The evidential system in Sihuas Quechua: personal vs. shared knowledge

Diane Hintz
SIL International

diane_hintz@sil.org

1   Introduction

Studies on Quechua evidential enclitics generally focus on =*mi* 'direct evidence', =*shi* 'reported evidence', and =*chi* (or a variant) 'conjecture' (Adelaar 1977, Weber 1986, Floyd 1999, Faller 2002, and others). Sihuas Quechua (SQ) has three <u>pairs</u> of markers:

$$=mi \text{ vs. } =ma, \quad =shi \text{ vs. } =sha, \quad =ćhi \text{ vs. } =ćha ,$$
$$=chaq,$$

and stacking of some markers on the stem (=*mi*=*sha*, and =*ćhi*=*ma*)

Altogether, the system consists of 7 single evidential markers and two sets of stacked markers. The main focus of this paper is to determine what =*ma* is doing that is different from =*mi*, what =*sha* is does differently from =*shi*, what = *ćha* is does that is distinct from =*ćhi*. The additional evidential, =*chaq,* occurs only in my elicited data (see fn 3). At the end of the paper I touch on the functions of the stacked markers.

Overview of characteristics of Quechua evidential markers (Hintz 2007:69-70):
=*mi* implies that speakers have direct evidence of what is being stated and
        that they are convinced that what they are stating is absolutely true.
=*shi* is used with reported, secondhand information, generally making no claims
         as to its reliability.
=*chi* indicates that the source of evidence is the speaker's inference, based on their own
         analysis of generally known facts, a type of conjecture. The use of =*chi* indicates
         the speaker's evaluation that the statement is probably true.

Evidential characteristics, in relation to source of information
                (direct personal experience, report, inference),
Epistemic modality characteristics, in relation to speaker evaluation of certainty of the
                information (certain, probable or possible).

Sihuas Quechua:
• spoken in the highlands of central Peru by about 6,000 people, unstudied until recently
• 2010 and 2011, Dan Hintz and I made recordings of naturally-occurring SQ speech
• transcribed the recordings with the assistance of four native speakers
• the data consist of: a conversation, (12½ minutes),
                a personal history monologue, (15 minutes),
                2 oral reports (11 minutes total),
                a folktale (2 minutes),
                a short speech (⅔ minute),
                a short prayer (1½ minutes), and
                elicited data, where I anticipated there were holes

Table 1. FREQUENCIES OF EVIDENTIAL MARKERS IN MONOLOGUE AND DIALOGUE

Frequency	=*mi* 'DIR1'	=*ma* 'DIR2'	=*shi* 'RPT1'	=*sha* 'RPT2'	= *ćhi* 'CNJ1'	=*ćha* 'CNJ2'
monologue	53	--	3	--	--	3
dialogue	11	36	10	4	4	26

2   =*mi* 'DIR1' vs. =*ma* 'DIR2'

• =*mi* and =*ma* both indicate that the source of information is the speaker's direct experience, and that the speaker is completely certain of what he is communicating.
• =*mi* 'DIR1' is used in all genres, but =*ma* 'DIR2' is used only in conversation.

2.1   =*mi* 'DIR1'

• to make assertive, often forceful statements that sometimes have the rhetorical effect of announcements, and
• with direct personal knowledge or personal commitment,
   –when speakers assert that they have personally witnessed an event, (1),
   –when they state with total certainty that something is the way it is, (2) or
   –when they avow to personally make certain an event will take place in the future, (3).

(1)   =*mi* 'DIR1' assertive statement, personal knowledge   (festival conversation)

   *Shamu-ra-n=**mi**   alkaldi Julio.*
   come-PST-3=**DIR1** mayor Julio
   'Julio, the mayor, came=**mi**.'

(2)   =*mi* 'DIR1' assertive statement, personal knowledge   (festival conversation)

   *Reunion-ne:=**mi** ka-Ø-n Sihuas-ćho:.*
    meeting-1=**DIR1** be-PRS-3 Sihuas-LOC
   'My meeting=**mi** is in Sihuas.'

(3)   =*mi* 'DIR1' assertive statement, personal commitment   (report Sep 2010)

   *"Ya,   ware:=**mi**, || .. aywa-Ø-: promocion-ta   rura-q,"* || *ni-shka-:.*
    OK, tomorrow=**DIR1**   go-PRS-   promotion-OBJ do-PRMT   say-PST.R-1
   ' "OK, tomorrow=**mi** I will go to do promotion," I said.'

