

On the Sentence-final Clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe: Emergence of Mirative Category in the Influence of Turkic Languages

KOGURA, Norikazu
ILCAA, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

The present paper investigates the semantic function and the development of the sentence-final clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe. The paper will first discuss the semantic function of the sentence-final clitic =*lyañe* by comparing to other related forms such as auxiliary verbs *biXe* and *yelaXe=i*, and argue that =*lyañe* denotes that there is a discrepancy between the propositional content of the clause and the knowledge of the speaker. The paper will further make a brief comparison to the sentence-final clitic =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur, and propose the possibility that =*lyañe* has emerged in the influence of Modern Uyghur.

Keywords: Sibe (Manchu-Tungusic), mirativity, Modern Uyghur (Turkic), language contact

1. Preliminary
2. Theoretical framework
3. The semantics of the clitic =*lyañe*
4. The sentence final clitic =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur
5. The development of the clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe: Emergence of mirative category
6. Conclusion

1. Preliminary*

This paper discusses the semantic function of the sentence-final clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe. =*lyañe* is used when there is a discrepancy between the knowledge of the speaker and the actual situation, like the sentence (1) below.

KOGURA, Norikazu. 2024. "On the Sentence-final Clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe: Emergence of Mirative Category in the Influence of Turkic Languages". In Norikazu Kogura and Kumiko Sato (eds.). *Aspects of Turkic Languages II: Information Structure and Knowledge Management*. pp.143–154. <https://doi.org/10.15026/0002000304>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

* This paper is based on the paper "On the sentence-final clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe" presented in SIAC 2023. The data in this paper are collected from two speakers, one born in the fourth village in Cabcal (Chabucha'er Xibo Zijixian in Chinese) in 1940s, and one born in the third village in Cabcal in 1970s. In this paper, Sibe is written using phonemic transcription, which is based on Kubo et al. (2011). The phonemic inventory of Sibe is as follows: /a, e, i, o, u, p, b, t, d, k, g, q, G, f, s, x, ʧ, X, š, c, j, r, l, m, n, ŋ, N, y, w/. Here /X/ stands for the archiphoneme of /x/ and /χ/. In addition, " ' " stands for marked accent, and "#" stands for a syllable boundary in Chinese words. "-" stands for a suffix boundary and "=" stands for a clitic boundary.

- (1) *nane=ni' gume merañe yawe-mai=lyañe.*
 people=TOP all like.this walk-IMPV.IND=SFC
baitaqu=lyañe.
 no.problem=SFC
afsi baNje-Xe baite bi-Xe=i ere=ni'.
 how occur-PFV affair AUX-PFV=IND this=TOP
 'People are all going out like this, and there isn't any problem. How does such affair come?'

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. =lyañe in the literature

The sentence-final clitic =*lyañe* discussed in this paper has scarcely mentioned in the literature (Yamamoto 1969, Norman 1974, Li et al. 1984, 1986, Sameng et al. 2011, Zikmundová 2013). Zhang (2008) mentions a clitic *alingge(e)*, which looks corresponding to =*lyañe*. However, the function seems different. The following sentence (2) is from Zhang (2008).

- (2) *tumaqe da emdan alin nunggu-t jila-maqe, amsi emdan xula-xeng aimaqe da vierxi amirxe xozu-t mezik elden bisi-r alingee.*
 '(It is said that he) once stood on the mountain, and cried to the north, it was like there occurred a line of light in the north-eastern corner.' (Zhang 2008: 259)

2.2. Theoretical framework for discussion

Before investigating the semantic function of the clitic =*lyañe*, we will see the theoretical framework adopted in this paper. The notion of consistency between newly-acquired information and knowledge has been discussed in the framework of evidentiality proposed by Chafe (1986), whereby the evidentiality system consists of the source, reliability, and status of the obtained knowledge—matched against other knowledge or resources—and the mode of knowing. Chafe (1986) assumes mental processing that matches our knowledge with other knowledge or other resources. Of these other resources, matching with expectations correspond to what is referred to as mirativity, that is, the “unprepared mind of the speaker” (DeLancey 1997), in the literature. The figure 1 in the following shows the framework proposed by Chafe (1986).

