Evidential Types: Evidence from Cree Dialects

Author(s): Eleanor M. Blain and Rose-Marie Déchaine

Source: *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 73, No. 3 (July 2007), pp. 257–291

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/521728

EVIDENTIAL TYPES: EVIDENCE FROM CREE DIALECTS[1]

Eleanor M. Blain and Rose-Marie Déchaine

Brandon University and University of British Columbia

Evidentials, which introduce the speaker's perspective regarding information being presented, can be divided into at least two classes in Cree: CP-external (with illocutionary force) and IP-external (with temporal or modal force). Cree dialects differ in their deployment of evidentials. CP-external evidentials include quotative verbs (attested in all Cree dialects) and reportative particles (in Plains Cree). IP-external evidentials include dubitative particles (in Plains Cree) as well as affixal indirect evidentials that are temporally conditioned (in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi). The proposed analysis of evidential types in Cree dialects lends support to the Evidential Domain Hypothesis (Blain and Déchaine 2006) that claims that evidentials differ from each other according to the syntactic domain in which they are introduced.

[Keywords: Plains Cree, East Cree, Naskapi, Montagnais, evidentials, quotatives, reportatives, dubitatives]

1. The syntactic and semantic heterogeneity of evidentials. Evidential markers are elements that introduce the speaker's perspective regarding the information being presented (Chafe and Nichols 1986) and indicate the speaker's degree of commitment to the truth of what s/he is uttering. We look at evidential marking across a range of Cree dialects, comparing the western-most variety of Cree (Plains Cree) with the eastern-most varieties (the Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi complex).[2] For example, in Plains Cree, the most frequent evidentials include the quotative verb *itwê*-, the reportative particle *êsa*, and the dubitative particle *êtokwê/êtikwê* (Wolfart 1998). Representative examples are given in (1).[3]

[2] Cree is a member of the Algonquian language family and displays a high degree of dialect diversity: Plains Cree is spoken on the Prairies; Woods, Swampy, and Moose Cree constitute a succession of distinct dialects ranging across a northern tier from Saskatchewan to Ontario; finally, the Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi complex of Québec and Labrador forms the eastern edge of the dialect continuum.

[3] Abbreviations used are: 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; 3>1 = third person acting on first person; 3>3OBV = third person acting on third-person obviative; 3OBV>3 = third-person obviative acting on third person; CONJ conjunct; DUBIT dubitative; EVID

(1*a*) PLAINS CREE QUOTATIVE *itwê-*

    . . . *"â,   namôy   mîn   êwako   ê-wî-atoskâtamân,"   **itwê**w.*
        well   NEG   also   that   CONJ-FUT-engage.in(1)   **say**(3)

'. . . "Well, I am also not going to engage in that," he **said**'.
(Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw 1998:52, line 18)

(1*b*) PLAINS CREE REPORTATIVE *êsa*

    . . . , *êkotê   ê-sa-sâsakitisihk   **êsa**, . . .*
        there   CONJ-RED-lie.on.back(3)   **REPORT**

'. . . and [**reportedly**] he was lying there on his back'.
(Ahenakew 2000:110, lines 2–3)

(1*c*) PLAINS CREE DUBITATIVE *êtokwê*

    . . . , *tânisi   **êtikwê**   anima   matwân cî*
        how   **DUBIT**   that   I.wonder

    ê-manitowit   awa   ôhow   mitoni   anima.
    CONJ-have.spirit.power(3)   that   owl   really   that

'what **must** have happened, I suppose, was that the owl had spirit-
   power'.[4]
(Whitecalf 1993:42, lines 28–29)

1.1. The Evidential Domain Hypothesis. We propose that evidential markers can be introduced in a number of different positions in the clause. We assume that clauses are partitioned into at least four domains: the clause-typing domain (CP), the temporal domain (IP), the aspectual domain (AspP), and the predicate domain (vP). This is illustrated in (2). Accordingly, at least four different kinds of evidentials are predicted to exist depending on which part of the clause they are associated with, as in (3).

(2) [$_{CP}$ . . .   [$_{IP}$ . . .   [$_{AspP}$ . . .   [$_{vP}$ . . .]]]]
    CP-DOMAIN   IP-DOMAIN   AspP-DOMAIN   vP-DOMAIN

---

evidential; FUT future; IMPERS.SUBJ impersonal subject; INCL inclusive; INDEF indefinite; IND.EVID indirect evidential; IPC indeclinable particle; NEG negation; NONFACT nonfactual; NUM number; OBV obviative; OP operator; PASS.PL passive plural; PERF perfect(ive); PERS person; PL plural; QUOTE quotative; RED reduplication; REPORT reportative; s.o. someone; s.t. something; SG singular; SUBJ subjective; VAI intransitive verb with animate subject; VII intransitive verb with inanimate subject; VTA transitive verb with animate object; VTI transitive verb with inanimate object.

[4] In (1*c*), the fixed expression *matwân cî*, translated as 'I wonder', consists of the yes/no question marker *cî* in combination with *matwân*. It is glossed by Wolfart and Ahenakew (1998:82) as a polar dubitative and is one of the minor modes of Plains Cree evidentials (Blain et al. 2006).

