In this talk I argue that Aymara does not possess an evidential system as part of the grammar with markers for direct, reportative and indirect-inferential evidentiality. Hardman (1986) described the particles, -wa, saña and –tayna as evidential markers for the respective evidential value. I present alternative interpretations as modus sensitive focus marker for –wa, as full verb with the meaning of ‘to say’ for saña and as temporal marker setting the event time before the time of realization for –tayna. The alternative analyses are based on original field work in La Paz/Bolivia. A questionnaire was elaborated which set sentences containing the above particles in evidential contexts.

Structure of the talk
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2. Previous research
3. Elaboration of the questionnaire
4. Questionnaire Results
5. Alternative analyses

1. Aymara
- SOV
- Jaqi language family
- Spoken in Bolivia, Peru and northern Chile by about 3 million people
- Polysynthetic
- Four grammatical persons (in-/exclusion of speaker and addressee)
- Subject and Object agreement
- Tenses: general tense (non-future), future, two past tenses

| - Tenses are claimed to mark evidentiality |

2. Previous Research on Evidentiality in Aymara
- Hardman (1986): three-way evidential system
  o Direct evidentiality: -wa attaches to any constituent but the direct object, restricted to one occurrence per clause:

(1) jupa-w ut unj-i.
    s/he-wa house see-ST.3>3
  'She saw the house.'  (the speaker saw her looking at the house)

(Hardman 1986)
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- Reportative evidentiality: $saña$ always in sentence final position:

(2) waliki-w $sa$-$sa$-$w$ si.
   Good-wa say-SUB-wa say:ST.3>3
   'It is Good!' (told to the speaker by somebody else)

(Hardman 1986)

- Indirect-inferential evidentiality: $-tayna$ verbal inflection which sets an event in a distant past, has a mirativity interpretation. As $-tayna$ is the most frequent form of the Far Distant tense I will use $-tayna$ to refer to that tense.

(3) Jupax ut $unjatayna$.
   s/he house see-FD.3>3
   'She must have seen the house.'

The three particles are morphologically diverse and therefore do not constitute a uniform evidential system.

3. Elaboration of the questionnaire

In constructing the questionnaire I followed Matthewson (2004).

- Sentence-context pairs
  - Sentences marked with one of the particle under discussion
  - Contexts state the evidential basis on which the speaker makes his statement

Sentence marked with $-wa$:

(4) Pedro-$x$ $cervez uman-t-i$-$wa$.
   Pedro-xa beer drink-EXT-ST.3>3-wa
   'Pedro drank beer.'

Direct evidential context:
   'Usually Pedro does not drink beer. In the afternoon Pedro and Miguel meet in a café and this time Pedro drinks a beer. Afterwards Miguel meets another friend and tells him...'

Sentence marked with $saña$:

(5) Pedro-$x$ $cervez uman-t-i$ $situ$-$wa$.
   Pedro-xa beer drink-EXT-ST.3 say:ST.3>1-wa
   'Pedro drank beer.'

Reportative evidential context:
   'Usually Pedro does not drink beer. In the afternoon Pedro and Miguel meet in a café and this time Pedro drinks a beer. Afterwards Miguel meets another friend and tells him about it. The other friend tells Maria afterwards...'

Sentence marked with $-tayna$:

(6) Pedro-$x$ $cervezuman-ta$-$tayna$.
   Pedro-xa beer drink-EXT-FD.3>3
   'Pedro drank beer.'
Indirect-inferential context:
'Usually Pedro does not drink beer. In the afternoon Miguel meets Pedro in a cafe. He takes notice that in front of Pedro there is an empty bottle of beer on the table. Therefore he assumes that Pedro has drunken beer. Afterwards Miguel meets another friend and tells him...'

- 3 (sets of sentences) x 3 (markers) x 3 (contexts) = 27 sentence-context pairs
- 24 interviews in and around La Paz/Bolivia
- Sentences were presented in Aymara and contexts in Spanish
- Interviewees were asked to state whether a sentence in a context was acceptable

4. Questionnaire Results

Predicted results:

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aymara sentence containing –wa or –tayna</th>
<th>direct context</th>
<th>reportative context</th>
<th>indirect-inferential context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aymara sentence containing –wa</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aymara sentence containing –saña</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aymara sentence containing –tayna</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers indicate the absolute number of positive answers, the percentages in parenthesis give the relative number of positive answers. The three lines in each cell correspond to the different sets of sentences.

- Predictions are not born out for –wa and –tayna

Actual results:
Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>direct context</th>
<th>reportative context</th>
<th>indirect-inferential context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aymara sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>containing -wa</td>
<td>24 (100%)</td>
<td>14 (58,33%)</td>
<td>10 (41,66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (91,6%)</td>
<td>16 (66,66%)</td>
<td>14 (58,33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 (95,83%)</td>
<td>9 (37,5%)</td>
<td>5 (20,83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aymara sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>containing -saña</td>
<td>4 (16,6%)</td>
<td>23 (95,83%)</td>
<td>1 (4,16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1(4,16%)</td>
<td>22 (91,6%)</td>
<td>5 (20,83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (16,6%)</td>
<td>23 (95,83%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aymara sentence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>containing -tayna</td>
<td>15 (62,50%)</td>
<td>22 (91,6%)</td>
<td>13 (54,16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (58,33%)</td>
<td>17 (70,83%)</td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 (50%)</td>
<td>20 (83,33%)</td>
<td>14 (58,33%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three may co-occur with each other:

(7) Jupa-w jupa-r satayna.  
  s/he-wa him-BEN say.FD.3>3  
  'He told him.'  
  (Yapita & Van der Noordaa 2008 p. 152)

Interim summary:

1. –wa and –tayna do not behave semantically like direct and indirect-inferred evidentials, respectively
2. Saña does behave semantically like a reportative but syntactically it is a verb, as will be shown below.

