This publication is supported by La Trobe University
LA TROBE UNIVERSITY http://www.latrobe.edu.au

Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area
Volume 30.2 — October 2007

EVIDENTIALS AND EVIDENTIAL-LIKE CATEGORIES IN NDRAPA*

Shirai Satoko
Kyoto University
xirai@bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp

The Mätro dialect of the nDrapa language (Qiangic) contains both an evidential system and evidential-like categories. The evidential system distinguishes between direct, inferred and reported evidentials. The direct evidential is unmarked, but the others are marked with sentence-final particles. Evidential-like categories include the point-of-view system or the conjunct/disjunct system marked with disjunct markers, and the epistemic modality system marked with sentence-final particles. The point-of-view system often shows an evidential-like connotation and restrictions of person, although it is neither evidential nor person-marking by nature.

Keywords: Evidentials, point of view, conjunct/disjunct, modality, Qiangic.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to (1) describe the evidential phenomena of the Mätro dialect of the nDrapa language and (2) consider the system of evidentials and evidential-like categories in nDrapa.

The evidential system of nDrapa is considered to belong to the B1 type in Aikhenvald (2004: 65), which distinguishes between direct, inferred and reported evidentials. Moreover, this language has the following two evidential-like categories: (1) the point-of-view or

* This study is supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research funded by the Japan Society for Promotion of Science ("Linguistic Substratum in Tibet"; No. 16102001; headed by Yasuhiko Nagano) and by MEXT ("Areal Study of the Tibeto-Burman Languages in Southwestern China"; No. 16720087; Satoko Shirai).

conjunct/disjunct pattern, which has evidential-like connotations cross-linguistically, and (2) epistemic modality that is marked with a sentence-final particle.

Section 1.1 introduces the target language. Section 2 describes the evidential system of the language. Section 3 introduces evidential-like categories and discusses its characteristics. Finally, section 4 summarises the discussion.

1.1 The language

nDrapa (Zhaba)[1] is a member of the Qiangic language group, spoken in Western Sichuan in China[2]. This language is divided into two dialect groups: the upper dialect group and the lower dialect group[3]. The upper dialect is spoken in the southern part of Daofu County, Ganzi Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Sichuan Province, China; and the lower dialect is spoken in the northern part of Yajiang County of the same prefecture.

There have been a few previous studies involving the sketches of this language (B. Huang 1990, 1991) and its vocabulary (B. Huang et al. eds. 1992). These studies deal with the Zhatuo dialect that is spoken in the Zhatuo District (扎拖鄉) of Daofu County.

Data pertaining to the Mätro dialect of the nDrapa language is based on the information collected through the author's fieldwork. The main consultant—a woman who was born in 1945 in Mazhong Village (麻中村), Zhongni District (仲尼鄉), Zhaba Region (扎壩區), Daofu County (道孚縣)—assisted the author with her fieldwork. This paper refers to the subdialect spoken by the consultant as the "Mätro" dialect[4]. The Mätro

---

[1] This language is known as *Zhaba (扎壩, 扎巴)* (Huang 1990, 1991; H. Sun 2001; and many others). It is the Chinese translation of the Tibetan name of the place [ⁿɖapa] or [ⁿdzapa]. A part of the nDrapa community uses this Tibetan name to refer to the region inhabited by them; therefore, in this paper, nDrapa is used when referring to "the language that is used in nDrapa [place]".

[2] For details of the language group, please refer to H. Sun (2001) and LaPolla (2003a).

[3] The terms "upper" and "lower" do not imply imply social positions but the upper and lower areas of the Xianshui River (鮮水河). These terms have been derived from the area itself.

[4] The consultant informed the author of the diverse dialects that exist among the villages; further, she stated that the name of her village in the Mätro dialect was

dialect belongs to the upper dialect group, as does the Zhatuo dialect that is described in the previous studies. However, these two dialects are different in terms of their phonologies, certain aspects of their vocabularies, etc.

The following are the phonemes of Mätro nDrapa: /p, t, ʈ, c, k; b, d, ɖ, ɟ, g; ts, tɕ; dz, dʑ; m, n, ɳ, ŋ; f, s, ɕ, x; v, z, ʑ, ɣ; w, j; l, r; l̥, r̥; N, H, ʔ; i, ɨ, ʉ, u, e, ɵ, o, ɛ, ə, ʌ, a; ei, əu/[5]. The maximum syllable structure is CCCV. Further, the language comprises the so-called "word tone" system. /ˆ/ (high-falling), /ˉ/ (mid-level), and /ˊ/ (low-rising) are tonemes[6].

SOV is the basic constituent order. In principle, modifiers are placed after the head noun (N A); however, demonstratives precede nouns (Dem N). Grammatical relationships are marked with postpositionals (N PP).

The following are the structures of the verbal predicates:

(i) P1-VS + P2-AuxS-S + Pcl(s)
(ii) P1-P2-VS-S + Pcl(s)

---

pronounced as *ˊmɛɖo* [mɛɻʈo̤ɬ]. She referred to the people and the region as *ˊnɖabi* and to their language as *ˊnɖaнkɛ*. *нkɛ* is a Tibetan loanword that means 'language'.

[5] The phonemes /N, H, ʔ/ are abstract phonemes which appear only as the first component of the consonant cluster, where /N/ is a nasal stop, /H/ is a fricative and /ʔ/ is a voiceless stop. In principle, the place of articulation of these abstract phonemes is identical with the following consonant with the exception that /H/ can be realised as preaspiration of the following obstruent in word-initial position. /N/ and /H/ also show (de)voicing assimilation to the following consonant. At certain positions such as after a syllable break or after /ʔ-/, voiceless stops and affricates are aspirated (/K/ → [K^{h}]), and voiced stops and affricates are devoiced (/G/ → [K], where K and G represent all voiceless and voiced obstruents respectively). Moreover, voiceless stops and affricates are aspirated after /N-/. Even though there appear to be some nasal vowels, these are observed only in new loanwords. For the details of phonology, please refer to Shirai (2006a: 7-27).

[6] In this paper, the tones are labeled at the initial position of the tone bearing unit (phonological word). This paper uses an "equal to" sign (=) to indicate the formation of a phonological word. A dot inside a phonological word indicates that the following syllables are atonal. For some morphophonological phenomena of a phonological word, please refer to Notes 9 and 25 of the present paper.

