' (EKG § 500, p. 36)
- (9) a. Nüüd lubatavat ka meil eraettevõtlust.
Now is.allowed.QUOT also to.us privatisation.PAR
'Reportedly, we are now also allowed to privatise.' (EKG II § 500, p. 36)
- b. Ta saavat stipendiumi Soome.
He receive.QUOT stipend.PAR into.Finland
'It is said that s/he is going to receive a scholarship for studying in Finland.' (Klaas 1997, 87)

Blass (1990) and Itani (1996) point to examples where hearsay-particles can actually be used when it is clear from the context that the speaker does indeed trust his mediating information source strongly, and where consequently there is no suggestion of doubt. They present these examples as one argument to treat these particles as indicating interpretive use rather than an evidential mood. Such examples don't seem to be found with the Estonian quotative.

However, the Estonian quotative is - like the particles examined by Blass and Itani - used in ways that do not fall directly under the hearsay category. The quotative can be used in indirect quotations, as a free alternative to the indicative:

- (10) (EKG II §716; p. 295)
- a. Jüri ütles, et Sirje sõidab maale.
Jüri said, that Sirje travels to countryside.
'Jüri said that Sirje is travelling to the countryside.'
- = Jüri ütles, et Sirje sõitvat maale.
Jüri said that Sirje travel-QUOT to countryside.
'Jüri said that Sirje is travelling to the countryside.'
- b. Jüri ütles, et Sirje on nii ilus.
Jüri said, that Sirje is so beautiful.
- = Jüri ütles, et Sirje olevat nii ilus.
Jüri said, that Sirje is-QUOT so beautiful.

Furthermore, the following example does not seem to fall squarely under the category of hearsay:

- (11) Minu asi paistis olevat segane asi. (Haamer p. 23)
My.GEN case appeared be.QUOT unclear case.
'My case appeared to be an unclear one.'

This is Harri Haamer's evaluation of his situation after his last interrogation at the KGB station in Pagari street, Tallinn. It is easy to see that metarepresentation is involved: Haamer attributes the thought HARRI HAAMER'S CASE IS UNCLEAR to his interrogators. But he arrives at this through his own observations, his own conclusions, not through the mediation of someone else. There is no in-between witness. Therefore it is not obviously a case of hearsay.

3. 3. 2 The quotative and other ways of expressing hearsay

In Estonian there are actually several different ways to express hearsay. First, there are lexical expressions such as 'räägiti' (one says) or 'räägitakse' (it is said) which contribute to the conceptual content of higher-level explicatures. In these cases, the embedded clause has indicative rather than quotative. Also, if the context is clear

enough, indicative may be used instead the quotative.

- (12) Haamer, p. 24
Räägiti, et nendes käikudes on tapetud inimesi.
Say.IPS that in.these in.corridors were slain.PCP people.P.GEN

Seda on teinud venelased ja sakslased ja jälle venelased.
This.PAR was done.PCP Russians and Germans and again Russians.

'It was said that in these corridors people were slain. This was done by
Russians and Germans and again Russians.'

Other alternatives include the following:

- (13) (EKG II, § 500; pp. 36-37)
- a. Indicative imperfect of the Verb pidama 'to have to'
Nüüd pidi ka meil eraettevõtlust lubatama.
Now is.necessary also to.us privatisation.PAR allow.IPS.INF1
'Now it is reportedly also allowed to us to privatise.'
- b. Indicative perfect personal or impersonal with the temporal function of the imperfect
Kui Mari eile läbi metsa koju oli läinud,
When Mari yesterday through wood.GEN to.home was going.PCP

oli ta suure põdrapulliga vastamisi sattunud.
was she big.GEN elk.with opposite happened.

Jalad olid äkitselt nõrgaks läinud ja minestus Ø peale tükkinud.
Legs were suddenly weak become.PCP and unconsciousness Ø on
happened.

Kõik ta luud oli läbi taotud ja kondid Ø läbi klopitud.
All her bones were through beaten and bones Ø through beaten.

'When Mari came home through the woods yesterday, she happened to
run accross a big elk. Suddenly her legs became week and she started
to faint. All her bones were beaten through.'
- c. da-infinitiv
Minust hoovata seletamatut võlu.
From.me flow.INF2 inexplicable.PAR charm.PAR
'Reportedly, from me flows an inexplicable charm.'

d. subordinate clause with nagu 'as if' whose verb is in the subjunctive.

Minu naine väidab, nagu ei oskaks mina naelagi seinä lüüa.