source of knowledge	mode of knowing	reliable	knowledge matched against
		k	
		n	
???	---> belief	o	
evidence	---> induction	w	---> verbal resources
language	---> hearsay	l	---> expectations
hypothesis	---> deduction	e	
		d	
		g	
		e	
		unreliable	

Fig. 1 The evidential system proposed by Chafe (1986)

The functions of some grammatical forms in Sibe have been discussed in terms of this theoretical framing in Kogura (2013, 2018, 2021a), and the function of some grammatical forms in Modern Uyghur have been discussed in Kogura (2022). Kogura (2022) proposed that Modern Uyghur has a category denoting the consistency between matched newly-acquired information and the fixed knowledge. The present paper proposes that Sibe also has the same category. In the following part of this paper, we will discuss the semantics of the clitic =*lyaje* in Sibe (section 3), then make a brief comparison to the clitic =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur (section 4).

2.3. Forms regarding matching in Sibe

2.3.1. *bi-* (*biXe=i*, *biXe*)

bi- is an auxiliary whose lexical meaning is ‘to be, to exist,’ and *biXe=i* and *biXe* are its perfective indicative and perfective participle, respectively. The function of *bi-* (*biXe=i*, *biXe*) has been discussed in Kogura (2013, 2018, 2021a), arguing that *biXe=i* denotes that the speaker has acquired the propositional content of the clause as new information, and *biXe* denotes that the propositional content of the clause is a knowledge that the speaker has already acquired, and the speaker recalls it. The following sentence (3) *biXe=i* denotes that the speaker has just found that (s)he drinks alcohol, and the following sentence (4) *biXe* denotes that the speaker remembers that (s)he told his or her child not to swim in Yili river and scolds the child not have heard his or her warning.

- (3) *oi, tere ayrke aymi-me bi-Xe=i.*
 INTJ 3SG alcohol drink-CVB AUX-PFV=IND
 ‘Oh, (s)he drinks alcohol.’

- (4) *yeli#bira=de efse-me oju=qu seme*
 PN=DAT swim-CVB AUX=IRR.NEG COMP
 [#*ale-Xe bi-Xe=i / ale-Xe bi-Xe*].
 [tell-PFV AUX-PFV=IND / tell-PFV AUX-PFV]
 ‘I told you not to swim in the Yili river, didn’t I?’

2.3.2 *yela-* (*yelaXe=i*)

yela- is another auxiliary whose lexical meaning is ‘to stand,’ and *yelaXe=i* is its perfective indicative. The function of *yela-* (*yelaXe=i*) has also been discussed in Kogura (2013, 2018, 2020), arguing that the auxiliary *yela-* (*yelaXe=i*) denotes that the propositional content of the clause is exception for the newly-acquired information or knowledge. The following sentence (5) was uttered in a situation where although the speaker is not feeling cold, (s)he saw the hearer shivering and thought that (s)he feels cold, and would like to offer to close the window.

- (5) *sefe meji’ [?saχuruN / saχuruN yela-Xe=i] na.*
 teacher a.bit [cold / cold AUX-PFV=IND] Q
fa=we gida-ci o-mi ba.
 window=ACC close-COND AUX-IRR.IND INF
 ‘Teacher, do you feel cold? Is it good to close the window?’

Here the speaker would like to convey that it (the room) is cold. However, this information is discrepant with the speaker’s knowledge, because the speaker is not feeling cold. In this case, the use of the auxiliary *yelaXe=i* denotes that the information the speaker is conveying is exceptional, in other words the speaker would like to convey that the room is cold just temporally, or cold just for some people. This information is neither discrepant to the speaker’s knowledge that the room is not cold for the speaker, nor to the hearer’s knowledge. Thus the auxiliary *yelaXe=i* re-solves the discrepancy between the propositional content of the clause conveyed as new information to the hearer, and the knowledge of the hearer.

