An Overview of Meskwaki Evidentiality

Amy Dahlstrom

videntials are grammatical markers which indicate the warrant for an utterance: for example, whether a reported event was witnessed firsthand, or whether the speaker was told about it by someone else.[1] For Algonquian, Murray (2016) demonstrates that Cheyenne exhibits a striking paradigm for expressing evidential notions. I show below that Meskwaki also encodes a similar set of evidential functions but the organization of the system is quite different from that of Cheyenne. Also discussed are other Meskwaki constructions which bear a resemblance to prototypical evidential constructions in expressing speaker uncertainty.

Preliminaries

Definition of Evidentiality

Brugman and Macaulay (2015), in a long survey article on evidentiality, posit the following definition:

(1) "two properties are criterial: (i) marking source of evidence and (ii) membership in grammatical categories. Other properties vary cross-linguistically: presence

of epistemic, illocutionary, or mirative meaning; speaker deixis; obligatoriness; complementarity of meaning with other items; and truth-conditionality." (Brugman and Macaulay 2015:201)

Brugman and Macaulay take a fairly conservative position, viewing the issue of SOURCE OF EVIDENCE as criterial, along with stipulating that the evidentials must be expressed as a grammatical category and not, for example, with an optional adverb such as *reportedly* in English. Other properties that have been claimed to be part of evidentiality, such as the parameter of speaker certainty discussed below, are taken to be optional components which may vary cross-linguistically.

Cheyenne Evidential Paradigm

The most striking cases of an evidential opposition are those in which an evidential morpheme appears in a single inflectional slot, creating a paradigm of evidential possibilities. Cheyenne, as described by Murray (2016), is one such language. Consider the following set of examples from Murray 2016:493–494, citing forms from Leman 2011:

(2) a. É–hoo'koho–Ø.
   3–rain–WTN
   'It's raining, I witnessed.'

   b. É–hoo'kȯhó–nėse.
   3–rain–RPT.SG.INAN
   'It's raining, they say.' or 'It's raining, I hear.'

   c. É–hoo'kȯhó–**neho.**
   3–rain–NAR.SG.INAN
   'It rained, it's told.'

   d. **Mó**–hoo'kȯhó–**hané**–**he.**
   Q+3–rain–NEG$_{\text{INAN}}$–INF
   'It's raining, I gather.' or 'It must be raining.'

In (2a) a verb with no overt morpheme in the evidential slot must be interpreted as the speaker having directly witnessed the described event. In (2b) the suffix -*nėse* indicates that the speaker is reporting what the speaker was told. (2c) exhibits a different suffix -*neho,* which marks the assertion as being part of a traditional

narrative. (2d) contains an affix complex which marks the assertion as an inference on the part of the speaker.

Background on Verb Inflection

Some of the Meskwaki evidential categories are expressed by inflecting the verb of the clause in a specific paradigm. An explicit description of (part of) the verbal system may therefore be useful.[2] The opposition of INDEPENDENT ORDER and CONJUNCT ORDER inflection is familiar to Algonquianists; this opposition obtains in most of the daughter languages. Independent order verbs, as in (3) and (4) below, use a prefix position to the left of the verb stem to express a person feature for one of the arguments of the verb:[3]

(3) ke-wača·ho-Ø   'you (sg.) cook'   [independent indicative]
     2-cook-SG

(4) ke-wača·ho-petoke   'you (sg.) probably cook'   [dubitative]
     2-cook-DUB

The independent indicative verb in (3) bears the second person prefix *ke-*; since no plural marker is present in the suffix position, the second person argument is unambiguously singular. The dubitative paradigm exemplified in (4) likewise belongs to the independent order, as seen by the presence of the second person prefix *ke-*; its use is discussed in a later section of this paper.

Conjunct order verbs use a different set of morphemes to express person and number agreement with the argument(s) of the verb, and no person marker is prefixed to the verb stem. Instead, the left edge of the verb may be prefixed with the aorist prefix *e·h-*, serve as the locus of an ablaut process affecting the vowel of the first syllable of the verb stem (initial change), or have neither an aorist prefix nor initial change ("plain"). Meskwaki conjunct verbs also bear a final affix known as a MODE SUFFIX, which combines with the marking on the verb's left edge to indicate the specific paradigm within the conjunct order.[4] A later section of this paper discusses the use of conjunct verbs bearing the past tense/irrealis mode suffix *-ehe,* so it is necessary to provide some background on the mode suffixes here.