2.2   =*ma* 'DIR2'

• =*mi* 'DIR1' with first-hand knowledge that the speakers are certain of, that is, *personal* knowledge.
• =*ma* 'DIR2' with knowledge that both the speaker and at least one other person have acquired first-hand and are certain of, that is, *shared* knowledge.
• =*ma* 'DIR2', unlike =*mi* 'DIR1', is never used with the future, but only with states or events in the past or the present.
• Each of the 36 times =*ma* 'DIR2' occurs in the conversation it is in a response of some type, often confirming what the interlocutor has said.

(4) =*ma* 'DIR2' a confirming response, shared knowledge   (festival conversation)

  1 C: …*Rumpi-ćho:*   *mana-ku tushu-yka-ya-ra-:*   *no:-kuna-pis.*
        Opening.night-LOC no-Q.P   dance-CONT-PL.V-PST-1 I-PL.N-EVEN
        'Didn't we too (exclusive) dance on the opening night of the festival?'

  2 E: *Aw=__ma__ chay-ćho:=__ma__ || tushu-y-kaq-ta   rika-ski-ra-: no:-pis.*
       yes=__DIR2__ that-LOC=__DIR2__ dance-INF-DEF-OBJ see-PFV-PST-1 I-EVEN
       'Yes=**ma**, I saw you dancing there=**ma**.'

(5) =*ma* 'DIR2' a response, shared knowledge with interlocutor and people from the
    interlocutor's village   (festival conversation)

  E: *No:-kuna-man-pis=__ma__ shamu-ra-n chay artista*,
     I-PL.N-ALL-EVEN=__DIR2__ come-PST-3 that artist,
     'That artist came to us too=**ma** (to the people of Edilberto's community) (to sing).'

(6) =*ma* 'DIR2' response to a question, knowledge shared with others at the festival
    (festival conversation)

  1 C: *.. Ayka   pacha:ka-taq   ka-ra-n.*
       how.many group.of.pachaque.dancers-Q.C be-PST-3
       'How many groups of *pachaque* dancers were there?'

  2 E: *Ka-shqa=__ma__   nue:ve.*
       be- PST.R3=__DIR2__ nine
       'There were=**ma** nine.' (Edilberto and the townsfolk had seen them.)

Characteristics of both of the direct experience markers:
- the source of information is the speaker's direct experience
- the speaker is completely certain of what he is communicating

Differences between the two direct experience markers:
- =*mi* 'DIR1' is used with assertive statements; =*ma* 'DIR2' is used with responses
- =*mi* 'DIR1' with personal knowledge; =*ma* 'DIR2' is used with shared knowledge[1]
- =*mi* 'DIR1' in all genres; =*ma* 'DIR2' only in conversation.

3   =*shi* 'RPT1' vs. =*sha* 'RPT2'

  =*shi* 'RPT1' and =*sha* 'RPT2' are both used with information that is reported.
  =*shi* 'RPT1'is used in several genres, but =*sha* 'RPT2' is used only in conversation.

3.1   =*shi* 'RPT1'

  =*shi* 'RPT1' is used with information that has been reported to the speaker. It is used
with secondhand information, generally with no claims as to its reliability.

(7) =*shi* 'RPT1' information reported to the speaker   (festival conversation)

  E: *Chay-pita=__shi__ mas o menos banda,*
     that-ABL=__RPT1__ more or less   band,
     'The band from there=**shi** was of average quality.'

(8) =*shi* 'RPT1' information reported to the speaker   (festival conversation)

  E: *Santa Clara-ćho:=__shi__ entrada-wan   ka-ra-n pero no sé,*
    Santa Clara-LOC=__RPT1__ entrance.fee-COM be-PST-3 but no I.know
    'There was an entrance fee in Santa Clara=**shi** but I don't know.'

3.2   =*sha* 'RPT2'

- =*sha* 'RPT2' conveys, 'I know, because this is customary and people are saying it.'

(9) =*sha* 'RPT2'   reported, shared knowledge   (festival conversation)

  E: *Warantinchika=__sha__   celebra-shqa misa-ta chay-ćho:.*
    the.following.day=__RPT2__ celebrate-PST.R3 mass-OBJ that-LOC
    'The following day=**sha** he celebrated mass there.'

(10)=*sha* 'RPT2'   reported, shared knowledge   (festival conversation)

   E: *"Pachulka-pa=__sha__   pa:sa-n" ni-ya-ra-n*
     Pachavilca-GEN=__RPT2__ pass-3   say-PL.V-PST-3
     ' "It (the van) will come to Pachavilca=**sha**" they said.'