3. The semantics of the clitic =*lyañe*

In this section, we investigate the semantic function of the sentence-final clitic =*lyañe* by comparing to other related forms we have seen in the previous section. The sentence-final clitic =*lyañe* occurs after adjectives (6), and participle (7) and converb (8) of verbs.

- (6) (The speaker is trying a cloth. She was told that the cloth is too small for the speaker to put on.)

aNbu'=*lyaje*.

big=SFC

‘(The cloth is) big.’

- (7) (The hearer told the speaker that the hearer wouldn’t come to the party, however the hearer actually showed up to the party.)

ji-Xe=*lyaje*.

come-CVB=SFC

‘(Actually) you came.’

- (8) (The hearer told the speaker that the hearer cannot wrap dumplings, however the hearer is wrapping dumplings.)

si mutu-me=*lyaje*.

2SG be.able-CVB=SFC

‘(Actually) you can do (it).’

=*lyaje* can also occur in the main clauses of complex sentences. In this case, the main clauses denote the information that the speaker has just acquired, and the subordinate clauses denote the knowledge matched against that information.

- (9) *si ji=qu se-maqe ji-Xe*=*lyaje*.

2SG come=IRR.NEG say-CVB come-CVB=SFC

‘You said you wouldn’t come but (actually) you came.’

3.1 Information discrepant with the expectation of the speaker

=*lyaje* denotes that the information conveyed by the sentence is discrepant with a knowledge of the speaker, like in the sentence (6) above. Thus, =*lyaje* is not accepted when the propositional content of the clause is consistent with the knowledge of the speaker, like the sentence (10) in the following.

- (10) (The speaker is trying a cloth. She was told that the cloth is big for the speaker.)

??*meNjaje aNbu'*=*lyaje*.

actually big=SFC

‘(The cloth is) actually big (, as I was told.)’

This characteristic is similar to that of the auxiliary *biXe=i* we saw in 2.3.1, in terms that *biXe=i* is also used for denoting newly-acquired information for the speaker. In fact, *biXe=i* is also permitted in the sentences (6) and (10). The difference lies in that *biXe=i* can be used even the case there is no matched knowledge. The following sentence (11) was uttered when the speaker was not told anything and thus the speaker doesn't have any supposition. In this sentence, *=lyañe* is not accepted because the speaker doesn't have any information which is discrepant to the situation, and auxiliary *biXe=i* is used to denote a new information for the speaker.

- (11) (The speaker is trying a cloth by himself.)
 [??aNbu'=lyañe / aNbu' bi-Xe=i]
 [big=SFC / big AUX-PFV=IND]
 'It's big.'

3.2 Newly-acquired information and knowledge

=lyañe denote that the information conveyed by the sentence is discrepant to other information or knowledge. Logically this can be divided into two cases: the speaker's knowledge denoted by the clause is discrepant to the information newly acquired through other sources, or the newly-acquired information denoted by the clause is discrepant to knowledge of the speaker. Here *=lyañe* is possible only for the latter case, that is, *=lyañe* is only accepted for newly-acquired information which is discrepant with a knowledge of the speaker. The sentences (12) and (13) in the following shows that *=lyañe* is possible in such cases.

- (12) (The hearer told the speaker that the hearer cannot wrap dumplings, however the hearer is wrapping dumplings.)

si mutu=qu se-maqe mutu-me [=lyañe / ??bi-Xe].
 2SG be.able=IRR.NEG say-CVB be.able-CVB [=SFC / AUX-PFV]
 'You can do it (=wrap dumplings), although you said you can't.'

- (13) *ji-me se-maqe ji-Xaqu=lyañe.*
 come=IRR.NEG say-CVB come-PFV.NEG=SFC
 '(S)he said (s)he would come, (but (s)he) has not shown yet.'

And the following sentences (14) and (15) show that *=lyañe* is not accepted when it denotes a knowledge of the speaker.