(3) **Evid** [$_{CP}$ . . .   **Evid** [$_{IP}$ . . .   **Evid** [$_{AspP}$ . . .   **Evid** [$_{vP}$ . . .]]]]
     CP-EXTERNAL   IP-EXTERNAL   AspP-EXTERNAL   vP-EXTERNAL

For discussion and motivation of the proposed four-way syntactic typology, see Blain and Déchaine (2006).[5] Our claim that there are different types of evidentials is novel; we call this the Evidential Domain Hypothesis. The Evidential Domain Hypothesis contrasts with proposals that analyze evidentials as a uniform syntactic and/or semantic class. For example, Cinque (1999) posits a dedicated syntactic position for evidentials, while Faller (2002) argues, on semantic grounds, that evidentials are invariably illocutionary operators.

We argue that the Evidential Domain Hypothesis, as applied to data from Cree dialects (Plains Cree, East Cree, Montagnais, Naskapi), reveals the existence of two classes of evidentials in Cree: CP-external versus IP-external.[6]

1.2. The syntactic and semantic heterogeneity of Cree evidentials. The present analysis locates evidentials in different parts of the clause. The question we now address is which of these domains is relevant for Cree evidentials. Evidence from Cree dialects supports the distinction between CP-external and IP-external evidentials. CP-external evidentials introduce the speaker's perspective at the CP level. Semantically, they have illocutionary force. IP-external evidentials introduce the speaker's perspective at the IP level. Semantically, they have temporal and/or modal force.

We argue that quotatives (attested in Plains Cree and Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi [henceforth CMN]) and reportatives (attested in Plains Cree) are introduced in a CP-external position (4a). In contrast to this, dubitatives and nonfactuals (attested in Plains Cree) and indirect evidentials (attested in CMN) are introduced in an IP-external position (4b).[7] After showing how

---

[5] For related discussion, see Faller (2003a; 2004), who recognizes the existence of two types of evidentials on semantic grounds; her semantic classification corresponds to the distinction drawn here between CP-external and IP-external evidentials. Blain and Déchaine (2006) propose that the "perfect of evidentiality" (Izvorski 1997) is an instance of an AspP-external evidential, while the nonvolitional force of nonvisual evidentials in the first person (as reported by Curnow 2001, based on Ramirez 1997) is analyzed as an instance of vP-external evidentials.

[6] For alternatives to the syntactic analysis advocated here, see the pragmatic typology of Willett (1988) and the semantic typology of Speas (2004a; 2004b).

[7] Cinque (1999:174, n. 37) lists *allegedly*, *obviously*, *clearly*, and *evidently* as evidential adverbs in English (Chafe 1986 and Fraser 1996), and takes the contrast in (*i*) below to reflect the [Evaluative < Evidential] order. However, speakers we have consulted accept the [Eval < Evid] order only if *evidently* has comma and focus intonation, as in (*iib*).

(*ia*)   [$_{EVAL}$ **Fortunately**], he had [$_{EVID}$ **evidently**] had his own opinion of the matter.
(*ib*)   *[$_{EVID}$ **Evidently**], he had [$_{EVAL}$ **fortunately**] had his own opinion of the matter.   (cf. Siewierska 1992:418)
(*iia*)   *[$_{EVAL}$ **Fortunately**], he had [$_{EVID}$ **evidently**] formed an opinion on the matter.
(*iib*)   [$_{EVAL}$ **Fortunately**], he had, [$_{EVID}$ **EVIDÉNTLY**], formed an opinion on the matter.

evidentials present themselves in Plains Cree, we examine their distribution in the eastern dialects of CMN.

(4)   SYNTAX, SEMANTICS, AND DISTRIBUTION OF CREE EVIDENTIALS

	SYNTAX	SEMANTICS	DISTRIBUTION
(4a)	CP-external: **Evid** [$_{CP}$ . . . [$_{IP}$ . . .]]	Quotative	Plains Cree and CMN
		Reportative	Plains Cree
(4b)	IP-external: **Evid** [$_{IP}$ . . .]	Dubitative	Plains Cree
		Nonfactual	Plains Cree
		Indirect Evidentials	CMN

2. The heterogeneity of Plains Cree evidentials. The semantic and pragmatic properties of evidentials present the analyst with specific methodological problems that we discuss briefly (**2.1**). After surveying the evidential forms attested in Plains Cree (**2.2**), we show that Plains Cree evidentials are syntactically heterogeneous and argue that this heterogeneity is best understood in terms of how different types of evidentials are introduced, in particular whether they are CP-external (**2.3**) or IP-external (**2.4**).

2.1. The context of Plains Cree evidentials. Since evidentials can only be felicitously uttered by a speaker relative to a given context, any description or analysis requires that one examine their context of use. Conversations and extended narratives are the most natural source for this kind of data; the Plains Cree data reported here are drawn from narratives by Whitecalf (1993), Minde (1997), Kâ-Nîpihtêtêw (1998), and Ahenakew (2000).

In addition to controlling for context, another factor to consider is the translation process, which for evidentials is "notoriously difficult" (Faller 2002:3, n. 4). Some evidential morphemes translate into English verbs of saying: for example, the quotative is often rendered as *X **said** "S."* The reportative can be rendered as *X **reported** S*. There is also the possibility of translating these elements as adverbs, as with the reportative (***reportedly** S*), or as modals (*it **must** be the case that S*).