(11)=*shi* 'RPT1' vs. =*sha* 'RPT2'   (festival conversation)

  1 C: *.. Y   pay-ta-pis   invita-:,*
      and her-OBJ-EVEN invite-1
      'And I invited her too,'

  2 *Pay-qa=__shi__   mana pue:di-n-ku.*
      she-TOP=__RPT1__ no   can-3-NEG
      'She=**shi** can't come.' (she said to me)

  3 E: *Aw=ma,*
     yes=DIR2
     'Yes,'

  4 *A: mana=__sha__ pue:di-ya-n.*
      oh.yes no=__RPT2__ can-PL.V-3
      'Oh yes, they can't=**sha** come.' (Everyone there heard her, and we all know that.)

Comparion of =*shi* 'RPT1' and =*sha* 'RPT2':
- =*shi* 'RPT1' is used for knowledge that was reported to an individual
- =*sha* 'RPT2' is used with reported knowledge that is shared among the members of a
  social group.
- Speakers make no claims about the certainty of knowledge they mark with =*shi* 'RPT1'.
- They are certain of knowledge marked with =*sha* 'RPT2', due to corroborating talk by
  members of the social group.

4 =ćhi 'CNJ1' vs. =ćha 'CNJ2'

- The conjecture marker appears in various forms in Quechua, =chi, =cha, =ćhi or =ćha [2], depending on the dialect (Floyd 1999:94).
- Sihuas has not just one, but three markers, =ćhi 'CNJ1', =ćha 'CNJ2' and =chaq 'CNJ3'. [3] All of them pose conjectural (CNJ) queries. [4]

4.1 =ćhi 'CNJ1'

- In each instance of =ćhi 'CNJ1' in the conversation, the utterance poses a conjectural query, and gets an immediate, definitive answer to the question from the interlocutor. Usually the speech participants are already talking about the issue, when one wants confirmation from the other (or others).
- =ćhi 'CNJ1' is used with a personal conjecture, in that the person posing the query assumes that what he thinks is right, but does not know for sure.
- In each of the four occurences, the question is polar, and gets an affirmative response. The interlocutor knows the answer and confirms what the speaker suggests. [5]

(12) =ćhi 'CNJ1' conjectural query anticipating confirmation   (festival conversation)

   1 C: *Um,|| .. Sacse:-pita Dalin Velasquez,*
       um,   .. Sacsay-ABL Dalin Velasquez
       'Dalin Velasquez from Sacsay,

   2 *ni-ma-ra-n=ma, || ...um Profesor Yovani=ma chay-ta apa-n.*
       say-1-PST-3=DIR2   um Professor Yovani=DIR2 that-OBJ take-3
       Professor Yovani told me he would take him.'

   3 E: *A: pay=**ćh[i]**.*
       oh.yes him=**CNJ1**
       'Oh yes, him=**ćhi**.'

   4 C: [*A:,*]
             oh.yes
             'Oh yes.'

(13) =ćhi 'CNJ1' conjectural query anticipating confirmation   (festival conversation)

   1 C: *Sas-lla=**ćhi**.*
       quickly-DLM=**CNJ1**
       'Quickly=**ćhi**?' (Did it burn quickly?)

   2 E: *Peru simpli-lla.*
       but quickly-DLM
       'But quickly.'

   3 C: *A:.*
       oh.yes
       'Oh yes.'

- =ćhi 'CNJ1' gets an immediate, definitive answer and is used only in conversation.
- Language consultants volunteered additional examples and explained that when they use =ćhi 'CNJ1', they want a definitive answer.

4.2 =ćha 'CNJ2'

Conjectural queries marked by =ćha 'CNJ2' are requests for discussion, and are often stated in the form of probabilities. The speaker wants help with figuring out the issue and wants to talk about it. As the two (or more) people talk together, sometimes they get to an answer, and sometimes they are not able to figure it out between them. In a sense, =ćha 'CNJ2' marks shared conjecture.

(14) =ćha 'CNJ2' a request for discussion, shared conjecture   (festival conversation)

   1 C: *Si ishkan aywa-ya-pti-n-qa=**ćha** [allish]* —
       if two   go-PL.V-DS-3-TOP=**CNJ2** great
       'If they both go=**ćha**, that would be great.'

   2 E: [*Imano:-taq*] *chay, || Allish-ku canta-Ø-n?*
                    how-Q.C   that   great-Q.P sing-PRS-3
                    'How is that one?   Does she sing well?'