- (14) *oi cekse' bu-me o-mi se-Xe*
 INTJ yesterday give-CVB AUX-IRR.IND say-PFV
 [??=*lyaje* / *bi-Xe*], *eneje ane oju=qu o-Xe=i.*
 [=SFC / AUX-PFV] today why AUX=IRR.NEG AUX-PFV=IND
 'Yesterday you said it is possible to issue (a visa). Why is it not possible today?'
- (15) *eneje yawe-me seme gisere-Xaqu [??=*lyaje* / *bi-Xe*].*
 today leave-CVB COMP say-PFV.NEG [=SFC / AUX-PFV]
 'You didn't say that you would leave today. Do you leave today?'

3.3 The discrepancy was not resolved

=*lyaje* is accepted when the discrepancy has not been resolved. This can be in a good contrast to the auxiliary *yela-* (*yelaXe=i*), which denote that the discrepancy was resolved. As we saw in 2.3.2, the auxiliary *yela-* (*yelaXe=i*) conveys information as exceptional. For example, in the following sentence (16) the speaker assumes that (s)he has learned to ride a bicycle, but this day (s)he can't ride just temporarily.

- (16) (The speaker is learning to ride a bicycle. (s)he could run with a bicycle for a while, but today (s)he can't.)
cekse' mutu-me bi-Xe=je, eneje mutu=qu
 yesterday be.able-CVB AUX-PFV=VN today be.able=IRR.NEG
yela-Xe=i.
 AUX-PFV=IND
 'I could do (it) yesterday, but today I can't.'

In contrast, =*lyaje* is accepted in the sentence (1) in the beginning (revisited as 17), because the speaker is not sure how to resolve the discrepancy between what (s)he has heard and what (s)he is seeing at the time of speech.

- (17) *nane=ni' gume meraje yawe-mai=lyaje. baitaqu=lyaje.*
 people=TOP all like.this walk-IMPV.IND=SFC no.problem=SFC
afsi baNje-Xe baite bi-Xe=i ere=ni'.
 how occur-PFV affair AUX-PFV=IND this=TOP
 'People are all going out like this, and there isn't any problem. How does such affair come?' (=1)

4. The sentence final clitic =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur

So far we investigated the semantic function of =*lyañe* by comparing to other forms in Sibe, the function of =*lyañe* can be concluded as denoting that the propositional content of the clause is discrepant with a knowledge of the speaker, and the discrepancy is not resolved. In this section, we will investigate the characteristics of =*lyañe* comparing to a form having similar function in a neighboring language.

The sentence-final clitic =*Gu* (=ghu/=qu) in Modern Uyghur is also used when the propositional content of the clause is discrepant with another information or knowledge (Kogura 2022). The following sentence (18) was uttered when the speaker knew that the hearer was Japanese (or had Japanese nationality) then found at the time of speech that (s)he could not speak Japanese. In this case, in the speaker's knowledge all Japanese people can speak Japanese, and this knowledge is not compatible with the information that the hearer can't speak Japanese, which the speaker just learned through observing the hearer. Hence, the clitic =*Gu* is permitted in the sentence (18).

(18) (The speaker speaks to the hearer, who can't speak Japanese)

sän Yaponiyä-liq=qu?

2SG Japanese-ADJVZ=SFC

'You are Japanese, aren't you?' (Kogura 2022: 40)

The clitic =*Gu* can be combined with the auxiliary *ikän*, in which case the auxiliary *ikän* denotes that the propositional content of the clause is not fixed knowledge of the speaker, and =*Gu* denotes that the propositional content of the clause is not consistent with the knowledge of the speaker, and the combination denotes that the information that the speaker has just acquired is incompatible with his or her knowledge. The following clause (19) was uttered when the speaker thought (s)he was a student, then discovered that (s)he was a teacher and could not decide whether that was true or not.

(19) *u muallim i-kän=ghu.*

3SG teacher AUX-PST.PTCP=SFC

'(S)he is a teacher (I didn't think so.)' (Kogura 2022: 41)

The function of the clitic =*Gu* is quite similar to that of =*lyañe* in Sibe. However, the clitic =*Gu* is different from =*lyañe* in terms that the =*Gu* is also accepted with the knowledge of the speaker.