(5) e·h-wača·ho-yan-i   'that you (sg.) cooked'   [aorist conjunct]
AOR-cook-2-MODE

(6) we·ča·hoyanini   'whenever you (sg.) cook'   [iterative]
IC-wača·ho-yan-ini
IC-cook-2-MODE

(7) wača·ho-yan-e   'if you (sg.) cook'   [subjunctive]
cook-2-MODE

In (5)–(7) the second person singular subject is expressed by the suffix *-yan*, completely unrelated to the second person morpheme found in the independent order forms in (3)–(4). The verb in (5) is marked as aorist conjunct by the combination of the prefix *e·h-* and the mode suffix *-i;* aorist conjunct verbs are used in subordinate clauses (and main clauses in narratives, as discussed below). The iterative form in (6) is marked by initial change applying to the first syllable of the stem plus the mode suffix *-ini;* such verbs are glossed 'whenever . . . ' The subjunctive form in (7), used for hypothetical conditional clauses and 'when' clauses referring to future time, requires only the mode suffix *-e;* neither initial change nor the aorist prefix is used in the subjunctive paradigm.

Conjunct participles, which function as relative clauses, fill the mode suffix slot with a suffix agreeing with the head of the relative clause:

(8) a. ke·no·na·ta   'the one (prox.) who spoke to him/her (obv.)'
    IC-kano·n-a--t-a   [conjunct participle]
    IC-speak.to-direct-3–3.head
   b. ke·no·na·čini   'the one (obv.) whom he/she (prox.) spoke to'
    IC-kano·n-a--t-ini   [conjunct participle]
    IC-speak.to-direct-3–3.'head

The transitive verb forms in (8) are both suffixed with the direct theme sign *-a·,* indicating that the subject outranks the object on a hierarchy of non-third person > third person proximate > third person obviative, plus the person agreement suffix *-t,* encoding third person. In (8a) the final suffix *-a* indicates that the head of the relative clause is the third person proximate singular argument; in (8b) the third person obviative argument is marked as head of the relative clause.

The INTERROGATIVE ORDER in Meskwaki is organized in a fashion similar to that of the conjunct order. The left edge of the verb may undergo initial change, be prefixed with the aorist prefix, or be plain. A suffix -*w* appears in all interrogative paradigms after the theme sign and before the person/number suffix; an additional suffix -*e·n* appears in almost all of the interrogative order paradigms.[5] As in the conjunct order, a mode suffix appears in the final suffix position.

(9) mehkaw-a·-w-an-e·n-i   'you (sg.) apparently found him/her'
       find-direct-**interr**-2-**interr**-mode   [plain interrogative]

(10) we·ča·hokwe·na   'whoever cooks'
       IC-wača·ho-**w**-k-**e·n**-a   [interrogative participle]
       IC-cook-**interr**-3-**interr**-3.head

In (9) the interrogative suffix -*w* occurs after the direct theme sign -*a·*, which indicates that the subject of 'find' outranks the object. The second person singular subject is expressed by the suffix -*an*, which is in turn followed by the interrogative suffix -*e·n*. The mode suffix slot is filled with -*i*. Note that the verb in (9) is plain, neither bearing an aorist prefix nor having undergone initial change. (The evidential function of the plain interrogative is discussed further below.) (10) likewise belongs to the interrogative order: as a participle, its mode suffix slot is filled with a suffix agreeing with the head of the relative clause. Note further that in (10) the suffix sequence of -*w-k* metathesizes to *kw*.

The label of "interrogative" for this set of paradigms dates back at least to Jones 1911:826, motivated by the use of interrogative participles as in (10) to express embedded questions. Embedded questions are described in detail by Dahlstrom (2019). In general, the paradigms belonging to the interrogative order perform various irrealis functions (Dahlstrom 2019); Goddard (2006b:189ff) analyzes the -*w* suffix of the interrogative order as an irrealis suffix which derives ultimately from a Proto-Algonquian negative.[6]

Meskwaki Evidentials

With this background information on the Cheyenne paradigm in (2) and the organization of Meskwaki verb inflection, let us now examine how Meskwaki indicates

a speaker's warrant for making a statement. Meskwaki expresses the same range of evidential functions as the Cheyenne system—hearsay/inference/traditional narrative—but Meskwaki exhibits what Brugman and Macaulay (2015:224) term the SCATTERED type of system. That is, the evidential markers are not in a single morphological slot forming a paradigmatic opposition. Instead, the strategies employed in Meskwaki include a second-position enclitic particle, an inflectional paradigm specialized for one of the evidential functions, and appearance of a subordinate clause verbal paradigm in main clause contexts to mark another function. Each of these strategies is explicated below.