(i) is the structure of a predicate with an auxiliary and (ii) is that of a predicate without an auxiliary. The only obligatory element is a verb stem (VS). "P1" and "P2" are the slots of a directional prefix and a negative prefix, respectively. A suffix (S) that follows the verb stem or the auxiliary stem (AuxS) indicates the "point of view". Sentence-final particles (Pcl) indicate the mood, evidentiality, and/or modality[7].

2. EVIDENTIALS IN NDRAPA

The Mätro dialect of the nDrapa language has at least two explicit evidential markers: (1) *ba* for the inferred evidential and (2) *dɛ* for the reported evidential[8]. Both these evidential markers (*ba* and *dɛ*) belong to the closed word class of sentence-final particles[9]. The direct evidential, which should be opposed to these two evidentials, is not marked formally.

---

[7] Thus far, two patterns of consecutive sentence-final particles have been found: *dɛ* (hearsay) plus *mo* (confirmation), and *dɛ* (hearsay) plus *ba* (inferential). Therefore, there are at least two slots of the sentence-final particles; however, the details are yet to be examined.

[8] In the following example, both *dɛ* and *ba* are used in one predicate, although few parallel examples were found in the personal fieldwork conducted thus far. In this case, *ba* is less likely to be an evidential marker; rather, it appears to be a modality marker, which tones down the rhetoric.

ˊsomuɲi	ˉtsoNba	ˉtsɛri=wu	ˊdaja	ˊNgo	ˊce=ɖ-ɛ=**dɛ**=**ba**.
tomorrow	shopkeeper	PN=on	money	a.little	give=IPF-DISJ=HS=INFR

'I have heard that the boss is going to give Tseri some money tomorrow.'

Yadu Qiang also has double evidentiality: The inferential and visual markers can be used together (LaPolla 2003b: 203).

[9] Generally, a sentence-final particle forms a single phonological word with the preceding word (please refer to the example provided in Note 8), but it may be emphasised as an independent phonological word that bears a tone.

ˊsomuɲi	ˉtsoNba	ˊŋa=wu	ˊdaja	ˊNgo	ˊce=ɖ-ɛ	ˋ**ba**.
tomorrow	shopkeeper	1SG=on	money	a.little	give=IPF-DISJ	INFR.EMPH

'I *think* that the boss will give me some money tomorrow.'

2.1 Inferred evidential

The inferential particle *ba* is added to the sentence in order to indicate that the speaker has not directly witnessed the event and is not fully confident about the propositional content. Inference can be based on (1) visual evidence, (2) sensory evidence, and (3) assumption. For example, (2) below can be spoken if the speaker hears a sound similar to that of rain falling and without actually seeing outside, infers that it is raining.

(1) ¯ŋoro ¯ɟo-rɛ = ɴtsa ¯ɴtsɛɖose ¯do-tɕo = ba.
3SG friend-PL=with dance DIR-come/go=INFR
'I guess she went dancing with friends (because she seemed happy before she went out).'

(2) ´moʔgu ´a-dɛ = ɖʌ = ba.
rain DIR-fall=IPF=INFR
'I guess it's raining.' (inside a room, on hearing the sound of rain outside)

(3) ¯ŋoro ¯l̥asa = rə ´tөɴda ´tɕiʜga ¯ɕjɛ = ɖ̣-ɛ = anʌ,
3SG PN=of thing much say=IPF-DISJ=though
¯ŋoro ¯l̥asa ¯ʌ-ji ¯mө-nʌ = ba.
3SG PN DIR-go NEG-EXP=INFR
'He talks about Lhasa so often, but I guess he has not been there (because his story is often inaccurate).'

2.2 Reported evidential

The hearsay particle *dɛ* is added to the sentence if the speaker has been informed by others about the fact. For example, (4) can be spoken if the speaker becomes aware of the fact that it is raining only after being told by her daughter and has not yet confirmed it herself.

(4) ´moʔgu ´a-dɛ ´ɖ̣-ɛ = **dɛ**.
rain DIR-fall IPF-DISJ=HS
'I heard that it's raining.'

(5) ˊjɛnʌ ˊtʉ̵ ˊʑjɛ ¯gə-dzɛ ˊʜi=dɛ.
yesterday LOG antiphonal.song DIR-sing PST.1=HS
'(According to him$_i$,) yesterday he$_i$ sang antiphonal songs.'

(6) ˊreɴtɕi ˊtʉ̵ ¯dʑədi=wu ¯gə-ɴtɕi ˊwu ˊdɛ.
PN LOG book=OBJ DIR-look finish HS.EMPH
'(According to her$_i$,) Renchi$_i$ finished reading a book.'

Reported speech is often found to include a logophoric pronoun *ˊtʉ̵*, as noticed in (5) and (6). A logophoric pronoun indicates that the referent is identical to the original speaker (the informational source of the reported speech).

Therefore, the original speaker of the speech report in (5) is understood to be the one who sang yesterday, even though it is not explicitly mentioned within the sentence. In (6), the referent of *ˊtʉ̵* is specified with an appositional proper noun *ˊreɴtɕi*[10].

Reporting verbs such as *¯dzɛ* 'say', *¯ɕjɛ/ˊa-ɕjɛ* 'say', or *¯gʌ-ʜmogi* 'ask', can be used to introduce quoted sentences, as indicated in the examples below. They are required when the original speaker, who is not identical to the subject of the quoted sentence, is overtly mentioned.

(7) ˊteru ˊlɛmɛ=wu ¯gʌ-ʜmogi ˊʜci-a, "¯no ˊʜsu
goblin monk=on DIR-ask PST-DISJ 2SG wool
ˊɕu=mɛ." ˊlɛmɛ ¯dzɛ ˊrɛ, "ˊŋa ˊʜsu ˊɕu."
need=Q monk say ST 1SG wool need
'The goblins asked the monk, "Do you need the wool?" The monk said, "I need it."' [Two Goblins][11]

[10] I am not concerned with the correlation between the logophoric pronoun and evidentiality in the present paper, although it has been discussed in some previous studies (for example, Culy 1997 and Dimmendaal 2001).