So if the three particles are not evidential markers, what are they?

5. Alternative Analyses

To corroborate further that we do not deal with evidential markers in this section I present alternative functions for –wa, saña and –tayna. As the data collection didn’t set out to research those alternative functions this is only tentative.

-wa:

-wa is a mood sensitive focus marker:

(8) Q: K’´iti-sa?  
  who-Q  
  ‘Who?’

A: Mariya-w wawa-r t´ant´ chur-i.  
  Maria-wa baby-GOAL bread give-ST.3>3  
  ‘Mary gave the baby bread.’  
  (Hardman 2001)
Claudius Klose

Non-Evidentiality in Aymara

The Nature of Evidentiality

(9)
Q: K’¨iti-ru-sa?
   who-GOAL-Q
   ‘To whom?’

A: Mariya-x wawa-ru-w t´ant´ chur-i.
   Maria-xa baby-GOAL-wa bread give-ST.3>3
   ‘Mary gave the baby bread.’

(Hardman et al. 1988)

(10)
Q: Kun-s chur-i?
   what-Q.give-ST.3>3
   ‘What did she give?’

A: Mariya-x wawa-r t´ant`-∅ chur-i
   Maria-xa baby-GOAL bread-wa give-ST.3>3
   ‘Mary gave the baby bread.’

(Hardman et al. 1988)

-wa doesn’t occur in questions (11-12) nor with imperatives (13-14):

(11) *Kuna-s jupa-n sut-pa-wa?
    What-Q s/he-POSS name-POSS.3P-wa
    ‘What is his name?’

(12) Kuna-s jupa-n sut-pa-xa?
    What-Q s/he-POSS name-POSS.3P-xa
    ‘What is his name?’

(13) *Sara-ma-wa.
    Go-IMP-wa
    ‘Go!’

(14) Sara-m.
    Go-IMP
    ‘Go!’

- Why was –wa misinterpreted as direct evidential?
  It only occurs in declarative sentences, not in questions nor in commands and in
  negated sentences it is restricted to the negation particle.
- Uni-directional implication:
  Sentences based on direct evidence $\rightarrow$ –wa.
  But not: -wa $\rightarrow$ Sentences is based on direct evidence

Soña:
- not an evidential marker as part of the grammatical system, but a full verb
- according to two of four criteria stated by Anderson (1986) verbs are not evidential markers:
Criteria b. Evidentials are not themselves the main predication of the clause, but are rather a specification added to a factual claim about something else.

Criteria d. Morphologically, evidentials are inflections, clitics, or other free syntactic elements (not compounds or derivational forms).

- According to these criteria a full verb does not count as evidential marker in the narrow sense. *Saña* is to be analyzed as full verb for the following reasons:
  a. The 3<3 form of *saña*, *si* is the only one syllable verb in Aymara and probably therefore claimed to be phonologically reduced and grammaticized.
  b. *saña* can be inflected:\footnote{See Yapita & Van der Noordaa (2008) for paradigms for all tenses.}

Table 3 – the simple tense paradigm for *saña*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sissma – jissma – ssma</th>
<th>‘I say to you’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sista</td>
<td>‘you say to me’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>‘she says to him’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sista – jista – sta</td>
<td>‘I say to him/her/them’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistan – jistan – stan</td>
<td>‘we say to him/her/them’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situ</td>
<td>‘she says to me’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistu</td>
<td>‘she says to us’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sista – jista – sta</td>
<td>‘you say to him/her/them’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sistam – jistam – stam</td>
<td>‘she says to you’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  c. *saña* is always in sentence-final position
  d. *saña* can take other suffixes such as –*wa* (15).

(15) Sarañani si-wa
go.FUT.4>3 say-ST.3>3-wa
'We will go he said to him'

e. *Saña* licenses a bi-clausal structure (matrix-/embedded clause) as the double occurrence of suffixes becomes possible which occurrences are limited to one per clause:

(16) waliki-w sa-sa-w si.
Good-wa say-SUB-wa say:ST.3>3
'O.K., she said.'

(1986)

- *-tayna*:

  - Used to describe events in a distant past but the event can be modified by temporal adverbial ‘yesterday’:
Maria-x masuru-x um apt-iri-w sara-tayna.
Maria-xa yesterday-xa water bring-PURP-wa go-FD.3>3
'Maria went yesterday to get water.'

Alternative account:

-tayna sets the event time before the point at which the speaker realizes (epistemically), $P_R$ that the event took place: $ET < P_R$

Picture 1: time line of the event described by (17)

ET: Maria goes to get water
$\downarrow$
$X$

$P_R$: Speaker gets to know p.
$\downarrow$
$X$

$UT$
$\downarrow$
$X$

a. The past reading comes about by the precedence-relation between ET and $P_R$.
b. The non-direct evidentiality is entailed by the fact that the speaker cannot have witnessed the event as $P_R$ lies after ET.

-tayna can be also used to express mirativity (18)

Aka larankha k'allk'u-tayna-wa.
this orange sour-FD.3>3-wa
‘This orange is sour.’ (contrary to what I thought before tasting it)

- The mirative use arises if the UT coincides with $P_R$.

Summary:

1. The three-way evidential system as proposed by Hardman (1986) cannot be maintained.
2. The results of the questionnaire showed that:
   - $wa$ & -tayna do not behave like direct and indirect evidentials, respectively
   - Saña behaves semantically like a reportative evidential but is syntactically a verb
3. Alternative accounts for $wa$, saña and -tayna were given:
   - $wa$ is a mood sensitive focus marker
   - Saña is a full verb with the meaning of ‘to say’
   - -tayna marks a temporal relation setting ET before $P_R$
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