Hearsay: Second-Position Enclitic =ipi

Meskwaki exhibits a number of second-position enclitic particles which attach to the first phonological word of the clause, most with pragmatic functions such as emphasis or contrastive focus (Goddard 2015). A particularly frequent second-position enclitic is the hearsay evidential =*ipi*. (Note that the first vowel of this enclitic is frequently deleted by clitic sandhi [cf. Goddard 1991].)

(11) =*ipi* < *ipi* 'one says (thus), people say (thus)'
      i- 'say thus' + -*pi* 'X' (unspecified subject, independent indicative)

=*ipi* is a grammaticalized form of the Animate Intransitive verb stem *i*- 'say thus' inflected with the suffix -*pi,* the independent indicative form of the unspecified subject suffix denoting people in general.

The textual passage in (12), taken from a long text published in Dahlstrom 2003, illustrates the function of =*ipi*. The context of this passage is that the Meskwakis have defeated the Sioux, their traditional enemies, in a battle, killing all but one. The one survivor is sent home to tell the story and given detailed instructions about what to say. The hero ends with, 'As for you, right when you finish talking is when you will die.' The Sioux man goes back home, recounts what happened in the battle and says, 'As for me <HEARSAY EVIDENTIAL> I will die.'

(12) "ki·nake·hwi·na ki·šetone·moyanemeko i·ni wi·hnepo·hiyani," e·hineči,

    "ki·na=ke·hi=wi·na   ki·šetone·mo-yane=meko

    you=moreover=CONTRAST   PERF.talk-2/SUBJUNCT=EMPH

    i·ni   wi·h-nepo·hi-yani,"   e·h-in-eči,

    then   FUT-die-2/AOR   AOR-say.thus.to-X>3/AOR

    '"But as for you, right when you finish talking

    is when you will die," he was told,'

    [nine clauses intervene]

    ki·ša·čimočimeko, "ni·nake·hwi·napi ni·hnepo·hi," e·hišiwe·či.

    e·ha·htawa·sa·hiči e·hnepo·hiči.

    IC-ki·ša·čimo-či=meko,

    IC-PERF.tell.story-3/CH.CONJ=EMPH

    "ni·na=ke·hi=wi·na=**ipi**   n-i·h-nepo·hi-Ø,"   e·h-išiwe·-či.

    I=moreover=CONTRAST=**HRSY**   l-FUT-die-1/IND   AOR-declare.thus-3/AOR

    e·h-a·htawa·sa·hi-či   e·h-nepo·hi-či.

    AOR-suddenly.fall.on.back.DIM-3/AOR   AOR-die-3/AOR

    'After he had finished the whole story,

    "And as for me, **they say** I will die," he declared.

    'The poor guy keeled over backward and died.' (Dahlstrom 2003:43–44)

Since the source of the Meskwaki hearsay evidential is a verb of quoting, one might ask if the form in (12) is merely an instance of a quoting verb. The answer to that question is no: the enclitic seen in (12) and elsewhere has undergone grammaticalization to become an evidential particle and is not functioning as a verb. Evidence against analyzing =*ipi* in (12) as an ordinary verb of quoting comes from the shift of person between the two parts of (12). In the represented speech containing the evidential, the subject of *nepo·hi-* 'die' is first person. But if =*ipi* were functioning as a quoting verb framing a direct quotation, we would see a second person subject of 'die,' matching the earlier utterance. Alternatively, if the represented speech were presented as indirect quotation (possible though infrequent in Meskwaki), the verb *nepo·hi-* 'die' would be inflected in the aorist conjunct paradigm, used for subordinate clauses, instead of in the independent indicative paradigm found in main clauses. Since the clause in question exhibits both a shift in person and main clause independent indicative inflection, it is clear that =*ipi* here is not a regular quoting verb but instead a grammaticalized evidential particle.