[11] Examples from folk tales are identified with the title.

(8) ¯ʜgeʜgɛ ¯ɕjɛ=rɛ, "¯tsoɴba ´tʉ ´somuɲi
teacher say=ST shopkeeper LOG tomorrow
´ɖaɕi=wu ´daja ´ɴgo ´ce=ɖɨ ¯dzɛ=rɛ."
PN=on money a.little give=IPF say=ST
'The teacher said, "The shopkeeper$_i$ said that he$_i$ would give Tashi some money tomorrow".'

In particular, *¯dzɛ* 'say' is used very often in the form of a stem with a particle *´rɛ* or *´ne*[12]. It appears to be more grammaticalised: typically, a directional prefix is added to the main verb of the perfective predicate, as with *¯gʌ-ʜmogi* in (7). However, peculiarly, the verb *¯dzɛ* occurs without a directional prefix in a combination such as [*¯dzɛ* + PARTICLE]. Occasionally, the verb stem *¯ɕjɛ* also behaves like *¯dzɛ*, as indicated in (8).

Moreover, *¯dzɛ* 'say' can be used to introduce reported sentences, as indicated in the quoted part of (8) and the following examples.

(9) ´seibʌʜda ¯dzɛ ´ne, ´tʉ ´tsʌbi
rabbit say TOP LOG after
´abɵ ´ʜcʌʜcʌ ´rɛ.
grandfather chase ST
'The rabbit$_i$ said that an old man was chasing after him$_i$.'
[The Rabbit]

(10) ¯tsɛri ´tʉ ´ɖiʜku=nʌ ¯go-ʜdu
PN LOG incarnated.lama=with DIR-meet
`nʌ ¯dzɛ=rɛ.
EXP say=ST
'Tseri$_i$ says that he$_i$ has met the incarnated lama.'

It should be pointed out that the function of *¯dzɛ=rɛ* in (10) appears to be parallel with that of *dɛ* in (6). However, the combination of [*¯dzɛ* + *rɛ*]

[12] *´rɛ* appears to be related to (and is in fact phonologically identical to) one of the copulas. I have glossed *´ne* as a topic marker in this paper, although the status of *´ne* is under consideration. According to the present gloss, *¯dzɛ ´ne* could be literally translated as 'as for what [somebody] said…'. The [*¯dzɛ* + *´ne*] form always precedes the quoted sentence, unlike the [*¯dzɛ* + *´rɛ*] form.

can either precede (7) or follow (8, 10) the quoted sentence. This fact suggests that *¯dzɛ* is a free morpheme[13], unlike the hearsay marker *dɛ*.

This paper considers that the expressions with *¯dzɛ* are in the process of grammaticalisation: although they have retained the status of being the head of the predicate, the morphology of the stem is reduced.

Note that the distinction between hearsay, reportative and quotative is not entirely clear-cut in nDrapa; thus, the hearsay marker can be found in a quotative sentence. In the following example, both a reporting verb and a hearsay particle are used to introduce a quoted sentence.

(11) ´aʜɟa ¯ȼjɛ=rɛ, `ɴguʔtȼi-rɛ ´somuɲi ¯ʜgeɴbɛ=da
father say=ST leader-PL tomorrow temple=at
¯ɴdʑeɴdʑa ´vo=ɖ-ɛ=dɛ.
worship come=IPF-DISJ=HS
'Father said, "The leaders will come and worship at the temple tomorrow".'

2.3 Direct evidential

The following example, (12), is an example of the direct evidential which can be contrasted with (2) and (4). Although the sentence does not have any sentence-final particles like the explicit evidential markers, it implies that the speaker directly observed the rain falling outside or at the window.

(12) ´moʔgu ´a-dɛ=ɖ-ɛ.
rain DIR-fall=IPF-DISJ
'It's raining.'

The fact that the direct evidential is formally unmarked is in accordance with the universal tendency, as mentioned in Aikhenvald (2004: 72−73) and DeLancey (2001: 379)[14].

[13] In a situation where they precede the quoted sentence, as illustrated in (7), the utterance is considered to include two different clauses. However, when they follow the quoted sentence as in (10), the quoted sentence is considered to be the complement clause of *¯dzɛ=rɛ*.

In nDrapa, a conjunct sentence (i.e., a sentence without a disjunct marker [§3.1]) without an evidential particle implies that the speaker has direct knowledge, as indicated in the following examples[15].

(13) ¯ŋa=gə ¯tɕi ¯ŋo-tɕo.
eye=in any DIR-come/go
'Something has entered my eye.'

(14) ¯ŋoro ´ɴɟe ´a-mwi ´ʜce.
3SG door DIR-close PST
'He closed the door.' (the speaker participated in the scene)

In addition, generally known facts are expressed without any explicit evidential markers. A disjunct marker (§3.1) is typically added to the predicate of such a sentence. It should be noted that the sentence-final pattern of (15) is a verb plus auxiliary *ɖ-ɛ*, which is the same as the sentence-final pattern of (12).

(15) ¯wore `wo ´ɴgaɴgu `ce ´ɕu=ɖ-ɛ.
every.year tax give need=IPF-DISJ
'We need to pay our taxes every year.'

Occasionally, a sentence with a disjunct marker has a reported-like connotation. For example, in (16a), such a connotation is derived from the original implication that the speaker has not participated in the process of the event (i.e., the previous winter seasons experienced by somebody else).

---

[14] "The unmarked form in an evidential system typically represents information which the speaker knows from first-hand, visual perception." (DeLancey 2001: 379)

[15] I do not assume the zero marker for the direct evidential, but consider that the connotation of directness is derived from the implication of the conjunct pattern.

(16) a. ¯ɴda ´maʜtsa ´goɴkɛ ´ʐɨ ¯dʐidʐi
formerly at.all such snow big
´a-dɛ `mɵ-n-a.
DIR-fall NEG-EXP-DISJ
‘(According to them,) there has never been such heavy snowfall.’

b. ¯ɴda ´maʜtsa ´goɴkɛ ´ʐɨ ¯dʐidʐi
formerly at.all such snow big
´a-dɛ `mɵ-nʌ.
DIR-fall NEG-EXP
‘We have never been hit by such heavy snow.’ [*lit.* ‘(As far as I know,) there has never been such heavy snowfall.’]