2.2. The form of Plains Cree evidentials. In Plains Cree, several elements have the status of evidential markers.[8] As mentioned above, the most frequently occurring are quotative *itwê-*, reportative *êsa*, and dubitative *êtokwê* (Wolfart 1998). In addition, there is a nonfactual evidential, *êska*, which rarely occurs in Modern Plains Cree but is attested in earlier forms of

---

[8] James et al. (2001:230) state that "evidentials occur . . . only in the [Cree] varieties in Quebec and Labrador." D. James (personal communication) informs us that this is a claim about affixal evidentials only. As we shall see, while evidentials in Modern Plains Cree are particles, they are affixal in CMN.

the language. Morphosyntactically, Plains Cree evidentials are heterogeneous: while quotative *itwê-* is a verb, reportative *êsa*, nonfactual *êska*, and dubitative *êtokwê* are particles.[9] Their dictionary definitions, adapted from Wolfart and Ahenakew (WA) (1998), are given in (5).

(5*a*) **it-** VTA say thus to s.o., say this of s.o. (WA 1998:39)
     it- VTI say thus of s.t., say thus about s.t. (WA 1998:39)
     itwê- VAI say thus, call (it) thus; have such a meaning (WA 1998:44)
     itwêmakan- VII say thus, have such a meaning (WA 1998:44)
     itwêski- VAI say thus habitually, always say thus (WA 1998:44)

(5*b*) **êsa** IPC reportedly [i.e., information received from others, in contrast to *êtokwê* and *pakahkam*] (WA 1998:34)

(5*c*) **êtokwê** IPC presumably, I guess [*sic*; cf. *êtikwê*; dubitative, reflecting personal inference, in contrast to *êsa* and *pakahkam*] (WA 1998:34)

(5*d*) **êska** IPC beyond belief [revelatory] (WA 1998:34)

In addition to these four main types of evidentials, there are also "minor modes" of evidentiality (cf. Goddard 1995). For example, in Plains Cree, there are two other elements that seem to function as evidentials, namely, *pakahkam* and *matwân cî*, defined as follows:

(6*a*) **pakahkam** IPC I think; perhaps [expectation, in contrast to *êsa* and *êtokwê*] (WA 1998:142)

(6*b*) **matwân cî** IPC I wonder [polar dubitative] (WA 1998:82)

In this paper, we do not treat these minor modes of evidentials, other than to note their existence.[10]

2.3. CP-external evidentials in Plains Cree. Plains Cree CP-external evidentials include quotative *itwê-* and reportative *êsa*. Following Faller (2002:16), we treat these as illocutionary operators that present information.
  2.3.1. Plains Cree quotative *itwê-*. Quotative *itwê-* and its variants have several properties in common. In terms of its discourse function, the

---

[9] Many Proto-Algonquian affixal modes have been replaced by particles or preverbs in Plains Cree (D. Pentland, personal communication). The particle *êsa* (from Proto-Algonquian *ye:sani*) replaced the affixal assertive mode (*-san-*), which corresponds to Bloomfield's (1962) present tense. The preverb *kî-* replaced the affixal preterit (*-pan-*), with the old preterit form now used for other functions. (For related discussion, see Pentland 1984; 1988.) Plains Cree *êtokwê* (and its cognate forms) is from Proto-Algonquian *ye:toke:*, a particle which has replaced the older dubitative inflection with *-toke:-* on the verb; see the Cree verb paradigms of Ellis (1971).

[10] Given the definitions of Wolfart and Ahenakew (1998), we expect these minor modes of evidentials to fall into the class of indirect evidentials.

quotative presents evidence in historical and personal narratives. Morpho-syntactically, quotative *itwê-* is a verb; as such, it can be inflected for first-, second-, or third-person subject agreement, and it occurs with tense/aspect markers. Although the quotative is often translated as a verb of saying—for example, Wolfart and Ahenakew (1998:39) gloss it as 'say thus'—a more accurate translation of *itwê-* would be as a verb of 'thus-ing'. This captures the fact that *itwê-* is not, strictly speaking, a verb of saying; rather it only PRE-SENTS direct speech.[11] This contrasts with English-type *say*, which presents both direct speech (*John said, "I left"*) and indirect speech (*John said that he left*). Finally, in terms of its position, quotative *itwê-* usually occurs to the right of the proposition that it is associated with, as in (7).

(7a) . . . , *"â,   namôy,"   **itwêw**,   "môy   êwako*
      well   NEG   **say**(3)   NEG   that

     *ê-wî-atoskâtamân,"   **itwêw**.*
     CONJ-FUT-engage.in(1)   **say**(3)

'. . . , "Well, no," he **said**, "I am not going to engage in that," he **said**'.
(Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw 1998:52, line 14; translation adapted by RMD and EB)

(7b) . . . , *"kiyâm   êkota   ka-nipahâhkatosocik,"*
      let.it.be   there   IRREALIS-die.of.starvation(3PL)

     *ê-**it**ihcik.*
     CONJ-be.**said**(PASS.PL)

'. . . , "Let them starve to death there," it was **said** of them'.
(Ahenakew 2000:108, lines 20–21)

Quotative *itwê-* sometimes precedes the clause, as in (8). As far as we can determine, such examples are most often attested when the quotative is sand-wiched between a modifying element and the main body of the quotation. In (8a), the modifying element is *kiyâm* 'let it be'; in (8b), it is *îh* 'look'. We analyze such expressions as adverbs that take propositional scope, i.e., they modify the entire clause quoted.