The passage in (13), taken from the text in Dahlstrom 1996, provides a further example of the use of *=ipi,* here reporting what the subject was told in a vision or dream:

(13) o·ni·na oškinawe·he·ha, "nahi, natawi-po·ni-mahkate·wi·no,"
      e·hineči e·hina·hpawa·či.

      o·ni=i·na   oškinawe·he·ha   "nahi,   natawi–po·ni–mahkate·wi·-no,"
      and.then=that   young.man.DIM   okay,   time.to–stop–fast-2/IMP
      e·h-in-eči   e·h-ina·hpawa·-či.   […]
      AOR-say.thus.to-X>3/AOR   AOR-dream.thus-3/AOR
      pye·ya·niči o·sani, e·ha·čimoha·či e·na·hpawa·či. "ni·hpo·nipi–mahkate·wi," …
      IC-pya·-niči   o·s-ani,   e·h-a·čimoh-a·či   IC-ina·hpawa·-či.
      IC-come-3'/CH.CONJ   3.father-OBV   AOR-tell-3>3'/AOR   IC-dream.thus-3/PART/OBL
      "n-i·h-po·ni–=ipi–mahkate·wi·-Ø," …
      1-FUT-stop–=HRSY–fast-1/IND
      'And then that young teenage boy, "Okay, it's time for you to stop fasting," he dreamed
      that he was told. […]
      When his father came, he told him what he had dreamed.
      "**They said** I should stop fasting," … ' (Dahlstrom 1996:130)

In (13) we again see the hearsay evidential *=ipi* used to report a previous utterance. The original utterance is by the spirits whom the young man sees in a dream; they tell the young man to stop fasting, using an imperative form with second person singular inflection. The young man then reports this to his father, changing the imperative to a statement, shifting the person of the subject of *po·ni–mahkate·wi·-* 'stop fasting' to first person singular, and attaching the evidential enclitic to the right of the first phonological word, the preverb *po·ni-*'stop, cease.'

Inference: Plain Interrogative Inflection

A very different strategy is employed in Meskwaki to indicate that an utterance is an inference: that is, that the speaker is deducing after the fact that something has occurred. Such utterances are marked by inflecting the verb in the plain interrogative paradigm, analyzed in (9). For example, the context for (14) is that the speaker has seen tracks in the snow and signs of a struggle. He infers that a bear has killed his son:

(14) nesekokwe·nima·hi·na mahkwani
      nes-ekokwe·ni=ma·hi=i·na
      kill-3'>3/**PLAIN.INTERR**=after.all=that.**ANIM**   mahkw-ani
      'A bear must have killed that guy, after all.' (Dahlstrom 1996:140)   bear-**OBV**

An additional example of plain interrogative verbal inflection marking an utterance as an inference may be seen in (15):

(15) aniwisa·hikwe·ni
      aniwisa·hi-kwe·ni
      run.fast.**DIM**-3/**PLAIN.INTERR**
      'He must have run fast.' (Kiyana 1913:1005)

(15) is from a long text about the culture hero Wisahkeha; the speakers are young women who failed to keep up with a no longer visible Wisahkeha and infer that Wisahkeha must have run so fast that he is out of sight.

The following example illustrates the use of plain interrogative verb inflection with a first person subject:

(16) ki·ša·kotekwa·mo·hiwa·ne·ni
      ki·ša·kotekwa·mo·hi-wa·ne·ni
      sleep.soundly.**DIM**-1/**PLAIN.INTERR**
      'I must have been sound asleep.' (Kiyana 1913:496)

(16) shows that the inferential evidential can be used about one's own previous experiences if one is not conscious at the time.

The expression of the inferential evidential with verb inflection is formally distinct from the use of a second-position enclitic to express the hearsay evidential, illustrating the scattered nature of Meskwaki evidentiality.

Traditional Narratives: Aorist Conjunct Inflection on Verbs in Main Clauses

Like Cheyenne, Meskwaki has a way of indicating that a narrative is a traditional one, rather than a personal story. Aorist conjunct verb inflection, illustrated above in (5), has as its primary function encoding subject and object agreement in subordinate clauses, both complement clauses subcategorized for by the matrix

verb and adjunct clauses expressing adverbial notions. In traditional Meskwaki narratives, however, we find aorist conjunct inflection appearing also in the main clauses of the sentences of the story.[7] (17) is one of countless examples that could be provided of this use, here as the very first sentence of a story.