It is concluded that the evidentials in nDrapa are not obligatory. The sentences that are unmarked for evidentiality may imply the direct evidential as indicated in (12), (13) and (14). The evidential value is not fixed but dependent on the context in the sentences that do not have an evidential particle but do have a disjunct marker: direct in (12) but indirect in (16a).

3. EVIDENTIAL-LIKE CATEGORIES

In the nDrapa language, certain phenomena are found to be similar to evidentials. At this point, the paper introduces the point-of-view system that is marked with verbal suffixes and the epistemic modality that is marked with sentence-final particles. In a broader sense, the former is also considered as an epistemic modality.

3.1 The point-of-view system

3.1.1 Suffix -a

The nDrapa language has suffixes that are added to verbs or auxiliaries and display evidential-like connotations. One such suffix is *-a*.

Predicates that end with the suffix *-a*, which is attached to a verb, always imply that the event has occurred already. Further, they imply that

the locutor did not participate in the event but that he or she observed the event or its result; this is in contrast to predicates without *-a*.

The contrast between sentences with and without the suffix, as indicated below, might appear to be close to the evidential category; in other words, it might appear to be related to the manner in which the information was obtained.

(17) a. ˊjenʌ ¯ŋoro ¯ʜtɛwu ¯gʌ-ʔdj-a.[16]
yesterday 3SG PN DIR-arrive-[a]
'He arrived at Tau yesterday (I saw him arrive).'

b. ˊjenʌ ¯ŋoro ¯ʜtɛwu ¯gʌ-ʔdi.
yesterday 3SG PN DIR-arrive
'He arrived at Tau yesterday (I was in the same bus to Tau).'

(18) a. ¯ŋoro ¯ʌ-ʜsɨ-a.
3SG DIR-recover-[a]
'She has recovered.'

b. ¯ŋoro ¯ʌ-ʜsɨ.
3SG DIR-recover
'She (the one to whom I attended) has recovered.'

(19) a. ¯aɴta ˊl̥ɛʜʑʌ ¯gʌ-ʔdi-a.
a.little.while.ago moon DIR-arrive-[a]
'The moon has just come out (I saw the moon).'

b. ¯aɴta ˊl̥ɛʜʑʌ ¯gʌ-ʔdi.
a.little.while.ago moon DIR-arrive
'The moon has just come out (I saw it come out).'

In my opinion, the contrast of participation, i.e., whether or not one experiences the process of the event, should be distinguished from evidentiality.

[16] In this example, *ʔdi* 'arrive' plus suffix *-a* is reduced to a single syllable *ʔdja* [ttĭa˥]. This form is considered to be a free-variational allomorph of the two-syllable form *ʔdia* [tti˥a˩] which is found in (19a). The parallel reduction is often observed: for example, *ɴpo* 'be defeated' plus *-a* is reduced to *ɴpwa* as shown in (20b).

If we consider this to be evidentiality, then determining the evidential to which they could belong becomes problematic; this is because in examples (17)-(19), both the sentences with and without the suffix imply that the speaker is directly aware of the fact. For example, (17a) can be used in the case wherein the speaker directly sees "him" at the bus terminal when "he" just arrives. (17a) is different from (17b) in terms of whether the speaker shared the experience of the process of coming (e.g., a bus trip), with the person being referred to. A parallel distinction is found in (18) and (19). (18a) refers only to the resultant status, while (18b) implies that the speaker has been tending to a sick person and is directly aware of the process of the person's recovery. (19a) and (19b) differ in terms of whether or not the speaker has observed the process involved in the appearance of the moon.

Interestingly, in example (18), the speaker who can utter a sentence without *-a* as (18b) also has the possibility to utter (18a). In this case, it depends on the speaker in terms of whether or not she or he expresses the degree of commitment.

3.1.2 Restriction of the person: The "conjunct/disjunct" pattern

The abovementioned characteristic of the suffix *-a* results in the restriction of the person of the subject. When the subject is in the first person, the predicate without *-a* (which implies that the speaker has experienced the process), is naturally chosen.

(20) a. ¯ŋ̩jɛ ´a-Npo.
1PL DIR-be.defeated
'We were defeated.'

b. ¯ŋoro ´a-Npw-a.
3SG DIR-be.defeated-[a]
'He was defeated.'

In fact, the predicate with *-a* is rarely chosen if the speaker participates in the event as the agent, as indicated below in (21).

(21) ¯ŋa ´zama ¯gɨ-ʔdzɨ `wu/*`wu-a
1SG meal DIR-eat PFT/PFT-[a]
'I have eaten already.'

In cases where the agent is a non-first person, a predicate with *-a* is usually more natural, as shown in (22a) and (23a). However, again, a predicate without *-a* is chosen only if it is clear from the context that the speaker has directly experienced the process of the event, as represented in (22b), or that the speaker has preferred to explicitly express his or her commitment to the event, as denoted in (23b)[17].

(22) a. ¯ŋoro ´zama ¯gɨ-ʔdzɨ `wu-a
3SG meal DIR-eat PFT-[a]
'S/he has eaten.'

b. `ŋoʜnɛ ´ŋa-ɖo ´zama ¯gɨ-ʔdzɨ `wu.
3DU 1SG-place meal DIR-eat PFT
'The two of them have eaten a meal in my house. (I treated them.)'

(23) a. ¯no ´zama ¯gɨ-ʔdzɨ `wu-a=mo
2SG meal DIR-eat PFT-[a]=CFM
'You have eaten, haven't you?'

b. ¯no ´zama ¯gɨ-ʔdzɨ `wu ´mo,
2SG meal DIR-eat PFT CFM
´xɛ `ga-ʔdzu
now DIR.PRH-eat.IPR
(To a child who is eating snacks just after finishing lunch) 'You have eaten already, haven't you? You must not eat any more.'

In an interrogative sentence, the person restriction is observed between the second and non-second persons. If the sentence is spoken as

[17] The auxiliary without *-a* in (23b) is considered to be emphatic; in other words, through this sentence, the speaker emphasises that she or he is aware of the fact that the hearer has eaten.

a question pertaining to an action of the hearer, then *-a* cannot be included, as indicated in (24)[18].