=*Gu* can also be used with the auxiliary *idi*. In this case, the sentence denotes that the knowledge of the speaker is incompatible with the information that the speaker has just

acquired. The following sentence (20) was uttered when a colleague of the speaker had told that (s)he had a headache, and the speaker thought (s)he would be absent from the meeting, however the colleague arrived at the meeting. Then the speaker asked the hearer why (s)he arrived at the meeting.

- (20) *besħ-ij* *agri-watqan=ti=ghu,* *nimä* *üchün*
 head-POSS.2SG ache-PROG-PST.PTCP=AUX-PST=SFC what reason
yeghin-gha *käl-di-ŋ?*
 meeting-DAT come-PST-2SG
 ‘You have a headache. Why did you come to this meeting?’ (Kogura 2022: 41)

This comparison shows that the clitic =*Gu* denotes that the propositional content of the clause is incompatible with another information or knowledge, and the auxiliaries *idi* and *ikän* are used according to whether the content of the clause is a knowledge that the speaker had acquired before the utterance or not.

As we saw in 3.1, =*lyañe* in Sibe also denotes that the content of the clause is not consistent with the knowledge of the speaker, however, as we can see in the following sentence (21, partly revisited from 15), it cannot be accepted for the knowledge of the speaker which is not consistent with the newly-acquired information of the speaker.

- (21) *??eneje* *yawe-me* *seme* *gisere-Xaqu=lyañe.*
 today leave-CVB COMP say-PFV.NEG=SFC
 ‘You didn’t say that you would leave today.’ (=15)

5. The development of the clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe: Emergence of mirative category

So far, we saw the function of the sentence-final clitic =*lyañe*, and made a brief comparison to the sentence-final clitic =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur. The main point of the paper is as following:

- (i) The sentence final clitic =*lyañe* in Sibe denotes that the speaker is not able to handle the discontinuous situation.
- (ii) =*lyañe* can be used when the discrepancy is not resolved at the time of speech. The auxiliary *yela-* (*yelaXe=i*) is used when the discrepancy is resolved.
- (iii) =*lyañe* can be used when the propositional content of the clause is new information, and is inconsistent to the knowledge of the speaker, but can’t be used when

propositional content of the clause is knowledge, and is inconsistent to the knowledge of the speaker.

- (iv) The sentence final clitic =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur also denotes that the content of the clause is incompatible with other information or knowledge. Compared with =*lyañe* in Sibe, =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur can denote both the clause is new information, and is inconsistent to the knowledge of the speaker, but can't be used when propositional content of the clause is knowledge, and is inconsistent to the knowledge of the speaker, by combined with the auxiliaries *idi* and *ikän*.

Here I would like to discuss how the clitic =*lyañe*, or the mirative category in Sibe, has occurred. The first problem is that Manchu, which belongs to the same Tungusic languages as Sibe and has the closest genetic relationship with Sibe, does not have the mirative category as discussed in this paper. As discussed in 2.1, although it has been argued that the clitic *alingge(e)*, and *alingge(e)* is similar to *adali* in Manchu to some extent, the forms do not have straightforward correspondence in form and function. Furthermore, no form that functionally corresponds to =*lyañe* has not been found in the literature of other Tungusic languages. It is also possible to consider that the form has been borrowed from Mongolian languages, but no form with similar form and function can be found in the descriptions of Dagur languages, which is supposed to have the strongest contact with Sibe among Mongolic languages.

On the other hand, in the Turkic languages, elements having similar function are found in Kazakh (Geng et al. 1985) and Kyrgyz (Hu 1986), in addition to Modern Uyghur, which is discussed in this paper. This fact suggests that the clitic =*lyañe* and the mirative has not originally existed in Tungusic languages, but arose due to the influence of other languages, especially Turkic languages. The problem in this case, however, is that =*lyañe* is unlikely to be an element borrowed from the Turkic languages. For the first, the form =*lyañe* in Sibe and =*Gu* in Uyghur are fundamentally different in forms. This is also consistent with the tendency in the borrowing proposed by Kogura (2021b), that is, the borrowing of grammatical and lexical forms from Chinese and Mongolian languages is quite popular, whereas *qalques* are popular in the borrowing from Turkic languages.