(17) našawaye nekoti neniwa okwisani eˑhmahkateˑwiˑnaˑči

    našawaye   nekoti   neniwa   o-kwis-ani   eˑh-mahkateˑwiˑn-aˑči
    long.ago   one   man   3-son-OBV   AOR-make.O.fast-3>3'/AOR

    'Long ago a certain man made his son fast.' (Dahlstrom 1996:129)

Other examples of main clause aorist conjunct verbs may be seen in the nonquoted segments of (12) and (13) above.

Personal narratives, on the other hand, such as *The Autobiography of a Meskwaki Woman* (Goddard 2006a), use independent indicative inflection in many of the main clauses:

(18) keˑhtenameko keˑkeyaˑh nenahihaˑwa

    keˑhtena=meko   keˑkeyaˑhi   ne-nahih-aˑwa
    truly=EMPH   eventually   1-know.how.to.make-1>3/IND

    'I really did learn how to make it [a yarn belt] eventually.' (Goddard 2006a:32)

Here the narrator is telling about her own life, rather than relating a traditional story, so the regular independent indicative inflection for main clauses is used.[8]

Hearsay Enclitics in Narratives

The Cheyenne system makes a clear distinction between the reportative evidential and the narrative evidential: only one can be chosen for the inflectional slot. Since Meskwaki evidentiality is of the scattered sort, there is no paradigmatic blocking preventing a hearsay enclitic being used in narratives, as will be shown in the subsections below.

Shifts to Independent Indicative within the Narrative

A fairly common phenomenon in Meskwaki narrative texts is that the narrator will sometimes step out of the narrative mode, adding background information as a remark in one of the inflectional paradigms typical of face-to-face conversation. Such asides are often accompanied by the hearsay evidential:

(19)   aniwe·we·kesiniwanipi pe·hki i·nini ahkohko·ni,
     aniwe·we·kesi-**niwani**=**ipi**   pe·hki   i·nini   ahkohkw-ani,
     have.loud.sound-3'/IND=HRSY really   that.ANIM.OBV drum-OBV
     'That drum really had a loud sound, it's said, ...' (Dahlstrom 2015:191)

The verb in (19) is inflected in the independent indicative, used for nonnegated main clause assertions.

Negated main clauses express negation with the negative particle *a·kwi* 'not' plus negative inflection on the verb. This pattern is also seen in asides by a narrator, and may be accompanied by a hearsay evidential:

(20)   na·hka a·kwipi nahi-mi·hkemehkwe·we·čini,
     na·hka   a·kwi=**ipi**   nahi–mi·hkemehkwe·we·-čini,
     also   not=HRSY   be.given.to–court.women-3/NEG
     'Also, it's said, he never chased women, ...' (Dahlstrom 2015:188)

In contrast to (20), (21) illustrates how narrative clauses marked with the evidential strategy of employing aorist conjunct inflection on main clauses express negation: a negative preverb *pwa·wi–* 'not' is added to the verb complex, allowing the aorist conjunct inflection to surround the preverb-verb compound:

(21)   e·hpwa·wi–ki·šihto·či   na·tawino·ni
     e·h-**pwa·wi**–ki·šiht-o·či   na·tawino·ni
     AOR-not–fix-3>0/AOR   medicine
     'He hadn't prepared any medicine.' (Dahlstrom 2003:36)

Another syntactic construction typical of main clauses in face-to-face conversation is an equational sentence with a zero copula. Such equational sentences are also found as asides by a narrator and are likely to include a hearsay evidential:

(22) oškinawe·he·hanipi ke·hekwičini.

      oškinawe·he·h-ani=ipi   IC-kehekwi-čini.

      young.man.DIM-OBV=**HRSY**   IC-lose.O2.as captive 3/PART/3′

      'It was a young teenage boy, it's said, who gave him the slip.' (Dahlstrom 2015:146)

The second word in (22) is a conjunct participle, 'the one who gave him the slip,' equated with the clause-initial noun.

    Asides such as (19), (20), and (22) break the sequence of foregrounded clauses advancing the narrative, and thus are not expressed using the aorist conjunct paradigm typical of traditional narratives. At the same time, such asides present information that the narrator does not know from firsthand experience, and the hearsay evidential is therefore appropriate.