(8a) . . . , *"kiyâm"   ni-ka-**itw**ân,*
      let.it.be   1-IRREALIS-**say**(1)

     "tita-kitimâkinâkoyahkok   ôma   ê-nêhiyâwiyahik, . . ."
     IRREALIS.respect(3)   this   CONJ-be.Cree(1PL.INCL)

'. . . , "Let them respect," I will **say**, "that we are Cree, . . ." '.
(Whitecalf 1993:52, lines 16–17)

---

[11] It would be more accurate to describe *itwê-* as a "presentational" evidential, rather than a quotative per se. For related discussion, see Faller (2002).

(8*b*) . . . , *"îh,"*   *k-**êtêyim**ak,*   *"tânis   âwa,   môy*
          look.   CONJ-**think.thus**.of.s.o.   how   this   NEG

      âw   ê-ayamihcikêt, . . ."
      this   CONJ-read.things(3)

  '. . . , "Look!" I **thought** of him, "What's with him, he does not
      read, . . ." '.
  (Ahenakew 2000:123–24)

A third possibility is for the quotative to be sentence-initial, as in (9). For
the texts that we have access to, this seems to be quite rare.

(9) *kî- **itwê**w   êwakw   âw   ôkimâhkân,   "mêkwâc   ôta*
    PERF-**say**(3)   that.one   this   chief   while   the

      ê-pimâtisicik   kêhtê-ayak, . . ."
      CONJ-live(3)   old.people

  'This chief used to say, "While the old people are still living amongst
      us, . . ." '.
  (Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw 1998:100, line 12)

Our analysis of quotative *itwê-* is as follows.[12] First, we claim that it is
CP-external; this captures the fact that it takes propositional scope. Second,
we propose that it introduces a discourse-linked operator (OP) in its specifier
position. This yields the base structure in (10). The canonical right-periph-
eral surface position of quotative *itwê-* arises by displacement of the CP
to the left (11*a*). Alternatively, an element may be introduced into the oper-
ator position, as in (11*b*); since this sentence-initial position usually has an
adverbial function, we label it as such. In a context such as (11*b*), left-
ward movement of the CP to sentence-initial position is blocked, and quo-
tative *itwê-* surfaces between the initial position and the CP. Finally, it is
possible—though rare—for quotative *itwê-* to occur in sentence-initial po-
sition (11*c*).[13]

(10)   [$_{\text{EVIDP}}$ OP [$_{\text{EVID=QUOTE}}$ [*itwê-*] [$_{\text{CP}}$ . . .]]]

(11*a*) RIGHT-PERIPHERAL QUOTATIVE (cf. 7)
        [$_{\text{EVIDP}}$ **CP**   [$_{\text{EVID=QUOTE}}$ [*itwê-*] [**t$_{\text{CP}}$** . . .]]]

---

[12] In (8), quotative *itwê-* has no tense marking and the default temporal orientation is past;
this is a general property of eventive verbs in Plains Cree. In (8*a*), the verbal status of quotative
itwê- is confirmed by the fact that it can be inflected with future/irrealis *ka-*.

[13] As with Plains Cree, Quechua CP-external evidentials also show second-position effects
(Blain and Déchaine 2006) in that they are associated with a Focus position (Muysken 1995)
that follows an initial Topic position.

(11*b*) SECOND-POSITION QUOTATIVE (cf. 8)
      [EVIDP **Adverb** [EVID=QUOTE [*itwê*-]] [CP . . .]]

(11*c*) SENTENCE-INITIAL QUOTATIVE (cf. 9)
      [EVIDP OP [EVID=QUOTE [***itwê***-] [CP . . .]]]

Observe that if an adverbial element precedes quotative *itwê*-, it is con-
strued as part of the quotation (cf. 8). Such adverb-initial orders could also
be derived by raising the adverb out of the CP to Spec, EvidP. This might be
a plausible analysis for (8*a*), where *kiyâm* is clearly connected to the lower
quoted CP. However, in (8*b*), the sentence-initial exclamative *îh*, while
clearly in the scope of quotative *îtêyim*- 'think thus', is not obviously seman-
tically connected to the quoted CP and so is unlikely to have originated
there.

While sentence-initial adverbs are clearly part of the quoted material,
there are contexts where adverbial modifiers are not part of the quotation.
This occurs when the adverb both follows and modifies the quotative, as
in (12).[14]

(12*a*) *"ê-pê-nâtâstimit,"*   *kî-**itwêw**,*   ***pêyakwâw*. . . .**
      CONJ-toward-whisk-away(3>1)   PERF-**say**(3)   **once**

      ' "He came to whisk me away to him," he had **said**, **once** . . ." '.
      (Ahenakew 2000:112, line 11)

(12*b*) *ayi, "mistahi,   mistahi   ayi   kaskêyihtam   ayisiyiniw," . . .*
      ah   much   much   ah   be.lonesome(3)   person

         ***itw*-âniwiw**   ***mâna*, . . .**
         say-IMPERS.SUBJ   **usually**

      'Ah, "A person gets very lonesome," it is **usually said**, . . .'.
      (Whitecalf 1993:66, line 14)

Thus, we see that the [ADVERB QUOTATIVE] order and the [QUOTATIVE
ADVERB] order differ with respect to the scope of the quotative. This follows
from the present analysis. In a quotative context, a sentence-initial adverb is
necessarily in Spec, EvidP and so is perforce in the scope of the quotative
(13*a*). As for the [QUOTATIVE ADVERB] order, this arises when the adverb is
directly modifying the quotative verb (13*b*).