My wife claims, as.if not know.SJ I nail.even into.wall beat.INF2.

'My wife claims that I couldn't even drive a nail into the wall.'

e. Verb olla 'to be' in past perfect with main verb in the imperfect participle.

Mari olla eile suure põdrapulliga vastamisi sattunud.

Mari be.INF2 yesterday big.GEN elk.with opposite happened.PCP.

'Mari reportedly happened to run accross a big elk.'

f. The verb from pidada with ma-infinitiv.

Minust pidada seletamatut võlu hoovama.

Me.from must.INF2 inexplicable.PAR charm.PAR flow.INF1

'An inexplicable charm is reportedly flowing from me.'

This diversity of ways how to express hearsay strongly suggests that 'hearsay' is a label for a certain pragmatic interpretation rather than a semantic category that can be encoded as such. There are various ways how the communicator can make sure the addressee arrives at this intended interpretation, only one of which is using the quotative.

3. 3. 3 Other uses of the -vat form

While there are a variety of ways how to express hearsay in Estonian, the '-vat' form itself can be used in ways other than hearsay alone. EKG calls this the '-vat infinitive', although other grammars (e.g. Valgma & Remmel 1970) do not have such a category. The form of this infinitive is indistinguishable from the quotative, as can be seen in (14). However, the use of this infinitive does not fall squarely under the above definition of hearsay in Estonian: in subordinate clauses embedded under verbs of speech, thought and perception.

(14) The paradigm of the so-called -vat infinitive

a. Ma arvasin seda juba teadvat.

I reckoned.1S this.PAR already know.VAT

'I thought that I knew this already.'

b. Teadsin seda juba tehtavat.

Knew.1S this.PAR already done.VAT

c. Arvasin Peetri olevat kirja juba lugenud.

Reckoned.1S Peter be.VAT letter already read.PCP

'I thought that Peter had already read the letter.'

= Ma arvasin Peetri juba lugenuvat kirja.

I reckoned Peter already read.VAT letter.PAR

d. Teadsin seda juba tehtud olevat.

Knew.1S this.PAR already done.PCP be.VAT

'I knew that this was already done.'

(15) a. Ma arvasin sind magavat.

I reckoned.1S you.PAR sleep.VAT

'I thought that you were sleeping.'

b. Selle nõu leiab ta päris kohase olevat.

This.GEN news.GEN find.3S he really ? be.VAT

c. Mõtlesin Peetri kirja juba lugenud olevat (=lugenuvat)

Thought.1S Peter letter already read.PCP be.VAT (=read.PERF.VAT)

'I gathered that Peter had already read the letter.'

d. Teadsin seda sageli tehtud olevat.

Knew.1S this.PAR often done.PCP be.VAT

e. Olen kuulnud siin palju loetavat.

Be.1S heard.PCP here much read.IPS.VAT

'I have heard that much is read here.'

(16) leidma 'find'; lootma 'hope'; ütlema 'say'; aimama 'foresee, sense, guess'; arvama 'reckon'; avastama 'find out'; eeldama 'assume'; kaebama 'complain'; kartma 'be afraid'; kujutlema 'imagine'; kurtma 'complain, lament'; kuulma 'hear'; mõtlema 'think'; möönma 'admit, grant'; mäletama 'recall'; märkama 'notice'; nentima 'state, claim, assert'; nägema 'see'; oletama 'suppose'; ootama 'wait'; rääkima 'speak'; taipama 'understand'; tajuma 'perceive, sense'; teadma 'know'; tundma 'feel'; tunnistama 'witness'; tõendama 'testify, affirm, certify'; väitma 'claim'; uskuma 'believe'; ütlema 'say'

3. 3. 4 A procedural semantics for -vat: interpretive use

The picture that has emerged is the following:

1. There is a verb form specifically indicating hearsay information: the *-vat* form.
2. Besides this form, there are many other ways to express hearsay.
3. There are also other uses of the *-vat* form that do not fall squarely under the definition of hearsay.

My suggestion is to analyse the *-vat* form in the following way:

1. Syntactically, it is an infinitival functional projection, i.e. a T[ense] head with the feature [-T]. It also has the property of calling for Exceptional Case Marking constructions.
2. Semantically, it encodes procedural information: to treat the propositional form of the clause as attributed thought. The relevance of this clause is in it's being embedded under a higher-level explicature. In other words: it is a marker of attributive interpretive use.