(24) (¯no) ´zama ¯gɨ-ʔdzɨ `wu=me/*`wu-a=mɛ
2SG meal DIR-eat PFT=Q/PFT-[a]=Q
'Have you eaten already?'

(25) ¯ŋoro ´zama ¯gɨ-ʔdzɨ `wu-a=mɛ
3SG meal DIR-eat PFT-[a]=Q
'Has s/he eaten?'

Within the sentence of the reported evidential (§2.2) or the one that has been quoted, the person restriction depends on whether the subject of the reported/quoted predicate is identical to the original speaker. If the subject is identical to the original speaker, as shown in (26), then the suffix *-a* cannot be added to the reported predicate. However, when the reported or quoted sentences show the subject to be different from the original speaker, as indicated in (27), both forms—those with *-a* and those without *-a*—can be observed.

(26) ´reNtɕi ´tʉ ¯dʑəʲdi=wu ¯gə-Ntɕi ´wu ´dɛ.
PN LOG book=OBJ DIR-look finish HSEMPH
'(According to her$_i$,) Renchi$_i$ finished reading a book.' =(6)

(27) a. ´aHʄa ¯ɕjɛ=rɛ, `Nguʔtɕiʲ-rɛ ¯Hkatɕa ´a-ɕjɛ
father say=ST leader-PL speech DIR-say
`wu-a=dɛ.
PFT-[a]=HS
'Father said, "The leaders have finished giving their speeches".'

[18] Interrogative sentences without *-a* are found more frequently regardless of the person. It is considered to be an expression of linguistic politeness; in other words, the conjunct form is selected to prioritise the hearer's point of view.

¯ŋoro ¯dʑəʲdi ¯dɛ=pjɛ=rə ´a-l̥o `wu=me.
3SG book one=NC=NML DIR-read.aloud PFT=HS
'Did he finish reading aloud one book?'

b. ´aʜɟa ¯ɕjɛ=rɛ, `ɴguʔtɕi-rɛ ¯ʜkatɕa
father say=ST leader-PL speech
´a-ɕjɛ `wu=dɛ.
DIR-say PFT=HS
'Father said, "The leaders have finished giving their speeches".' (The speaker recognises that her father heard all the speeches.)

This type of split distinction between persons is congruent with the distinction between the "locutor" and the "non-locutor" (Curnow 1997: 189-192) that is found within the so-called conjunct/disjunct pattern (Hale 1980). In other words, the first person in the statement, the second person in the question, and the original speaker in the quoted sentences are the locutors, while the other persons are the non-locutor. In Hargreaves (1991: 32), this distinction is described as the "epistemic authority".

The basic distribution of the predicates with *-a* and those without *-a* is considered to be congruent with the conjunct/disjunct pattern, i.e., the function of the suffix *-a* is to mark the sentence in the disjunct pattern. Henceforth, in this paper, this type of suffix will be referred to as the "disjunct marker".

The predicates of sentences with unintentional and uncontrollable[19] action may use the disjunct form, independent of person, as indicated below in example (28a). Moreover, this characteristic is typical of the conjunct/disjunct pattern; it is explained by considering the process of "forgetting" as basically outside the locutor's field of view. The sentence without *-a* (28b) may have the connotation of the locutor's intention and may be translated as 'I forgot him on purpose' or 'I have decided to forget him'.

(28) a. ¯ŋa ¯ŋoro=bɛrə ¯do-ʜmo `wu-a.
1SG 3SG=about DIR-forget PFT-DISJ
'I have forgotten him.'

[19] The feature of "intentionality" is more appropriate than "controllability" in the descriptive study of nDrapa (Shirai 2006a: 87-88).

b. ¯ŋa ¯ŋoro＝bɛrə ¯do-ʜmo `wu.
1SG 3SG=about DIR-forget PFT
[*lit.* 'I have forgotten him (consciously).']

The terminology of the conjunct/disjunct is controversial because many different phenomena are found between Newar and modern Tibetan[20]. This paper considers the following two types of conjunct/disjunct patterns: (1) the "person-restricted" type, like that of Newar[21] and (2) the "point-of-view" type, like that of modern Tibetan, Awa Pit and nDrapa (Shirai 2006a: 216-55). As illustrated by the following examples from nDrapa, in the point-of-view type of the conjunct/disjunct system, the conjunct form is chosen if the speaker is a conscious participant in the process of the event—regardless of the person of the subject[22].

---

[20] DeLancey (1990, 2001) applies the notion of conjunct/disjunct, which has been used in the study of Newar (Hale 1980), to Lhasa Tibetan, although the language displays a different type of conjunct/disjunct pattern—similar to that of nDrapa (Shirai 2006a: 216-257). The evidential-like category in modern Tibetan is also referred to as "naiteki/gaiteki" (内的・外的 'inside/outside the speaker's will') in Takeuchi (1990), "ziryooiki/taryooiki" (自領域・他領域 'domain of self/other') in Hoshi (1997), and "self/other" in J. Sun (1993).

[21] In the conjunct/disjunct system in Newar, the person restriction is so strict that the conjunct pattern is rarely used when the subject is a third person, even in cases where the locutor participates in the event as an undergoer. That is, in Newar, person restriction is considered to be dominant over point of view. The following example from Kathmandu Newar illustrates the person-restricted type of conjunct/disjunct pattern, in contrast to (29) and (30).

wõ: ji-tO ten-O
3.ERG 1-DAT lay-PFT.DISJ
'S/he laid me down.' (Hargreaves 1991: 147 [3])

For further discussion on the two types of the conjunct/disjunct system, please refer to Shirai (2006a: 216-55).

[22] Parallel examples are found in the conjunct/disjunct system of modern Lhasa Tibetan:

`khöö ´nga yaa ´yiki ´yangse ¯tanki ˆyöö
3SG.ERG 1SG toward letter often send.[NONPAST.CONJ]
'He often sends me letters.' (Hoshi 1997: 173 [9])

(29) ´ɖaȼi ¯aɴta ´ŋa .nɛɴɟi
PN a.little.while.ago 1SG toward
´a-ȼjɛ `wu/*`wu-a.
DIR-say PFT/PFT-DISJ
'Tashi has told me a little while ago.'