   3 C: *Yurisa?*
       Yurisa
       'Yurisa?'

   4 E: *Aw.*
       yes
       'Yes.'

   5 C: *Aw.*
       yes
       'Yes.' (she sings well)

---

[2] The last two are with the retroflexed affricate.

[3] The evidential enclitic, =chaq 'CNJ3', does not occur in the corpus. However, language consultants gave me examples of its use. When =chaq is used in a question, the speaker has good reason to believe that the answer will be in the affirmative. For instance, if Edilberto sees adobe bricks being brought into Deborah's vacant lot, he could ask Tomás, "*Wasinta ruranqachaq*?" 'Is she going to build her house?' The interlocutor may or may not know the answer. The few examples I have of this enclitic indicate that it marks inference, based on either visible evidence or reasoning.

[4] Neither the Y/N question marker (-*ku*) nor the content question marker (-*taq*) is ever used in the same sentence with either of these two conjectural query markers. This contrasts with findings for the three Amerindian languages studied by Littell, Matthewson and Peterson (2010): St'át'imcets (Lillooet Salish), NiePkepmxcín (Thompson Salish), and Gitksan (Tsimshianic). In their study of conjectural questions in these languages, conjecture marker is used *together with* the Y/N question marker and also together with the content question marker.

[5] Clever, one of my language consultants, explained that in the case of more than one interlocutor, the speaker knows that at least one of them is going to know the answer.

(15) =*ćha* 'CNJ2'   a request for discussion, shared conjecture   (festival conversation)

1 E: *Mayqan=**ćha** gana-ra-n?*
    which=**CNJ2** win-PST-3
    'Which=**ćha** won?'

2 C: *Um, || ... Huayllabamba-ku-sh   ima-sh.*
      Huayllabamba-Q.P-RPT1 what-RPT1
      'Huayllabamba, I think.' (according to other people, among various
                   possibilities)

(16) =*ćha* 'CNJ2'   a request for discussion, shared conjecture   (festival conversation)

1 C: *...Ma: imano:=**ćha**,*
    Let's.see how=**CNJ2**
    'Let's see, how=**ćha** (would it be),

2   *No:-pis mana wiya-shqa-:-ku.*
    I-EVEN no hear-PST.R3-1-NEG
    I also haven't heard them (play).

3   *"Allish" ni-ya-Ø-n pay-kuna.*
    great say-PL.V-PRS-3 he-PL.N
    They themselves say they are great.

4   [*Um.*]
    um

5 E: [*Um.*] <L2> *Debe ser.* </L2>
    um   must be
    '[Um.] Must be.'

- In (17), several instances of =*ćha* 'CNJ2' occur in close succession. A lengthy discussion of almost four minutes follows.
- When both speech participants use =*ćha* 'CNJ2' successively like this, they may be inviting each other to thoroughly discuss the matter.

(17) =*ćha* 'CNJ2'   a request for discussion, shared conjecture   (festival conversation)

1 E: *…Qam-kuna-qa imano:-taq fiesta-yki-kuna-paq.*
    you-PL.N-TOP how-Q.C   festival-2-PL.N-PURP
    'You all, how about your festival.'

2 C: *…(H) No:-pis mayordomo   ka-Ø-:.*
      I-EVEN one.in.charge be-1
      'I am the one in charge.'

3 E: *… Y cualquiera forma=**ćha** pa:sa-nki.*
    and whatever way=**CNJ2** do-PRS-2
            'And in whatever way=**ćha**, you will do it.'

4 C: *… Chay=**ćha**. || Como sea, || ..“Pa:sa-shaq” ni-yka:=ma,*
    that=**CNJ2**   how be   do-FUT1   say-CONT=DIR2
    'That=**ćha**. || However it is, || I'm saying with certainty, "I will do it." '

5 E: *… May-pita=**ćha** .. apa-chi-nki banda-ta.*
    where-ABL=**CNJ2** bring-CAUS-2 band-OBJ
    'From where=**ćha** will you bring the band.'

Distinctions between =*ćhi* 'CNJ1' and =*ćha* 'CNJ2':
- =*ćhi* 'CNJ1' is used in asking for immediate, definitive confirmation on something the speaker thinks is probable. It marks personal conjecture.
- =*ćha* is used to request discussion on a conjectural matter that the interlocutor generally doesn't have the answer to either.[6] It marks shared conjecture.