(13*a*) ADVERB < QUOTATIVE (cf. 8)
      [EVIDP **Adverb**   [EVID=QUOTE [*itwê*-]] [CP . . .]]

---

[14] See Collins and Branigan (1997) and Branigan and MacKenzie (2002).

(13*b*) QUOTATIVE < ADVERB (cf. 12)
    [$_{EVIDP}$ CP [$_{EVID=QUOTE}$ [[*itwê-*] **Adverb**] [t_{CP} . . .]]]

To summarize, Plains Cree *itwê-* is almost always found in second-position, either following the clause it is construed with or following an adverbial element. We now consider the other CP-external evidential found in Plains Cree, namely, reportative *êsa*.

2.3.2. Plains Cree reportative *êsa*. Plains Cree reportative *êsa* has the following properties. Semantically, it indicates that the narrator did not personally witness or experience the event (Wolfart 1998:178); this correlates with a past orientation. Morphosyntactically, *êsa* is an invariant particle.

Consider (14). In (14*a*), the narrator is telling about a woman who finds a dead prairie chicken on the road. In (14*b*), the narrator is providing a secondhand account of someone who turned himself into a jackfish to avoid being whisked away. In (14*c*), the narrator is reporting that someone was related to her husband's family.

(14*a*) *wahwâ,*   *kitâpamêw*   ***êsa*,**
        oh.my!   look.at(3>3′) REPORT

    "*nikâh-~*   *nikâh-mowâw*   *awa*   *âpihtâ-kîsikâki . . .*"
    able-~   able-eat(1>3)   this   noon

'Oh my, she [**reportedly**] looked at it, "I could eat this at noon, . . ."'.
(Ahenakew 2000:94, line 6)

(14*b*) *êkos*   ***êsa***   *(ay âyis   mistahi   sôskosiwak),   êkosi*
        and.then REPORT because   very   slimy(3PL)   thus

    môy   *kî-kâhcitinik*   *anihi,*
    NEG   PERF-catch(3OBV>3)   those(OBV)

    sô-sôskopitik [*LAUGHS*].
    RED-pull.on.smooth.one(3OBV>3)

'And so [**reportedly**] (for they are very slimy), so the other could not catch him, he could not get a grip on him'.
(Ahenakew 2000:112, lines 16–17)

(14*c*) . . . ,   ***ês***   *ôm*   *ê-wâhkômât,* . . .
        REPORT   this   CONJ-related(3>3)

'. . . , so [**reportedly**] he was related to them, . . .'.
(Ahenakew 2000:76, line 9)

As with quotative *itwê-*, reportative *êsa* occurs in one of three positions: it may follow the proposition it is associated with (14*a*); it may occur in second position sandwiched between an adverbial element and the clause (14*b*);

or it may occur in sentence-initial position (14*c*). The latter seems to be relatively infrequent.

Our analysis of reportative *êsa* parallels that of quotative *itwê-*: it is CP-external, takes propositional scope, and introduces a discourse-linked operator (OP) in its specifier position. This yields the structure in (15). The surface position of reportative *êsa* arises in one of three ways. In (16*a*), the CP undergoes leftward movement and surfaces to the left of reportative *êsa*. In (16*b*), the adverbial element is introduced into the operator position thereby blocking leftward displacement of the CP; consequently, *êsa* occurs in second-position between the adverb and the CP. In (16*c*), *êsa* occurs in sentence-initial position.

(15) $[_{\text{EVIDP}} \text{ OP } [_{\text{EVID=REPORT}} [\textit{êsa}] [_{\text{CP}} \ldots]]]$

(16*a*) RIGHT-PERIPHERAL REPORTATIVE (cf. 14*a*)
$[_{\text{EVIDP}} \quad \textbf{CP} \quad [_{\text{EVID=REPORT}} [\textit{êsa}] [\textbf{t}_{\textbf{CP}} \ldots]]]$

(16*b*) SECOND-POSITION REPORTATIVE (cf. 14*b*)
$[_{\text{EVIDP}} \textbf{Adverb} \quad [_{\text{EVID=REPORT}} [\textit{êsa}] [_{\text{CP}} \ldots]]]$

(16*c*) SENTENCE-INITIAL REPORTATIVE (cf. 14*c*)
$[_{\text{EVIDP}} \text{ OP } [_{\text{EVID=REPORT}} [\boldsymbol{\textit{êsa}}][_{\text{CP}} \ldots]]]$

Adverbs that precede reportative *êsa* fall within its scope. In (17*a*), the sentence-initial *kêtahtaw* 'suddenly' is construed as part of what is being reported. Similarly, in (17*b*), the sentence-initial *mêtoni* 'really' is under the scope of the reportative. In other words, semantically *êsa* modifies the proposition as a whole, but syntactically it is inserted into the proposition that it modifies.