(30) ¯ɳa = gə ¯tȼi ¯ŋo-tȼo.
eye=in any DIR-come/go
'Something has entered **my** eye.' [*lit.* 'Something has entered the eye.'] = (13)

In nDrapa, the conjunct form is chosen even in cases wherein the locutor has not participated in the proposition but is directly aware of the process of the event, as indicated in (30) and (17)-(19).

Thus, in conclusion, the nDrapa language has a point-of-view[23] system that is congruent with a type of conjunct/disjunct system. This system is neither "evidential" nor "person-marking" in its nature, although it includes an **evidential-like connotation** and a **person restriction**.

Without affecting the truth value of the propositional content, the point-of-view system reflects the manner in which the speaker recognises the event; thus, it belongs to the category of epistemic modality. Some studies treat the conjunct/disjunct pattern as person marking (for example, Aikhenvald 2004: 123-127 and Cysouw 2003: 41-45)[24]. However, in the author's opinion, person agreement should be treated as a part of the proposition, which is contrary to the point-of-view system.

[23] The basic concept of the "point of view" was developed by Kuno (1978). The present paper includes the following two changes: (1) The person concerned with the point of view is always the locutor and (2) the key is whether or not the speaker includes the locutor's point of view in the utterance.

[24] "[I]n conjunct/disjunct systems, the choice of person-marking acquires an additional evidentiality connotation in that it can be used as an evidentiality strategy." (Aikhenvald 2004: 126)

3.1.3 Disjunct markers

In the Mätro dialect of the nDrapa language, sentences showing the locutor's point of view (the conjunct pattern) are morphologically unmarked in principle, while those not showing the locutor's point of view (the disjunct pattern) are marked with "disjunct markers." With regard to auxiliaries[25], the disjunct marker used for the perfective aspect is the suffix *-a* and that for the imperfective aspect is *-ɛ*.

	Imperfective group		*Perfective group*		
	IPF	ITER	PFT	EXP	PST
Conjunct	´ɖʌ	´ɴdu	`wu	`nʌ	´ʜɟie/´ʜcie
Disjunct	´ɖ-ɛ	´ɴdu-ɛ	`wu-a	`n-a	´ʜci-a

Table 1. nDrapa auxiliaries[26]

Split of the past auxiliary. Mätro nDrapa has the following three forms of the past (PST) auxiliary: (1) *´ʜɟie*, (2) *´ʜcie*, and (3) *´ʜci-a*[27]. From the viewpoint of person restriction, *´ʜɟie* co-occurs with a locutor agent, while the other two co-occur with a non-locutor agent.

[25] Auxiliaries are counted among the enclitics in nDrapa. The tone of an auxiliary is considered to be specified; however, if the preceding verb (either a bare stem or a directional prefix plus a stem) is monosyllabic and the predicate does not take a negative form, the auxiliary forms a single phonological word with the verb in principle, for example, *´ji=ɖ-ɛ* (help=IPF-DISJ) but *´ji ´ma-ɖ-ɛ* (help NEG-IPF-DISJ). However, enclitics can be emphasised by forming an independent phonological word (cf. Note 9). If the preceding verb contains more than one syllable, both patterns are found: *´ɴpugɛ=ɖ-ɛ* (cry=IPF-DISJ) and *´ɴpugɛ ´ɖ-ɛ*.

[26] Some auxiliaries alternate between the single syllable form and the two syllable form, for example, one of the past conjunct auxiliaries is pronounced as *´ʜcie* in the position preceding a particle, but as *´ʜce* in the sentence-final position. In cases where an auxiliary has such allomorphs, I regard the two syllable form as the representative form to be listed up in Table 1.

[27] In Huang (1990, 1991), the corresponding form of *´ʜɟie* is regarded as the first-person form, *´ʜcie* as the third-person form, and *´ʜci-a* as the marker of the indirect evidential (判断語氣*panduan-yuqi* 'assessing-modality').

(31) a. ˊjenʌ ¯ŋa ¯mɛɴko=rə ˊɴɟe
yesterday 1SG hospital=of door
ˊa-mwi ˊʜɟe.
DIR-close PST.1
'I closed the door of the hospital yesterday.'

b. ¯ŋoro ˊɴɟe ˊa-mwi ˊʜce/*ˊʜɟe.
3SG door DIR-close PST
'He closed the door.' (The speaker was present at that time.)

c. ¯ŋoro ˊɴɟe ˊa-mwi ˊʜci-a.
3SG door DIR-close PST-DISJ
'He closed the door.' (The speaker did not see it.)

As indicated in (31a) and (31b), *ˊʜɟie* (*ˊʜɟe* in the sentence-final position) is only used with the locutor's intentional action. This restriction is not observed in the usage of the other auxiliaries. The contrast between *ˊʜcie* (*ˊʜce*) in example (31b) and *ˊʜci-a* in example (31c) corresponds to that between the forms with *-a* and those without *-a*, as shown in (17)-(19). In the auxiliary system of this language, the characteristic of *ˊʜci-a* is consistent with the other disjunct auxiliaries, while the contrast between *ˊʜɟie* and *ˊʜcie* is peculiar to the past auxiliary. Thus, it is concluded that both *ˊʜɟie* and *ˊʜcie* are conjunct and that they split according to the locutor's agentivity. This analysis results in a consistency in the system of auxiliary verbs in this language.

The disjunct markers for the imperfective. The disjunct forms of the imperfective group of auxiliaries involve the suffix *-ɛ*, as indicated in Table 1. However, when when a suffix of the same form is directly attached to verbs and adjectives, the sentence is not considered to be disjunct. It is the auxiliary *ɖɛ* that functions as a disjunct marker, which is directly attached to verbs and adjectives.

(32) ¯ŋa ˊsomuɲi ˊɟo=wu ˋgə-ji ˊɕu.
1SG tomorrow friend=on DIR-help need
'I will help my friend tomorrow.'

(33) ´somuɲi ´ɖaɕi ´ŋa=wu `gə-ji ´ɕɯ-ɛ.
tomorrow PN 1SG=on DIR-help need-[ɛ]
'I need Tashi's help tomorrow.' [*lit.* 'Tashi will help me tomorrow, (and I) need (it).']