Evidential Particles at Episode Boundaries

Besides the use of the hearsay evidential in asides by the narrator, the enclitic =*ipi* may sometimes occur at the start of a new episode of the story (cf. Dahlstrom 1996 for discussion of episode structure):

(23) kaho·nipi e·howi·wiči.

      kaho·ni=ipi   e·h-owi·wi-či.

      so.then=**HRSY**   AOR-have.wife-3/AOR

      'So then, it's said, he got married.' (Dahlstrom 2015:187)

The following sentences in the episode typically do not occur with the hearsay evidential, but rather simply use the main clause aorist conjunct inflection to indicate that this is part of a traditional narrative.[9]

Speaker Certainty

Some descriptions of evidential systems include forms marking the extent of speaker certainty (cf. Brugman and Macaulay 2015:205ff). If this parameter is taken to be part of evidentiality, then Meskwaki exhibits even more evidential distinctions, all expressed by the choice of verbal inflectional paradigm, as illustrated in this section.[10]

Dubitative

The DUBITATIVE mode of the independent order is used for speculations, and is often glossed 'probably' or 'must.' Cognate forms of this inflectional paradigm are reported to have evidential functions in Cree dialects (cf. Déchaine et al. 2017).[11]

(24) owiye·ha kekaka·čihekowa·toke
     owiye·ha   ke-kaka·čih-ekowa·toke
     someone   2-joke.with-3>2P/DUB
     'Probably someone was playing a joke on you two.' (Kiyana 1913:103)

(25) i·nina·hwe·na na·hkači ki·hka·nena·naki šawesi·toke·hiki
     i·nina·hi=we·na   na·hkači   ki·hka·nena·naki   šawesi-·toke·hiki
     then=rather   again   our.friends   be.hungry-3P/DUB
     'By this time our friends must be hungry again.' (Kiyana 1913:298)

Utterances expressed with dubitative inflection are based upon the speaker's general knowledge of what is likely and may refer to past, present, or future events. In contrast, utterances expressed with plain interrogative inflection are specific deductions about a past event based upon present evidence, typically visual evidence.

Remote Past

Some paradigms within the conjunct order form a remote past by replacing the regular mode suffix for that paradigm with the mode suffix -ehe. The resulting forms may be used for events in the past or to express speaker uncertainty, or both (cf. Thomason 2003:71). Example (26) illustrates the PAST AORIST CONJUNCT on a complement clause:

(26) šewe·na ayo·hmeko ki·hpya·ya·ni,
     e·hkehke·netama·ni e·hkemo·temiwa·tehe aša·haki.
     "šewe·na   ayo·hi=meko   IC-ki·h-pya·-ya·ni,
     but   here=EMPH   IC-PERF-come-1/CH.CONJ
     e·h-kehke·net-ama·ni   e·h-kemo·tem-iwa·tehe   aša·h-aki."
     AOR-know-1>0/AOR   AOR-steal.O2.from-3P>1/PAST.AOR   Sioux-PL
     'But after I came back here,
     I realized that the Sioux had stolen it [a canoe] from me.' (Dahlstrom 2015:162)

In (26), the use of *-ehe* on the complement clause makes it explicit that the time of the theft was earlier than the time of the speaker's realization.

(27) illustrates the use of the suffix–*ehe* with negative inflection, producing a PAST NEGATIVE:

(27) a·kwiča·hye·toke nana·ši mešotehe i·niya nemešo·ha

      a·kwi=ča·hi=ye·toke   nana·ši   mešw-etehe

      not=so=it.seems   ever   hit.with.shot-X>3/**PAST.NEG**

      i·niya   nemešo·ha

      that.**ABSENT**   my.grandfather

      'My late grandfather was never hit in battle, it seems.' (Michelson 1927:70)

Both (26) and (27) describe past events that were not witnessed directly by the speaker, illustrating the close connection between past tense and speaker uncertainty. Relatedly, Murray (2016:496) observes that the Cheyenne remote past co-occurs with the narrative evidential.

Changed Unreal: Mirative/Surprise

The CHANGED UNREAL occurs with the particle *keye·hapa* 'it turned out that . . . ' and displays the same suffix *-ehe* that occurs in the remote past. Mirative marking (i.e., marking of unexpected or surprising information) is closely connected to evidentiality in a number of languages (cf. Brugman and Macaulay 2015:209ff).