If there is an explicit matrix clause, the matrix verb can be taken to indicate the intended higher-level explicature. If the matrix verb were not a verb of speech act, perception or propositional attitude, it could not be interpreted as contributing to the intended higher-level explicature and the processing effort involved to satisfy the constraint encoded in the *-vat* form would be too high.

When there is no overt matrix clause, the higher-level explicature has to be completely inferred. A simple enrichment of the form 'the speaker has said that P' will not do; for then the processing effort demanded by the procedural element would not be rewarded, for there is a more economic way to express this: by using the indicative. Hence, a more elaborate higher-level explicature will be called for. A description such as 'someone other than the speaker said/believed/assumed that P' satisfies this condition and does not incur unreasonable processing effort. This higher-level explicature is then likely to give rise to additional cognitive effects: the speaker

doesn't know the truth value of P, the speaker doesn't want to commit himself to P, the speaker has doubts about P, etc.

In other words: the *-vat* form is a marker of attributive interpretive use, not specifically 'hearsay'. In the absence of overt matrix clauses, a hearsay-interpretation is the most relevant one for general reasons.

3. 3. 5 The quotative as a narrative verb form

An elliptic form of the quotative is often found in folk stories, e.g. fairy tales. It is elliptic in the sense that the auxiliary *olevat* is unexpressed. Example (17) is from a fairy tale, example (18) from EKG II.

- (17) Surnud ühel isandal naine ja jätnud maha kaksteist poega ja ühe tütrekese. Mõne aja pärast hakanud isa teist neidu armastama, nõida. See öelnud: "Tütar las jääb, aga oma pojad põleta kõik ära..." Isa mõelnud nii, mõelnud naa, ei teadnud mida ette võtta. Ja öelnud ta ühele oma teenrile...

'They say that the wife of a master had died and had left behind twelve sons and a little daughter. After a while the father had fallen in love with another maid, a witch. She is said to have said "Let the daughter remain, but burn all your sons..." The father is said to have thought this way and that way and he didn't know what to do. And he is reported to have told his servant...'

(example and translation from Klaas 1997, 89)

- (18) (EKG II § 500, p. 37)
Mari Ø läinud läbi metsa koju
Mari Ø being.PCP through wood.GEN to.home

ja Ø sattunud suure põdrapulliga vastamisi.
and Ø chanced.PCP big.GEN elk.with opposite.

Taotud tal kõik luud läbi ja Ø klobitud kondid.
Beaten for.her all bones and Ø beaten.PCP bones.

'Mari was on her way home through the wood and chanced upon a big elk. All her bones were thoroughly beaten up.'

According to Klaas (1997:91), the 'uniting of narrativity and doubting the reality is not a widespread phenomenon at all, it would rather be a peculiarity of the eastern Baltic areal.' If the Estonian *-vat* form were indeed a semantic mood whose semantics involves 'doubting the reality' (rather than a pragmatic effect that in general follows naturally from its semantics, as in my proposed analysis), this would indeed be a curious phenomenon. However, the analysis of the *-vat* form as a marker of attributive interpretive use throws a slightly different light on the issue, for interpretive use is intricately linked to narrative in a variety of ways.

First, the telling of a story is actually an act of interpretive use. The story teller is metarepresenting the content of a representation (a story) which is attributed to the general cultural heritage. From this perspective, the use of conceptual or procedural indicators of (attributive) interpretive use is not unexpected. If a language can encode interpretive use in its verbal inflection, repeated use of this form might give the appearance of a 'narrative verb form.'

Second, Smith (1990) has argued that the historic present in English (and presumably in other languages as well) '[forces] the reader to visualise the situation described as though he were there himself' (p. 92). In other words: the 'historic present' causes the reader to metarepresent the propositional content of the utterance in a world in which he is present. This may achieve further pragmatic effects such as causing a more vivid impression, or simply of drawing the reader into the narrative (Smith 1990:92 gives an example from a novel where the historic present is not used for vividness). This is, of course, a case of interpretive use. In Smith's account, this interpretive use reading is caused by the additional processing effort which the use of the present in an obvious past time context may cause. However, it is plausible that in a language that procedurally encodes interpretive use these interpretive use markers may be used to achieve this same effect: to get the reader to metarepresent the story content in a world in which he is present. (Estonian also makes use of the historic present)

There are thus a number of ways in which interpretive use and its overt marking may be naturally linked to narrative. Consequently, it shouldn't be surprising to find markers of interpretive use in narrative utterances/sentences. Actually, it might be worth investigating to what extent all so-called 'narrative verb forms' may actually be interpretive use variants of 'regular' tenses/aspects etc. Furthermore, 'narrative forms' may turn out to exploit interpretive use in different ways - in different languages and maybe even within one and the same.