Another possibility is that Sibe autonomously developed the mirative category. In this case, we may be able to assume a drift or a Sprachbund for the languages of Northwestern region of China. In any case, it is necessary to build up descriptive knowledge of the mirative categories of related languages in order to elucidate the development process of the mirative category in Sibe.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we saw the function of the sentence-final clitic =*lyañe*, made a brief comparison to the sentence-final clitic =*Gu* in Modern Uyghur, and propose the possibility that =*lyañe* has emerged in the influence of Modern Uyghur.

Abbreviations

ACC	accusative	PL	plural
ADJVZ	adjectivizer	PN	proper noun
AUX	auxiliary	POSS	possessive
COMP	complementizer	PROG	progressive
COND	conditional	PST	past
CVB	converb	PTCP	participle
DAT	dative	Q	question
IMPFV	imperfective	SFC	sentence-final clitic
INCL	inclusive	SG	singular
IND	indicative	TOP	topic
INTJ	interjection	VN	verbal noun
IRR	irrealis	1	first person
NEG	negation	2	second person
PFV	perfective	3	third person

References

- Chafe, Wallace. (1986) "Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing". In Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation. pp.261–272.
- DeLancey, Scott. (1997) "Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information". *Linguistic Typology* 1. pp.33–52.
- Geng, Shimin, Li, Zengxiang. (1985) *Hasakeyu Jianzhi*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Hu, Zhenhua. (1986) *Ke'erkezhiyu Jianzhi*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Kogura, Norikazu. (2013) *Shibego no asupekuto, modariti no kenkyu: Chishiki jotai no henkani motodzuku taieik*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Tokyo.
- . (2018) *Shibego no Modality no Kenkyu*. Tokyo: Bensei Publishing.
- . (2021a) "Evidentiality in Sibe". *Gengo no Ruikeiteki Tokucho Taisho Kenkyukai ronshu* 3. pp.31–59.
- . (2021b) "On the Historical Development and the Language Contact of Sibe: Focusing on Auxiliaries Denoting Progressive Aspect". *Journal of Manchu and Qing Studies* 20. pp.9–16.
- . (2022) "Evidential Categories in Modern Uyghur: The Auxiliary *i-* and Sentence-final Particles". In Kumiko Sato and Norikazu Kogura (eds.). *Aspects of Turkic Languages: Phonology, Morphosyntax and Semantics*. Fuchu: ILCAA. pp.33–46.
- Kubo, Tomoyuki, Kogura, Norikazu, and Zhuansheng. (2011) *Shibego no Kiso*. Fuchu: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Li, shulan, Zhongqian, and Wang, Qingfeng. (1984) *Xiboyu Kouyu Yanjiu*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- Li, shulan, and Zhongqian. (1986) *Xiboyu Jianzhi*. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.

- Norman, Jerry. (1974) "A sketch of Sibe morphology". *Central Asiatic Journal* 18(3). pp.159–174.
- Sameng, Yi'erhanzhi, Guo, Xiangyang, and Xie, Wei. (2011) *Xiboyu Tonglun*. Urumqi: Xinjiang Renmin Chubanshe.
- Yamamoto, Kengo. (1969) *A Classified Dictionary of Spoken Manchu*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Zhang, Taihao. (2008) *Xiboyu Yufa Yanjiu*. Kunming: Yunnan Minzu Chubanshe.
- Zikmundová, Veronika. (2013) *Spoken Sibe — Morphology of the Inflected Parts of speech*. Prague: Carolinum Press.

Acknowledgement

This study is supported by JSPS KAKENHI (18K12364, 18H03578, 22H00657) and ILCAA Joint Research Project (jrp000259).