Title	A note on reportative evidentials in Qaraqalpaq
Author(s)	ヤン, ムイ
Citation	言語文化共同研究プロジェクト. 2025, 2024, p. 44-50
Version Type	VoR
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/102185
rights	
Note	

A note on reportative evidentials in Qaraqalpaq[1]

ヤン ムイ（Muyi Yang）

1. Introduction

This note is a continuation of Yang (2024), where I have presented the paradigm of inferential evidentials in Qaraqalpaq based on the standard tests established in Matthewson et al. (2007). The goal of this note is to identify whether reportative evidentials in Qaraqalpaq are epistemic modals or illocutionary operators. For background on Qaraqalpaq as well as an overview of Matthewson et al.'s (2007) tests, the reader is referred to Yang (2024).

The first marker that expresses reportative evidentiality in Qaraqalpaq is *-GAn*, as in (5).

(1)   *ʒauɯn*   *ʒau-ʁan*.

         rain   fall-PTCP

         p: 'It rained.'

         Evid(p):   The speaker has reportative evidence that it rained.

Apart from reportative evidentiality, *-GAn* in root clauses can also express perfect, as in (2).

(2)   *seneŋ*   *toj-ɯŋ-da*   *men*   *wojna-ʁan-man*.

         2SG.GEN   wedding-2SG.POSS-LOC   1SG   dance-PTCP-1SG

         'I danced at your wedding.'

Note that among Turkic languages, it is quite common that indirect evidentiality and perfect are expressed by the same morpheme, such as Turkish *-mIš* (Izvorski 1997) and Kazakh/Uzbek *eken/ekan* (Straughn 2011). However, the expressions discussed in the literature are all reported to be compatible with both the reportative and the inferential use. To my knowledge, Qaraqalpaq *-GAn* is the only expression carrying both perfect and evidential meanings, with the latter being limited to reportative evidentiality. (3) exemplifies the use of *-GAn* in morphologically past perfect sentences.

(3)   *bǝr*   *waqɯt-tarɯ*   *ʒer-de*   *dinozavǝr-lar*   *bol-ʁan je-dǝ*.

         one   time-at   earth-LOC   dinosaur-PL   be-PTCP AUX-PST

         'There were dinosaurs once on the earth.'

Note that the prejacent of this type of reportative evidentials only allows past events. For example, (1) cannot be interpreted as 'They say it will rain'. Sentences conveying events in-progress also do not allow the evidential *-GAn*. The progressive light verb *atɯr*, as shown in (4), do not allow the root

-*GAn* intended for the reportative evidential meaning, as in (5).

(4) *woʝna-p*   *atɯr-man.*

      dance-NONF   PROG-1SG

      'I am dancing.'

(5) *Murat* *aina-nɯ*   *sɯn-dɯr-ɯp*   *atɯr-ʁan*   **(je-də).*

      M   window-ACC   break-CAUS-NONF   PROG-PTCP   AUX-PST

      Intended: 'They say that Murat broke the window.'

      Actual interpretation (with *je-də*): 'Murat broke the window (I witnessed).'

The second type of reportative evidentials is marked with *-Ep*, as in (6).

(6) *ʒaʊɯn* *ʒaʊ-ɯp-tɯ.*

      rain   fall-NONF-3

      p: 'It rained.'

      Evid(p):   The speaker has reportative evidence that it rained.

Straughn (2011) notes that Uzbek *-(i)b* and Kazakh *-(I)p* express the speaker's surprise and doubt at the prejacent, and suggests that the information is gained from non-firsthand source. Crucially, they involve a sense of 'non-volitionality', and are often used for describing bodily functions.

(7) *šölde-p*   *qal-ïp-pïn.*

      thirst-CVB   PFV-CPST-1SG

      'I've become thirsty.'   (Kazakh, Straughn 2011)

The Qaraqalpaq counterpart, namely *-Ep*, shows similar properties. This 'non-volitionality' reading, however, seem to be most salient for first-person subjects, although we found other cases with third-person subjects as well.

(8) *ʃølle-p* *qal-ɯp-pan.*

      thirsty   take-NONF-1SG

      'It turned out that I am thirsty (now).'

(9) *woʝna-p-pan.*

      dance-NONF-1SG

      'It turned out that I danced (e.g. in my dream).'

      Not: 'I danced.'

(10) *dala-da*   *qʊjaʃ* *ʃɯʁ-ɯp*   *tʊr-ɯp-tɯ.*

      outside-LOC   sun   exit-NONF   stand-NONF-3SG

      'It turned out that it's sunny outside (I saw).'

      NOT: 'It's sunny (I heard).'

In the next section, I apply Matthewson et al.'s tests to the above reportative evidentials. Table 1 summarizes the predictions of the modal analysis and the illocutionary operator analysis. Again, the reader is referred to Yang (2024) for an overview of the motivation of these tests.