4. Conclusion

The main points illustrated in this paper and suggestions for further discussion were the following:

1. There are meaning categories on the borderline between mood and aspect that can find a unified account in terms of metarepresentation of possible thoughts.
2. The expression of future tense may be based on metarepresentation rather than descriptive use. Languages may differ in the way they treat future time.
3. Hearsay indicators - or rather: attributive interpretive use markers - may be used as narrative devices.
4. Narrative 'tenses' or other 'narrative' verb forms may be based on interpretive use cross-linguistically. However, there are different ways in which interpretive use may enter into narration.

5. References

Blass, R. 1989: 'The grammaticalization of interpretive use: the case of re in Sissala.'
Lingua 79: 299-326.

Blass, R. 1990: *Relevance relations in discourse*. Cambridge: CUP.

[EKG I] Ereht, Mati, Reet Kasik, Helle Metslang, Henno Rajandi, Kristiina Ross,

Henn Saari, Kaja Tael, Silvi Vare 1993: Eesti Keele Grammatika [Grammar of Estonian]. Volume II: Süntaks. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut [Institute of Language and Literature of the Estonian Academy of Sciences].

[EKG II] Erelt, Mati, Reet Kasik, Helle Metslang, Henno Rajandi, Kristiina Ross, Henn Saari, Kaja Tael, Silvi Vare 1995: Eesti Keele Grammatika [Grammar of Estonian]. Volume I: Morfoloogia. Tallinn: Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Keele ja Kirjanduse Instituut [Institute of Language and Literature of the Estonian Academy of Sciences].

Itani, R. 1996: 'A relevance-based analysis of hearsay particles: With special reference to Japanese sentence-final particle tte.' In: R. Carston & S. Uchida (eds) Relevance Theory: Applications and Implications. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 47-68.

Klaas, B. 1997: 'The quotative mood in the Baltic Sea areal.' In: M. Erelt (ed.) Estonian: Typological Studies II. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Smith, N. V. 1990: 'Observations on the pragmatics of tense.' UCL Working Papers on Linguistics 2, 82-94. [French version published:]

Sperber, D. & D. Wilson 1995: Relevance. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell. (1st edition 1986)

Valgma, J. & N. Remmel 1970: Eesti Keele Grammatika. [Grammar of Estonian.] Tallinn: Valgus.

Wilson, D. 2000: Metarepresentation in verbal communication. In: D. Sperber (ed.) Metarepresentations. Oxford: Blackwell.

Abbreviations

General interlinear glosses

NEG negation
P plural
S singular
SJ subjunctive

Kurdish interlinear glosses

CO copula

FUT	future
IAM	imperfective aspect marker
IMPP	imperative plural
IMPS	imperative singular
IND	indefinite
IUM	interpretive use marker
IUP	interpretive use in the past
IUMN	interpretive use marker with negation
IZF	izafe feminine singular
IZM	izafe masculine singular
OBL	oblique case
OF	oblique case feminin singular
OM	oblique case masculin singulat
OP	oblique case plural (masculin and feminin)
INF	infinitive
PPS	postposition
SRM	specific reference marker

Estonian interlinear glosses

GEN	genitive case
INF1	ma-infinitive (citation form)
INF2	da-infinitive
IPS	impersonal
PAR	'partitive' case (accusative)
PERF	perfect
PCP	participle
QUOT	quotative
VAT	vat-infinitive

A note on interlinearisation

In Behdini interlinear glosses, I have not marked direct case. So, when a noun gloss doesn't have a gloss for a case, it's in direct case. Likewise, in Estonian interlinear glosses I didn't indicate nominative case; if a noun gloss doesn't have a gloss for a case, it's in nominative case.

I have not used abbreviations for the 11 non-basic cases in Estonian, but used mnemonic devices such as 'to.house' or 'house.to' instead of 'house.ILL' for the illative case. Since the latinised case names are not that often encountered in linguistic literature, I think that it is difficult to remember what they mean. The mnemonic devices seem good enough for our purposes and result in an easier to read gloss.

Since Estonian inflection often involves irregular stem modifications, I did not break up words into morphemes. Relevant grammatical features are indicated in the form '.FEATURE' (e.g. '.1S') if they aren't transparent in the meaning of the English gloss.