5   Evidentials in combination

Evidentials can be combined in Sihuas Quechua, as has also been observed in some other languages (Valenzuela 2003 for Shipibo-Konibo, LaPolla 2003 for Qiang, and Cheung et al. for Japanese).

5.1 =*mi* 'DIR1' + =*sha* 'REP2'

- In (18) and (19), =*mi* 'DIR1' and =*sha* 'REP2' are used together at the point when the speaker discovers, and is surprised by, something already known by the interlocutor(s).
- It is not uncommon that grammatical devices used to express evidentiality also express mirativity (Aksu-Koç and Slobin 1986, DeLancey 1997, 2001, Lazard 1999, 2001, Dickenson 2000, Aikhenvald 2004, and Peterson 2010 *inter alia*). It may be unusual for two evidential markers to be used in combination to convey surprise.

---

[6] Like in Sihuas Quechua, when Cusco Quechua speakers use the conjecture marker -*chá*, cognate to =*ćha*, they also do not expect the addressee to know the answer (Faller, 2003:26).

(18) =*mi* 'DIR1' + =*sha* 'REP2' surprise, counter-expectation

   Qam-lla=__mi__=__sha__   *usha-nki lechuga-:-ta.*
   you-DLM=__DIR1__=__RPT2__ finish-2   lettuce-1-OBJ
   'You=**mi**=**sha** are the one who has been finishing off my lettuce!' (and not another
    animal like I thought)

(19) =*mi* 'DIR1' + =*sha* 'REP2' surprise, counter-expectation (scenario)

   Chay=__mi__=__sha__   *mana pue:di-n-ku aru-y-ta.*
   that=__DIR1__=__RPT2__ not   can-3-NEG work-INF-OBJ
   'That=**mi**=**sha** is why he can't work.'

5.2   =*ćhi* 'CNJ1' + =*ma* 'DIR2'

- The only other evidentials which can be combined are =*ćhi* 'CNJ1' and =*ma* 'DIR2'.
- The use of this set marks an invitation to share in "wondering" about a question.
- These two enclitics combined (stacked) mark shared certainty that a clear yes or no
  answer will surface in time, though the interlocutors do not know what that answer is yet.
- Recall that =*ma* 'DIR2' marks shared certainty, and =*ćhi* 'CNJ1' marks a request for a
  definitive yes or no answer.

(20)= *ćhi* 'CNJ1'+ =*ma* 'DIR2' wondering

   1 E: *Ca:rro ka-nqa=__ćhi__=__ma__*?
        car   be-FUT3=__CNJ1__=__DIR2__
        'Will there be=**ćhi**=**ma** transportation?'

   2 T: *Ka-nqa-ku-raq? Imano:-ćha*?
        be-FUT3-Q.P-YET how-CNJ2
        'Will there be? How (will it be)?'

6   Conclusions

- Sihuas Quechua evidential markers carry more meaning than just source of evidence and
  speaker's evaluation of the certainty of the information.
- They also indicate whether the information is personal or shared.
- Some of them have interactional components to their meanings:
    =*ma* 'DIR2' marks a confirming response.
    =*ćhi* 'CNJ1' marks a request for confirmation.
    =*ćha* 'CNJ2' marks a request for discussion.
- They can also be combined (stacked) for other communicative functions:
    =*mi* 'DIR1' + =*sha* 'RPT2' marks surprise
    =*ćhi* 'CNJ1' + =*ma* 'DIR2' marks "wondering" about a question

Table 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF SIHUAS QUECHUA EVIDENTIAL ENCLITICS

	=*mi* 'DIR1'	=*ma* 'DIR2'	=*shi* 'RPT1'	=*sha* 'RPT2'	=*ćhi* 'CNJ1'	=*ćha* 'CNJ2'
source of evidence	direct	direct	reported	reported	assumed	assumed
level of certainty	certain	certain	--	certain	probable	probable
personal/ shared	personal (assertion)	shared (response)	personal 1 told 1	shared by the group	personal conjecture (confirm for me)	shared conjecture (talk with me about it)

In relation to advancing our understanding of evidentiality in language, this study has raised
some questions we may want to be asking:

- Are personal knowledge and shared knowledge marked distinctly?
- Does part of the meaning of a marker have to do with interaction?