Table 1: Matthewson et al. (2007)'s tests and predictions

	Modal analysis	Illocut. analysis
a. Felicitous if *p* is known to be false?	no	yes
b. Felicitous if *p* is known to be true?	no	yes
c. *Evid*(*p*) cancelable?	no	no
d. *Evid*(*p*) projects over negation?	yes	yes
e. *Evid*(*p*) can be picked up? (Originally: Challengeable?)	yes	no
f. Embeddable?	yes	no

2. Testing the reportatives

• Test a: When *p* is known to be false

   Both -*GAn* and -*Ep* are infelicitous when *p* is known to be false.

(11)   Context A: I was out for the whole day yesterday and it was sunny. But strangely, Murat

            came to tell me that it rained yesterday.

            # *заицп заи-ʁап*.

                rain   fall-PTCP

            'It rained (I heard).'

(12)   # *заицп заи-цр-тц*.

                rain   fall-NONF-3

            'It rained (I heard).'

• Test b: When *p* is known to be true

   Similarly, both markers are infelicitous when *p* is known to be true.

(13)   Context B: I was out yesterday and it was raining for the whole day. Murat didn't know

            that I went out and came to tell me that it rained yesterday.

            # *заицп заи-ʁап*.

                rain   fall-PTCP

            'It rained (I heard).'

(14)   # *заицп заи-цр-тц*.

                rain   fall-NONF-3

            'It rained (I heard).'

   Recall that -*Ep* has a use describing the speaker's bodily functions, events happened in the speaker's dreams, etc. In those cases, one would expect the speaker to know the truthfulness or the falsity of the prejacent. Below is another example showing a similar situation (although the translation given by the consultant is clearly reportative evidential, rather than '*it turned out that*'). At this stage, I have not developed tests for evidential sentences with first-person subjects, and will

thus leave these cases aside.

(15)   *men*   *ʒʏzək-tə*   *ʊrla-**p**-pan.*

       1SG   ring-ACC   steal-NONF-1SG

       'I stole the ring (they say) (although that's a lie).'

• Test c: Cancelability

For both markers, *Evid*(*p*) is not cancelable.

(16)   # *ʒaɯɯn* *ʒau-**ʁan**,*   *burqa*   *men*   *ʒaɯɯn*   *ʒau-ʁan-ɯm*   *kør-də-m,*

       rain   fall-PTCP but   1SG   rain   fall-PTCP-1SG.POSS   see-NPST-1SG

       heʃ-kəm   *maʁan*   *ajt-pa-dɯ.*

       no-someone   1SG.DAT say-NEG-PST

       'It rained (I heard), although I didn't see it and no one told me that.'

(17)   # *ʒaɯɯn* *ʒau-**ɯp-tɯ**,*   *burqa*   *men*   *ʒaɯɯn*   *ʒau-ʁan-ɯm*   *kør-də-m,*

       rain   fall-NONF-3 but   1SG   rain   fall-PTCP-1SG.POSS   see-NPST-1SG

       heʃ-kəm   *maʁan*   *ajt-pa-dɯ.*

       no-someone   1SG.DAT say-NEG-PST

       'It rained (I heard), although I didn't see it and no one told me that.'

• Test d: Projection over negation

For both markers, *Evid*(*p*) projects over negation. Meanwhile, the consultant points out that these sentences also have an interpretation where the evidential meaning disappears (Reading 2).

(18)   *ʒaɯɯn*   *ʒau-ta-**ʁan**.*

       rain   fall-NEG-PTCP

(19)   *ʒaɯɯn*   *ʒau-ta-**ɯp**-tɯ.*

       rain   fall-NEG-NONF-3

       Reading 1: 'It didn't rain (I heard).'

       Reading 2: 'It didn't rain (I checked myself).'

       But not : 'No one said that it rained.'

• Test e: Picking up by accepting or rejecting responses

For both markers, both *p* and *Evid*(*p*) can be easily picked up when the utterance is accepted, as in (21a) and (21b). As noted before, challenging the utterance involves more difficulty, and uses different phrases for '*No*' depending on how the consultant felt about the strongness of the challenge. But as shown in (21c) and (21d), both *p* and *Evid*(*p*) can be challenged.

(20)   Context: Elnara and Horzija stayed together in a windowless room for the whole day and no one else came to this room. Horzija went to another room to look for her toys for three minutes, during which Murat came in to tell Elnara that it rained and then left. Horzija came back with her toys.

       a. E to H: *ʒaɯɯn*   *ʒau-**ʁan**.*

rain   fall-PTCP

'It rained (I heard).'

      b. E to H: *ʒauɯn   ʒau-**ɯp**-tɯ.*

            rain   fall-NONF-3

            'It rained (I heard).'