(17*a*) . . . , *kêtahtaw*   **êsa**   *kâ-wâpamât*   *êkote*   *ê-pimih-~*
               suddenly   **REPORT**   CONJ-see(3>3OBV)   there   CONJ-fly-~

         ispimihk   *ê-pimihyâit*   *niska.*
         overhead   CONJ-fly(3)   goose

         = (*i*) '. . . when [**reportedly**] suddenly he saw some geese flying overhead'
         ≠ (*ii*) '. . . when [suddenly **reportedly**] he saw some geese flying overhead' (cf. Ahenakew 2000:110, lines 3–4)

(17*b*) . . . , *mêton*   **ês**   *ê-mis-âhkosit*, . . .
               really   **REPORT**   CONJ-very-sick(3)

         = (*i*) '[**reportedly**] he was very sick'
         ≠ (*ii*) '[really **reportedly**] he was very sick'
         (cf. Ahenakew 2000:70, line 33)

Reportative *êsa*, like quotative *itwê-*, is analyzed as being a CP-external evidential. If such evidentials need only be external to CP, we expect them to co-occur; illustrative examples are given in (18)–(20). We adopt the convention of using "X < Y" to indicate that X is nested inside of Y.

(18) QUOTATIVE < REPORTATIVE

. . . , *"kitasotamêkowininaw   êkây wîhkac   ka-pîkonahk*
     your.promise.to.us   never   FUT-break(3)

ê-nîsokâtêt   ayisiyiniw,"
CONJ-have.two.legs(3)   people

*kî-**itwêw**   **êsa**;*
PERF-**say**(3)   **REPORT**

'"So that no human walking on two legs would ever break the promises made to us," he [the Queen's representative] had **said**, it is **reported**;'.
(Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw 2000:100, lines 21–22)

(19) REPORTATIVE < QUOTATIVE

". . . , anima   k-ês-âsotamâkoyahk,   êkây   wîhkâc
    that   FUT-thus-make.promise(3>1)   NEG   ever

awiyak   ka-kî-pîkonahk;"
someone   FUT-PERF-break(3)

*êkos   **êsa**   kî-**itwêw**ak   kisêyiniwak   ôki.*
thus   **REPORT**   PERF-**say**(3PL)   old.men   these

'". . . no one would ever be able to break the promises he had made us;" thus then [**reportedly**] **spoke** these old men'.
(Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw 2000:112, lines 7–9)

(20) QUOTATIVE < QUOTATIVE

"'. . . , êkot[a]   ôma   kiyê-ohcihikoyahk   askiy-~ askiy,'
    there   this   IC-fight.so.over.st(3PL-2PL)   land

*kî-**itwêw**   **ês**   kisêyiniw,"*
PERF-**say**(3)   **REPORT**   old.man

*kî-**itwêw**   mâna   kâ-kî-oyôhtâwîyân.*
PERF-**say**(3)   usually   CONJ-PERF-father(1)

'"'. . . , it will be then that they fight us over the land,' that old man had then [**reportedly**] **said**," my late father used to **say**'.
(Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw 2000:112, lines 22–24)

Regarding the co-occurrence of CP-external evidentials, three of the four logical possibilities are attested: [QUOTE < REPORT], [REPORT < QUOTE], and

[QUOTE < QUOTE]. The absence of [REPORT < REPORT] likely reflects the fact that reportatives present only the speaker's perspective, so their iteration is pragmatically anomalous (akin to *I _reported_ that I _reported_ S). This contrasts with quotatives which can present the speech of any speech act participant (akin to X _said_ "Y _said_ 'S'").

To sum up, both quotative _itwê-_ and reportative _êsa_ are introduced in a CP-external position. They are both associated with an abstract discourse-linked operator (OP), which accounts for why the quotative and reportative are usually second-position elements. The requirement that the OP position be filled is satisfied by leftward displacement of the CP or by the introduction of an adverbial element to the left of the quotative or reportative. Less frequent is the occurrence of the quotative and reportative in sentence-initial position, which seems to be governed by stylistic factors. The rarity of sentence-initial quotatives and reportatives may be related to the requirement that the OP position be filled. If so, quotative and reportative evidentials in sentence-initial position should be felicitous only if the OP is linked to something else in the preceding discourse.[15]

2.4. IP-external evidentials in Plains Cree. We now consider the properties of IP-external dubitative _êtokwê_ and nonfactual _êska_.

2.4.1. Plains Cree dubitative _êtokwê_. Dubitative _êtokwê_ (or _êtikwê_) is an indirect evidential that indicates personal inference. It is temporally unrestricted insofar as it may occur with temporally unmarked verbs as well as with future and perfective forms. In Modern Plains Cree, dubitative _êtokwê_ is an invariant particle that precedes or follows the proposition it is associated with. While the Modern Plains Cree dubitative is a particle, the corresponding indirect evidential forms in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi are affixal.[16] As we shall see, this is a primary locus of variation in the Cree evidential system.

Dubitative _êtokwê_ is often translated into English as the epistemic modal 'must' (e.g., _John must be here because I see his coat_). Such indirect evidentials are not, strictly speaking, modals. In accordance with Faller (2002:10), we understand inference as the common thread that links indirect evidence to epistemic necessity: both are ways of acquiring information through reasoning. In addition, inferential indirect evidentials express THE SPEAKER'S JUDGMENT that the proposition expressed is necessarily true.

After presenting the contexts in which Plains Cree dubitatives occur (**2.4.1.1**), we argue that their IP-external status is consistent with their ordering relative to negation (**2.4.1.2**) and relative to CP-external evidentials (**2.4.1.3**). We close with a discussion of the Modern Plains Cree dubitative

---

[15] For discussion regarding information structure in Plains Cree, see Cook et al. (2005) and Muehlbauer (2005).

[16] See **3.3** for discussion of the morphosyntax of CMN indirect evidentials.

particle in relation to the affixal dubitative that was attested in older forms of Plains Cree (**2.4.1.4**).