(28) keye·hapake·hwi·na išemeko e·šimikehe . . .

      keye·hapa=ke·hi=wi·na   iše=meko   IC-išim-ikehe

      it.turned.out=moreover=but   just=EMPH   IC-speak.thus.to-X>1/**CH.UNR**

      'Actually, though, I was just being <u>told</u> that . . . ' (Goddard 2006a:18)

(29) keye·hapake·hipi i·nini mahkwani a·wahki·kwe·sahekotehe

      keye·hapa=ke·hi=ipi   i·nini   mahkw-ani

      it.turned.out=moreover=HRSY   that.OBV   bear-OBV

      IC-a·wahki·kwe·sah-ekotehe

      IC-scratch.O.face-3'>3/**CH.UNR**

      'But it turned out, they say, that the bear had scratched her face.' (Kiyana 1913:122)

Note that the hearsay evidential =*ipi* also appears in (29). (29) is hearsay from the point of view of the narrator speaking to the audience. The surprise is in the world of the story.

Conclusion

Using the conservative definition of evidentiality proposed by Brugman and Macaulay 2015, we may say that Meskwaki distinguishes three types of indirect evidence: hearsay, inference, and traditional narratives. These are the same distinctions made in the Cheyenne system and ones frequently found crosslinguistically in languages with evidential marking. A significant difference between the Cheyenne system and that of Meskwaki is that the Cheyenne morphemes indicating evidentiality occur in a single slot of the inflectional template, forming a neat paradigm, while evidential morphology in Meskwaki is realized in a "scattered" fashion. The scattered nature of Meskwaki evidentials permits an overlap in the distribution of the hearsay enclitic and the inflectional marking of a story as a traditional narrative. We may further conjecture that Meskwaki clauses with no overt evidential morphology are simply unmarked for source of evidence, rather than being explicitly marked as "witnessed," as in the Cheyenne system (cf. Brugman and Macaulay 2015:226ff on obligatoriness and complementarity).

Meskwaki also exhibits a number of inflectional verb paradigms specialized for indicating the extent of speaker certainty, a semantic parameter often included in discussions of evidentiality, including strategies for indicating speculation, uncertainty due to an event occurring in the remote past, and a mirative inflection indicating surprise.

NOTES

1. Thanks to Ives Goddard, Lucy Thomason, and others in the audience at the 49th Algonquian conference for their comments, and thanks also to Adam Singerman and the two anonymous reviewers for this paper.
2. See Goddard 1994:187–207; 1995 for full listings of the Meskwaki inflectional paradigms.
3. Abbreviations in the Meskwaki examples: 3′ = obviative, 0 = inanimate, ABSENT = absentative demonstrative, ANIM = animate, AOR = aorist prefix; aorist conjunct inflection, CH.CONJ = changed conjunct, CH.UNR = changed unreal, CONTRAST =

contrastive, DIM = diminutive, DUB= dubitative, EMPH = emphatic, FUT = future, HRSY= hearsay evidential, IC = initial change (ablaut rule), IMP = imperative, INAN = inanimate, IND = independent indicative, NAR = narrative evidential, NEG= negative inflection, O = (first) object, O2 = second object, OBL = oblique head of relative clause, OBV = obviative, PART = conjunct participle, PAST.AOR = past aorist conjunct, PAST.NEG = past negative inflection, PERF = perfective, PLAIN.INTERR = plain interrogative inflection, RPT = reportative evidential, SUBJUNCT = subjunctive, WTN = direct/witness evidential, X = unspecified subject. Subject and object features in verb inflection are separated by > and are followed by identification of the verbal paradigm. The head of a relative clause is identified following the label PART (participle). Vowel length is marked by a raised dot.

4. Most of the daughter languages have lost the Proto-Algonquian final vowels, with concomitant loss of many of the mode suffixes.

5. The prioritive paradigm, used to express that one event took place before another, lacks the -e·n suffix.

6. In this regard, note that the Cheyenne inferential evidential includes a negative morpheme in its complex of affixes (example (2d)).

7. Evidence that a particular clause is the main clause includes the clause being the only one in a given sentence; containing a matrix verb subcategorizing a complement clause; being the clause that advances the action of the narrative. See Dahlstrom 2006 for more detailed discussion.

8. See Cook 2014:92ff. for a discussion of the evidential function of main clause conjunct verb forms in Plains Cree.

9. But see Thomason 2015:329 for a writer who uses the hearsay evidential throughout.

10. Two more inflectional paradigms may be mentioned here, both archaic and rare. The CONCLUSIVE (e.g., -hapa third singular) is used for definite conclusions, often in exclamations, and the ASSERTIVE is used for strong assertions (e.g., -pani third singular). See Goddard 1995 for discussion and examples; cognate forms are used as evidentials in Mi'gmaq (Inglis 2003) and in the Cree-Innu dialect continuum (James et al. 2001; Déchaine et al. 2017).