(21)   a. H to E: *dʊrɯs, ʒauɯn   ʒau-dɯ.*

            correct rain   fall-PST

            'You're right, it rained.'   (20a)/(21a); (20b)/(21a)

      b. H to E: *dʊrɯs, Murat   saʁan   ajt-tɯ-p   atɯr-ʁan-ɯ-n.*

            correct M   2SG.DAT   say-PST   PROG-PTCP-3.POSS-ACC

            jesə-tə-m.

            listen-PST-1SG

            'You're right, I heard Murat saying that to you.'   (20a)/(21b); (20b)/(21b)

      c. H to E: *jaq, ʒauɯn   ʒau-ma-dɯ.   men   ʒaŋa   kør-də-m.*

            no   rain   fall-NEG-PST   1SG   just.now see-PST-1SG

            'No, it didn't rain. I looked (at outside) just now.'   (20a)/(21c); (20b)/(21c)

      d. H to E: *qalaj   bəl-e-seŋ?   senəŋ   menen   heʃ-kəm   søjles-pe-də-ʁo.*

            how   know-NPST-2SG 2SG.GEN with   no-someone talk-NEG-PST-EXCL

            'How do you know? No one talked to you.'   (20a)/(21d); (20b)/(21d)

• Test f: Embeddability

Finally, *-GAn* and *-Ep* come apart in their embeddability. *-GAn* loses its evidential use when embedded under the verb *say*, while *-Ep* can be embedded.

(22)   *Murat   ajt-ɯp   atɯr   ʒauɯn   ʒau-**ʁan**   dep.*

          M   say-NONF PROG rain   fall-PTCP   C

         'Murat is saying that it rained (he saw).'

         NOT: 'Murat is saying that it rained (he heard).'

(23)   *Murat   ajt-ɯp   atɯr   ʒauɯn   ʒau-**ɯp**-tɯ   dep.*

          M   say-NONF PROG rain   fall-NONF-3   C

         'Murat is saying that it rained (he heard).'

         NOT: 'Murat is saying that it rained (he saw).'

The results are summarized in the following table.

Table 2: Results of Matthewson et al. (2007)'s tests on Qaraqalpaq reportatives

	Modal analysis	Illoc. analysis	*-GAn*	*-Ep*
Felicitous if *p* is known to be false?	no	yes	no	no
Felicitous if *p* is known to be true?	no	yes	no	no

Evid(p) cancelable?	no	no	no	no
Evid(p) projects over negation?	yes	yes	yes	yes
Evid(p) can be picked up?	yes	no	yes	yes
Embeddable?	yes	no	no	yes

3. Discussion

Overall, it seems that both reportative evidential markers behave like epistemic modals, at least in terms of most of the tests applied. In particular, the results on *-Ep* is completely as predicted by the epistemic modal analysis.

The reportative marker *-GAn* shows one seemingly non-modal-like property, i.e. it cannot be embedded, while it behaves like an epistemic modal in all other respects. However, if we consider the behavior of *-GAn* in non-root clauses, viz. when it serves merely as a participle, a functional explanation may arise. To see this, consider (24), where there are two occurrences of *-GAn*, one of which helps form nominalization in the *when*-clause, and the other attaches to the light verb *tʊr*. It is quite clear that neither of them expresses evidentiality or present perfect (both clauses are about future events).

(24)　*jerteŋ*　　*sen*　　*dala-ɾa*　　　　*ʃɯq-**qan**-ɯŋ-da,*　　　*qar*　*ʒaw-ɯp*
　　　tomorrow　2SG　outside-DAT　　　exit-PTCP-2SG.POSS-COND　snow　fall-NONF

　　　*tʊr-**ʁan***　　　*bol-a-dɯ.*
　　　PROG-PTCP　　　be-NPST-3

　　　'Tomorrow when you go out, it will be snowing.'

I speculate that this is an indication for how to map the evidential *-GAn* in syntax: it needs to sit at a position where it is high enough to avoid over-generating the evidential (as well as the perfect) meaning in non-root clauses such as (24), and also below the functional projections to avoid functioning as an illocutionary operator.

4. Summary

This note provided the paradigm of reportative evidentials in Qaraqalpaq. Specifically, I applied the standard tests to identify the status of the evidential markers as modals or illocutionary operators. The tentative result is that the two reportative markers behave largely in line with epistemic modals, although more needs to be said regarding why *-GAn* exhibits non-modal-like behaviors regarding embeddability.

References

Izvorski, R. (1997). The present perfect as an epistemic modal. In Semantics and Linguistic Theory, volume 7, pages 222–239.

Matthewson, Lisa, Davis, Henry, and Rullmann, Hotze. (2007). Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St'át'imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, 7(1):201–254.

Straughn, C. A. (2011). *Evidentiality in Uzbek and Kazakh.* PhD thesis, University of Chicago.

Yang, M. (2024). A note on inferential evidentials in Qaraqalpaq. In 言語文化共同研究プロジェクト (自然言語への理論的アプローチ) / 2023, 21–29.