2.4.1.1. The context of Plains Cree dubitatives. In (21*a*), the narrator makes an inference about the belief system of whites based on the observation that some of them participate in all aspects of the Sundance. As for (21*b*), this is from a story about an old woman who picks up a roadkill bird on the way to church, a bird the minister can smell from the front of the church. The narrator infers the bird must have been dead for awhile. Observe that, in these examples, the dubitative occurs after the clause it is associated with.

(21*a*) . . . *ahpô*   *ayisk*   *môniyâsak,*   *wîstawâw*
      because   even   whitemen   they.too

    ê-tâpwêwakêyihtahkik   **êtikwê**   *anima*   *nipâkwêsimowin*
    CONJ-truly.believe.it(3PL)   **DUBIT**   that   sundance

    '". . . for even the Whites themselves **must** believe in the Sundance'. (Whitecalf 1993:54, lines 12–13)

(21*b*) . . . *ôm*   *âsay*   *êkota*   *tânitahto-kîsikâw*   **êtikw**   *âhpô*
      this   already   there   how.many-days   **DUBIT**   even

    ê-pimisihk   *ana*   *pihêw.*
    CONJ-lie(3)   that   prairie.chicken

    '. . . , that prairie-chicken **might** even have been lying there for a few days already'.
    (Ahenakew 2000:94 lines 9–11)

Dubitative *êtokwê* also occurs in second position; examples are given in (22). In (22*a*), the narrator recounts an incident that took place when she was a girl. A deranged man is lost and a search party is looking for him. The party finds his footprints in the snow, heading toward the place where treaty days are held. Dubitative *êtokwê* indicates that the narrator makes an inference based on information available to her. In (22*b*), because the minister can smell the bird from the front of the church, the narrator infers that the roadkill must smell bad.

(22*a*) . . . , *êkotê*   **êtikwê**   *kâ-~*   *k-âyi-~*
      over.there   **DUBIT**   CONJ-~   CONJ-ASP-~

    ê-wî-kakwê-isi-sipwêhtêt, . . .
    CONJ-intend-try-thus-depart(3)

    'He **must** have tried to go off to that place . . .'.
    (Ahenakew 2000:126, line 6)

(22*b*) . . . , *mâk* ***êtikwê*** *miyâkosiyiwa*, . . .
         but   **DUBIT** be.smelling(3OBV)

    '. . . , but it **must** have been smelling already, . . .'.
    (Ahenakew 2000:94, line 9)

Dubitative *êtokwê* is also found in sentence-initial position, as in (23). A Cree man sees a white woman headfirst in a garbage bin with her feet sticking out near a full clothesline; he infers that she must have been hanging up her laundry.

(23) ***êtikw*** *âwa* *môniyâskwêw* *wiyawîtimihk* *ê-akotât*
    DUBIT this white.woman outdoors CONJ-hang.up(3)

    okisîpêkinikêwina . . .
    her.laundry

    'The White woman **must** have been outside hanging up her
      washing . . .'.
    (Ahenakew 2000:92, lines 10–11)

Our analysis of dubitative *êtokwê* is as follows. First, we claim that it is IP-external; this captures the fact that its distribution differs from CP-external evidentials. As with the other evidentials, *êtokwê* introduces a discourse-linked operator (OP) in its specifier position. This yields the base structure in (24), where *êtokwê* is positioned external to IP. As with quotative *itwê-* and reportative *êsa*, dubitative *êtokwê* occurs in one of three positions relative to the clause it is associated with: in a right-peripheral position, in second position, and in sentence-initial position. The relevant structures are given in (25).

(24) $[_{\text{EVIDP}}$ OP $[_{\text{EVID=DUBIT}}$ [*êtokwê*] $[_{\text{IP}}$ . . .]]]

(25*a*) RIGHT-PERIPHERAL DUBITATIVE (cf. 21)
    $[_{\text{EVIDP}}$ **IP** $[_{\text{EVID=DUBIT}}$ [*êtokwê*] [**t$_{\text{IP}}$** . . .]]]

(25*b*) SECOND-POSITION DUBITATIVE (cf. 22)
    $[_{\text{EVIDP}}$ **Adverb** $[_{\text{EVID=DUBIT}}$ [*êtokwê*] $[_{\text{IP}}$ . . .]]]

(25*c*) SENTENCE-INITIAL DUBITATIVE (cf. 23)
    $[_{\text{EVIDP}}$ OP $[_{\text{EVID=DUBIT}}$ [***êtokwê***] $[_{\text{IP}}$ . . .]]]

One indication that dubitative *êtokwê* is IP-external is that it always follows wh-words such as *tânisi* 'how', as in (26). Here the narrator infers the owl has spirit-power based on a cultural belief about owls and because

she heard the dead owl hooting. We take the [WH < DUBITATIVE] order as indicative of the IP-external position of *êtokwê*.[17]

(26) . . . , ***tânisi êtikwê*** *anima matwân cî ê-manitowit*
            how   DUBIT that   I.wonder CONJ-have.spirit.power(3)

    awa ôhow mitoni anima.
    that owl   really that

  '**what must** have happened, I suppose, was that the owl had
  spirit-power'.
  (Whitecalf 1993:42, lines 28–29)

Our analysis of dubitative *êtokwê* as IP-external is supported by two other kinds of data: (*i*) its ordering relative to negation and (*ii*) its co-occurrence with CP-external evidentials.

