

Evidentials in Tohono O'odham: A Preliminary study
Yujeong Choi

This paper explores the pragmatic representation of evidentiality by looking at two evidential suffixes (-kĩ; direct and -ṣ; quotative evidential) in Tohono O'odham, a Native American language spoken in Southern Arizona and in Northern Sonora, Mexico. Specifically, evidential suffixes are analyzed within speech act theory as well as the speaker's production format. Evidentiality is generally defined as a way of encoding the source of information in a speaker's utterance. Particularly, the source of information may be classified into two groups based on the way in which speakers access the information source: direct evidence or indirect evidence. Direct evidence involves the speaker's attested experience of an event through visual, auditory, or other sensory means; in contrast, indirect evidence indicates the speaker's experience of an event through reported evidence, assumption, hearsay, or inference (Chafe and Nichols 1986; Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2004). Growing interest in the phenomenon of evidentiality in different linguistic subareas has occurred over the past two decades, from a language typological perspective, to anthropological linguistics, and to pragmatics (DeLancey; 2001; Fox 2001; Faller 2002; Aikhenvald 2004). However, no study has attempted to understand evidentiality while considering the relation between speech act theory and the speaker's role toward interlocutors.

According to Saxton (1982), evidential suffixes generally attach to mood and tense morphemes in Tohono O'odham. Although the evidential suffix -kĩ is translated into 'evidently' or 'apparently' and -ṣ 'reportedly' or 'apparently' in English, these suffixes do not specify the source of information. However, since these morphemes appear in different contexts, I postulate that these two morphemes represent different types of evidence.

The present analysis examines data from already existing materials. My preliminary analysis shows that the two evidential suffixes serve to differentiate speech acts. Based on Faller's (2002) analysis of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua, I propose that the directive evidential -kĩ asserts a speaker's proposition, creating an illocutionary force with -kĩ assertion. In contrast, the quotative evidential -ṣ presents a third party's assertion, providing illocutionary force with the presentation of -ṣ. Consequently, it is predicted that a speaker in certain speech acts enacts different roles toward his/her listeners.

In addition, drawing upon Goffman's (1981) production format in discourse, I propose that the speaker who uses the evidential suffix -kĩ serves the role of "author" in discourse by expressing one's authority and thus causes the listener to accept the message as general knowledge, whereas the speaker who uses the evidential suffix -ṣ serves a role of "animator" in discourse in that the speaker functions as a presenter of someone else's assertion. Therefore, the manner in which the speech act is carried out hinges upon the speaker's role.

Data¹:

1) 'E-atki 'ep 'ai mat o 'e-keihi go'odham

It is the time for the ritual.

p = 'it is the time for the ritual'

ILL = ASSERT (p)

SINC = { $Bel(s, p)$, EV = See (s, e_p) }

2) Hega'i 'aš cipkan.

(s)he is/was apparently working.

p = '(s)he is/was working.'

ILL = PRESENT (p)

SINC = { $\exists s_2$ [Assert (S_2, p) ^ $S_2 \notin \{h, s\}$] }

Selected References

- AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2004. Evidentiality, New York: Oxford University press.
- DELANCEY, SCOTT. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of pragmatics* 33. 369-382.
- FALLER, MARTINA. 2002. Semantics and pragmatics of evidential in Cuzco Quechua. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- FOX, BARBARA. 2001. Evidentiality: Authority, responsibility, and entitlement in English conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11 (2) .167-192.
- GOFFMAN, ERVING. 1981. Footing. In *Forms of Talk*, ed. by E. Goffman. 124 – 159. Philadelphia:University of Pennsylvania Press.
- SAXTON, DEAN. 1982. Papago. In *Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar 3*, ed. by R. Langacker. 92-266. Dallas: SIL
- WILLETT, THOMAS L. 1988. A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticization of Evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12. 51-97.

¹ The following abbreviations are used for the transcription of the data.

ASSERT: Speech act of assertion; *Bel*: believes; EV: evidential value; ILL: illocutionary act
LOC: locative; MD: mood; PERF: perfective; PROG: progressive; *Rea*: reasoning;
SINC: sincerity conditions; TNS: tense