(34) ¯ŋoro ´HSɛ ¯Hnɛ ´ɕu=ɖ-ɛ
3SG firewood burn need=IPF-DISj
'He must burn firewood.'

The verb stem *´ɕu* 'need' forms the second half of verb concatenations in (32)-(34). When it ends with a bare stem, the sentence conveys the speaker's intention, as presented in (32). If the suffix *-ɛ* is attached, as indicated in (33), then the sentence expresses the speaker's direct experience, i.e., she or he feels the need for someone's help. Both these sentences are conjunct because the locutor participates in the occurrence of the situation and the sentences are uttered from the locutor's point of view[28]. However, sentence (34) is not considered to have been uttered from the locutor's point of view because it objectively describes the non-locutor's status. The auxiliary verb *´ɖɛ* is added to the predicate of sentence (34), indicating that the sentence is disjunct.

The correlation of the distribution and the function of the concerned forms are illustrated in Table 2.

	-∅	*-ɛ*	*´ɖɛ*
auxiliaries and copulas	conjunct	disjunct	—
other (productive)	conjunct		disjunct

Table 2. Forms for the conjunct/disjunct pattern of the imperfective

The suffix *-ɛ* functions as a disjunct marker only with auxiliaries, copulas and existential verbs[29]. This fact suggests that the suffix is no

[28] The sentence pertaining to the locutor's state of mind does not choose the disjunct pattern; this is contrary to the unintentional action indicated in (28) (Shirai 2006a: 100-105).

[29] The pattern of existential verbs is omitted from the table because it has a peculiar distribution where either *-ɛ* or *´ɖɛ* functions as the disjunct marker with different implications. Please refer to Shirai (2006b) for details.

longer productive as a disjunct marker and that only the fossilised items remain. Thus, unlike perfective disjunct sentences, imperfective disjunct sentences require the auxiliary *ʻɖɛ*. When attached directly to the verb stem, the suffix *-a* functions as a disjunct marker, as indicated in section 3.1.1; this fact denotes that it is still productive as the disjunct marker for the perfective.

3.1.4 Co-occurrence with the evidential markers

Both sentences of the conjunct pattern and those of the disjunct pattern can co-occur with evidential particles (*ba, dɛ*).

The conjunct/disjunct predicates can be followed by the hearsay/ quotative particle *dɛ* without any problem, as indicated in the examples of (27) and (35).

(35) a. ¯tsoNba ´tʉ ´somuɲi ´ɖaɕi = wu ´daja
shopkeeper LOG tomorrow PN=on money
´Ngo ´ce = ɖʌ = dɛ.
a.little give=IPF=HS
‘(According to boss$_i$,) boss$_i$ is going to give Tashi some money tomorrow.’

b. ´aɦa ¯ɕjɛ = rɛ, `Nguʔtɕi-rɛ ´somuɲi
father say=ST leader-PL tomorrow
¯HgeNbɛ = da ¯NdʑeNdʑa ´vo = ɖ-ɛ = dɛ.
temple=at worship come=IPF-DISJ=HS
‘Father said, “the leaders will come and worship at the temple tomorrow”.’ =(11)

The co-occurrence with the inferential particle *ba* is rather problematic. According to the examples that have been collected thus far, every sentence with a disjunct marker (*-ɛ*, *-a*) plus *ba* implies that the speaker infers that the event will occur in the future.

(36) ˊ somuɲi ¯tsoNba ¯tsɛri=wu ˊ daja ˊ ŋgo ˊ ce=ɖ-ɛ
tomorrow shopkeeper PN=on money a.little give=IPF-DISJ
ˋ ba.
INFR.EMPH
'I *think* that boss is going to give Tseri some money tomorrow.'

(37) ˊmoʔgu ˋʔtsi-a=ba.
rain let.up-DISJ=INFR
'I think the rain will stop (soon).'

On the other hand, no disjunct marker precedes the inferential particle *ba* when the speaker infers an event from the present or the past.

(38) ˊbəʜɟʌ-rɛ ˊʜdʉʜdʉ ˊɖʌ=ba.
child-PL fight IPF=INFR
'Children seem to be fighting.' (hearing the sound of the next room)

(39) ¯ŋoro ¯l̥asa ¯ʌ-ji ¯mɵ-nʌ=ba.
3SG PN DIR-go NEG-EXP=INFR
'I guess he has never been to Lhasa.'

Example (37) may appear odd because predicates that end with verbs plus *-a* are found only with past/completed events, as observed in §3.1.1. In this language, the combination of [*-a* + *ba*] is considered to function as the counterpart of *-a* in the future tense[30].

The problems of the correlation between the point-of view system and evidentiality (especially the inferred evidential) remain to be solved.

[30] Predicates without suffixes or evidential particles can be used regardless of the tense. Please compare (17b) with the example below. On doing so, it can be concluded that the suffix *-a* does not specify the tense of the predicate; in other words, predicates with *-a* and those without *-a* do not differ in terms of tense or aspect but in terms of point of view.

¯dɛʜɲʌ ¯ŋa ¯ŋoro=wu ¯ɲjɛlɛ ¯ʜco.
one.day 1SG 3SG=on punish
'Someday I will punish him.'

The inferred evidential has epistemic implicatures, and this fact is considered to affect the correlation with the point-of-view system.

3.2 The sentence-final particle of the admirative

Section 2 demonstrated that evidentials in nDrapa are indicated with sentence-final particles. This language has more items in the same word class, including an admirative marker.

Since the evidential system or the conjunct/disjunct system in many languages is reported to have (ad)mirative connotations (Aikhenvald 2004: 195-209; DeLancey 2001), it is noteworthy that nDrapa has a proper marker for the admirative.

The admirative particle *sa* is added to the sentence in order to express that the speaker was astonished by that which he or she recently learnt. For example, (40) implies that the speaker was earlier unaware of the taste of the dish and found it to be very sour after tasting it.

(40) ¯goro ´zo = **sa**.
this sour/hot=ADM
'This is sour/hot!'