References

Adelaar, Willem F.H. 1977. *Tarma Quechua: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Aksu-Koç, Ayhan A. and Dan I. Slobin. 1986. A Psychological Account of the Development and Use of Evidentials in Turkish. In Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology,* 159-167. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cheung, Jackie C.K., Michael Leung, Amie Yang, Diana Xing, and Jane Tse. 2010. Variation in Restrictions on Multiple Evidential Markers in Japanese by Speaker Age. In Tyler Peterson and Uli Sauerland (eds.), *Evidence from evidentials,* 29-40. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 28. Vancouver, Canada.

DeLancey, Scott. 1997. Mirativity: the grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1: 33-52.

DeLancey, Scott. 2001. The mirative and evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 369-382.

Dickinson, Connie. 2000. Mirativity in Tsafiki. *Studies in Language* 24.2: 379-421.

Faller, Martina T. 2002. Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cusco Quechua. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

Floyd, Rick. 1999. *The Structure of Evidential categories in Wanka Quechua*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.

Hintz, Daniel J. 2006. La evidencialidad y la co-construcción del conocimiento en el quechua del sur de Conchucos. Paper presented at the 52nd International Congress of Americanists, Seville, Spain, July 2006.

Hintz, Diane M. 2007. Past tense forms and their functions in South Conchucos Quechua: time, evidentiality, discourse structure, and affect. Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Santa Barbara. http://repositories.cdlib.org/pacrim/Quechua/

LaPolla, Randy J. 2003. Evidentiality in Qiang. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Studies in Evidentiality*, 63-78. Amsterdam and Philadelpha: John Benjamins.

Lazard, Gilbert. 1999. Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other? *Linguistic Typology* 3: 91-109.

Lazard, Gilbert. 2001. On the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 359-367.

Little, Patrick, Lisa Matthewson and Tyler Peterson. 2010. On the Semantics of Conjectural Questions. In Tyler Peterson and Uli Sauerland (eds.), *Evidence from evidentials,* 89-104. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 28. Vancouver, Canada.

Peterson, Tyler. 2010. Examining the Mirative and Nonliteral Uses of Evidentials. In Tyler Peterson and Uli Sauerland (eds.), *Evidence from evidentials,* 129-159. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 28. Vancouver, Canada.

Valenzuela, Pilar M. 2003. Evidentiality in Shipibo-Konibo, with a comparative overview of the category in Panoan. In Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. and R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *Studies in Evidentiality*, 33-61. Amsterdam and Philadelpha: John Benjamins.

Weber, David J. 1986. Information Perspective, Profile, and Patterns in Quechua. In Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, 137-158. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex.

Glossing abbreviations for Sihuas Quechua

1	-:	first person (verbal/nonverbal)
2	-nki	second person (verbal)
3	-n	third person (verbal/nonverbal)
ABL	-pita	ablative case
ALL	-man	allative case
CNJ1	-ćhi	conjecture evidential, query for definitive answer
CNJ2	-ćha	conjecture evidential, request for discussion
CNJ3	-chaq	conjecture evidential, request to confirm an inference
COM	-wan	comitative case
CONT	-yka:	continuous aspect
DEF	-kaq	definite
DIR1	=mi	direct evidential, personal knowledge
DIR2	=ma	direct evidential, shared knowledge
DLM	-lla	delimitative
DS	-pti	adverbial, different subject
EVEN	-pis	additive, even, too
FAR	-mu	cislocative/translocative, action at a distance/from afar
FUT1	-shaq	future, first person subject
FUT3	-nqa	future, third person subject
GEN	-pa	genitive
INF	-y	infinitive
LOC	-ćho:	locative case
NEG	-ku	negative
NOW	-na	by now, already
OBJ	-ta	accusative case, direct/indirect object
PFV	-ski	perfective aspect
PL.N	-kuna	plural nonverbal
PL.V	-ya:/-ya	plural verbal
PRMT	-q	purpose complement with motion verb
PRS	-Ø	present
PST	-ra	past
PST.N	-naq	narrative past
PST.R3	-shqa	recent past (from perfect), 3rd subject, and 3rd subject > 1st object & 3rd subject > 3rd object
PURP	-pa:	purposive case
Q.C	-taq	content question
Q.P	-ku	polar question (yes/no)
RECP	-naku	reciprocal
RPT1	-shi	reportative evidential, reported by one person to speaker
RPT2	-sha	reportative evidential, shared within social group
TOP	-qa	topic
YET	-raq	yet

Transcription symbols

…	pause
–	truncated intonation unit (em dash)
[ ]	encloses overlapping speech
(H)	audible inhalation
‖	intonation unit boundary (or new line)
<L2> </L2>	code switch to another language (Spanish)