11. See also the discussion of dubitative forms in Nishnaabemwin in Valentine 2001:832ff.

REFERENCES

Brugman, Claudia, and Monica Macaulay. 2015. Characterizing Evidentiality. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2):201–237.

Cook, Clare. 2014. *The Clause-Typing System of Plains Cree: Indexicality, Anaphoricity, and*

Contrast. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 1996. Narrative Structure of a Fox Text. *nikotwâsik iskwâhtêm, pâakihtêpayih! Studies in Honour of H. C. Wolfart,* ed. by J. D. Nichols and A. C. Ogg, pp. 113–162. Algonquian and Iroquoian Memoir 13. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 2003. Warrior Powers from an Underwater Spirit: Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of an Illustrated Meskwaki Text. *Anthropological Linguistics* 45:1–56.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 2006. The Syntax of Algonquian Ethnopoetics. *Actes du Trente-Septième Congrès des Algonquinistes,* ed. by H. C. Wolfart, pp. 131–147. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 2015. Highlighting Rhetorical Structure through Syntactic Analysis: An Illustrated Meskwaki Text by Alfred Kiyana. *New Voices for Old Words: Algonquian Oral Literatures,* ed. by David J. Costa, pp. 118–197. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Dahlstrom, Amy. 2019. Embedded Questions in Meskwaki. *Papers of the Forty-Eighth Algonquian Conference,* ed. by Monica Macaulay and Margaret Noodin, pp. 69–85. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie, Monique Dufresne, and Charlotte Reinholtz. 2017. (Ir)realis Dubitative in the Cree Dialect Continuum. Paper read at the 49th Algonquian Conference, Montreal.

Goddard, Ives. 1991. Observations Regarding Fox (Mesquakie) Phonology. *Papers of the Twenty-Second Algonquian Conference,* ed. by William Cowan, pp. 157–181. Ottawa: Carleton University.

Goddard, Ives. 1994. *Leonard Bloomfield's Fox Lexicon: Critical Edition.* Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, Memoir 12. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Goddard, Ives. 1995. Notes on Fox (Mesquakie) Inflection: Minor Modes and Incompletely Described Morphemes. *Papers of the Twenty-Sixth Algonquian Conference,* ed. by David H. Pentland, pp. 124–150. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Goddard, Ives. 2006a. *The Autobiography of a Meskwaki Woman.* Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Goddard, Ives. 2006b. The Proto-Algonquian Negative and Its Descendants. *Actes du Trente-Septième Congrès des Algonquinistes,* ed. by H. C. Wolfart, pp. 161–208. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Goddard, Ives. 2015. The Twenty-Nine Enclitics of Meskwaki. *Papers of the Forty-Third Algonquian Conference,* ed. by Monica Macaulay and J. Randolph Valentine, pp. 72–116. Albany: SUNY Press.

Inglis, Stephanie. 2003. The Deferential Evidential in Mi'kmaq. *Papers of the Thirty-Fourth Algonquian Conference,* ed. by H. C. Wolfart, pp. 193–200. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

James, Deborah, Sandra Clarke, and Marguerite MacKenzie. 2001. The Encoding of Information Source in Algonquian: Evidentials in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 67:229–263.

Jones, William. 1911. Algonquian (Fox). *Handbook of North American Languages,* pt. 1, ed. by Franz Boas, pp. 735–834. Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 40. Washington, DC: GPO.

Kiyana, Alfred. 1913. *wisakea osani okyeni osimeani okomeseani* [Wisahkeha, his father, his mother, his younger brother, his grandmother]. Manuscript 2958-a, National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

Leman, Wayne. 2011. *A Reference Grammar of the Cheyenne Language.* n.p.: Lulu Press.

Michelson, Truman. 1927. *Contributions to Fox Ethnology.* Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin 85. Washington: GPO.

Murray, Sarah E. 2016. Evidentiality and Illocutionary Mood in Cheyenne. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 82:487–517.

Thomason, Lucy. 2003. *The Proximate and Obviative Contrast in Meskwaki.* PhD dissertation, University of Texas.

Thomason, Lucy. 2015. On Editing Bill Leaf's Meskwaki Texts. *New Voices for Old Words: Algonquian Oral Literatures,* edited by David J. Costa, pp. 315–452. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Valentine, J. Randolph. 2001. *Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.