(41) ¯ŋa = .ma ¯ɳwɛ ¯luʜto ¯xo ¯tɕi = sa.
1SG=than 2PL ingenuity more much=ADM
'You (cowboys) are more clever than I!' [Clever Cowboys]

(42) ¯ŋoro = rʌ ¯nɛvo ´duwa ¯te ´ɴdu = sa.
3SG=of sister smoke drink ITER=ADM
'His sister smokes!'

It should be noted that the forms of the verbs and the auxiliary preceding *sa* in (40)-(42) do not include the disjunct marker. Thus far, all the examples of *sa* that have been collected are connected to the conjunct forms, i.e., forms without disjunct markers.

The following example is from a folk tale. The narrator informs the hearers of the character's mentality as if it is a new and surprising fact.

(43) ˊlɛmɛ ˊteru ˊnɛ-i=wu ˊxɛɟɵ ˊma-ʜga ˊsa.
monk goblin two-NC=on actually NEG-like ADM
'Actually, the monk didn't like the two goblins!' [Two Goblins]

4. CONCLUSION

This paper presents an overview of the evidentials and evidential-like categories of the Mätro dialect of the nDrapa language.

The language distinguishes between the following three kinds of evidentials: direct, inferred and reported. The evidentials are marked with sentence-final particles, although the direct evidential is left unmarked. The evidentials are not obligatory.

Further, the point-of-view or conjunct/disjunct system often has an evidential-like connotation. In previous studies, the conjunct/disjunct system is regarded as a kind of person marking. However, it is concluded that the point-of-view system of nDrapa is not person marking in nature, but that it co-occurs with certain person restrictions. The point of view category is marked with the following disjunct markers: *-a* for the perfective and *-ɛ* (unproductive) or *ˊɖɛ* (productive) for the imperfective.

This paper also introduces the problems of the correlation of evidentiality and the point-of-view system.

In addition to the evidential and disjunct markers, the language has a sentence-final particle of the admirative.

ABBREVIATIONS

1	first person	LOG	logophoric pronoun
2	second person	NC	noun classifier
3	third person	NEG	negative
ADM	admirative	NML	nominaliser
CFM	confirmative	OBJ	object marker
DIR	directional prefix	PFT	perfective
DISJ	disjunct	PL	plural
DU	dual	PN	proper name
EMPH	emphasis	PRH	prohibitive
EXP	experiential	PST	past
HS	hearsay	Q	question particle
INFR	inferential	SG	singular

IPF	imperfective	ST	stative
IPR	imperative	TOP	topic marker
ITER	iterative	=	formation of a phonological word

REFERENCES

AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA Y. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CULY, CHRISTPHER. 1997. Logophoric pronouns and point of view. *Linguistics* 35: 845-859.

CURNOW, TIMOTHY JOWAN. 1997. *A Grammar of Awa Pit (Cuaiquer): An Indigenous Language of South-Western Colombia.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. The Australian National University.

CYSOUW, MICHAEL. 2003. *The Paradigmatic Structure of Person Marking.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

DIMMENDAAL, GERRIT J. 2001. Logophoric marking and represented speech in African languages as evidential hedging strategies. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21.1: 131-157.

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

__. 1990. Ergativity and the cognitive model of event structure in Lhasa Tibetan. *Cognitive Linguistics* 1.3: 289-321.

HALE, AUSTIN. 1980. Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct verb forms in Newari. In *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics No. 7 (Pacific Linguistics, Series A-No. 53),* ed. by Ronald L. Trail et al., 95-106. Camberra: The Australian National University.

HARGREAVES, DAVID J. 1991. *The Concept of Intentional Action in the Grammar of Kathmandu Newari.* University of Oregon dissertation..

HOSHI, IZUMI. 1997. *Tibettogo Rasahoogen ni okeru Zyutugo no Imi no Kizyututeki Kenkyuu [A Descriptive Study of Semantics of Predicates of Lhasa Tibetan]*. University of Tokyo dissertation.

HUANG BUFAN. 1990. Zhabayu gaikuang (An overview of the Zhaba language). *Zhongyang Minzu Xueyuan Xuebao* 1990.4: 71-82.

__. 1991. Zhabayu (The Zhaba language). In *Zangmianyu Shiwu-zhong [Fifteen Tibeto-Burman Languages],* ed. by Dai Qingxia, Huang Bufan, Fu Ailan, Renzeng-Wangmu and Liu Juhuang, 64-97. Beijing: Beijing Yanshan Chubanshe.

HUANG, BUFAN (Editor-in-chief). 1992. Zangmianyuzu Yuyan Cihui [A Tibeto-Burman Lexicon]. Beijing: Zhongyang Minzu Xueyuan.

KUNO, SUSUMU. 1978. *Danwa no Bunpoo [Discourse grammar]*. Tokyo: Taishuukan.

LAPOLLA, RANDY J. 2003a. Overview of Sino-Tibetan Morphosyntax. In *The Sino-Tibetan Languages,* ed. by Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla, 22-42. London/New York: Routledge.

__ with HUANG CHENGLONG. 2003b. *A Grammar of Qiang: with annotated texts and glossary.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

SHIRAI SATOKO. 2006a. *Dapago ni okeru Siten Hyoozi Sisutemu no Kenkyuu [A study of the 'point-of-view' system in nDrapa]*. Kyoto University dissertation.

__. 2006b. Analysis of Multiple Existential Sentences in nDrapa. In *A Festschrift in Honour of Professor Masahiro Shōgaito: Studies on Eurasian Languages,* ed. by 'Studies on Eurasian Languages' Publication Committee, 145-173. Kyoto: 'Studies on Eurasian Languages' Publication Committee.

SUN HONGKAI. 2001. Lun Zangmianyu zhong de Qiangyuzhi yuyan [On the languages of the Qiangic branch of Tibeto-Burman]. *Language and Linguistics* 2.1: 157-181.

SUN, JACKSON T.-S. 1993. Evidentials in Amdo Tibetan. *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 63.4: 945-1001.

TAKEUCHI TSUGUHITO. 1990. Tibettogo no zyutubu ni okeru zyodoosi no kinoo to sono hattatu katei (Functions and developing processes of auxiliary verbs in Tibetan predicates). In *Azia no Syogengo to Ippangengogaku [Asian Languages and General Linguistics]*, ed. by Sakiyama Osamu and Sato Akihiro, 6-16. Tokyo: Sanseido.