    2.4.1.2. Ordering of IP-external dubitative and negation. The relative ordering of the dubitative and negation is consistent with the claim that dubitative *êtokwê* is IP-external, and also provides evidence that the dubitative may sometimes be displaced. On independent grounds, Plains Cree negation has been argued to be introduced in the CP layer (27*a*).[18] We here propose that dubitative *êtokwê* is IP-external (27*b*). Together these two claims predict the ordering in (27*c*).

  (27*a*) NEG < CP
  (27*b*) DUBITATIVE < IP
  (27*c*) NEG < DUBITATIVE < IP

Plains Cree has two forms of negation, *namôya* and *êkâ*, and the [NEG < DU-BIT] order is attested with both of them, as in (28). Though the negative occurs before the dubitative in these examples, it nevertheless takes narrow scope, as shown by the unavailability of the 'no doubt' interpretation in (28*a–ii*) and (28*b–ii*).[19]

---

  [17] If wh-words occupy Spec,CP, then the [WH < DUBITATIVE] order follows from our IP-external analysis of dubitatives. However, if Plains Cree wh-questions are clefts of the form 'who is it that . . .' (Blain 1997), then the [WH < DUBIT] order would reflect the scope-taking properties of the wh-expression. Many of Lacombe's (1874*b*:62) examples show the dubitative with a wh-phrase, usually *tâni'si* 'how'; this use of the dubitative may be related to the Blackfoot nonaffirmative (Frantz 1991).

  [18] See Reinholtz (1999), Déchaine and Wolfart (1998; 2000), and Déchaine and Wiltschko (2002; 2003).

  [19] Quechua evidentials likewise take scope over negation (Faller 2002:227). For Faller, negation is part of the proposition expressed, while evidential force is analyzed as a sincerity condition and thus cannot (in general) be negated.

(28a) *Êkosi* **môy** *âyiwâk* **êtokwê** *kîkway*
in.this.way NEG more DUBIT anything

    ka-nitawêyihtamahk, . . .
    IRREALIS-want.s.t.(1PL.INCL)

    = (*i*) 'In this way, we **should probably not** want anything more, . . .'.
    ≠ (*ii*) 'In this way, we **no doubt** want something more, . . .'.
    (Minde 1997:14, line 19)

(28b) **êkây** **êtokwê** *ê-ohci-nôhte-kimoticik* *êwak* *ôma*
NEG DUBIT CONJ-PERF-want-steal(3PL) that.one this

    kâ-kî-tôtahkik *aya,* . . .
    CONJ-PERF-do(3PL) well

    = (*i*) 'They did **not** want to steal, **I guess**, when they did this, . . .'.
    ≠ (*ii*) '**No doubt** they wanted to steal, when they did this, . . .'.
    (Minde 1997:112, lines 12–13)

In addition to the [NEG < DUBIT] order, which is predicted by our analysis, the [DUBIT < NEG] order is also attested:

(29a) . . . , *ahpô* **êtokwê** *wîstawâw* **môy** *ê-kiskêyihtahkik,* . . .
    even DUBIT they.too NEG CONJ-know.it(3PL)

    '. . . , [it **must** be that] they themselves do **not** even know, . . .'.
    (Minde 1997:14, line 25)

(29b) . . . , *ê-kî-kostamihk* **êtokwê** **êkâ** *kwayask*
    CONJ-PERF-be.afraid.of.it(3PL) DUBIT NEG properly

    ka-tôtamâhk, . . .
    FUT-do.it(1PL)

    '. . . , they **must** have been afraid that we might **not** behave
    properly, . . .'.
    (Minde 1997:14, lines 9–10)

The [DUBIT < NEG] order seems to be a counterexample to the claim that dubitative *êtokwê* is IP-external. Given that NEG is in the CP-domain, and that *êtokwê* is IP-external, this predicts [NEG < DUBIT], as in (30a). We suggest that [DUBIT < NEG] is derived via movement of the dubitative to a higher position, as in (30b).

(30a)   NEG < DUBITATIVE < IP
(30b) **DUBITATIVE** < NEG < **t**$_{\text{DUBIT}}$ < IP

Positing dubitative movement to account for the [DUBIT < NEG] order might appear to be an ad hoc solution, but as we shall see, this is not an isolated case. The interaction of the IP-external dubitative with other CP-external evidentials suggests that dubitative movement can occur in those contexts as well.

2.4.1.3. IP-external dubitative with CP-external evidentials. Our analysis of dubitative *êtokwê* as IP-external predicts that it should be possible to embed the dubitative under quotative *itwê-* or reportative *êsa*. Consider first the embedding of dubitative *êtokwê* under quotative *itwê-*, as illustrated in (31). In (31*a*), the narrator introduces her own thoughts as a direct quotation, which itself contains a dubitative. In (31*b*), the dubitative occurs as part of an adverbial expression that precedes quotative *itwê-*. The old woman is sitting by the window when a stranger enters and starts telling her about the fate of the Cree people. The community infers, based on this evidence, that this woman must have had a vision. The narrator presents the community's inference via dubitative *êtokwê*.

(31) QUOTATIVE < DUBITATIVE

(31*a*) *"..., tânis **êtikw** âwa ê-wî-itâpacihtât*
how **DUBIT** this CONJ-intend-use.it(3)

k-ôtinahk," nititêyimaw, ...
CONJ-take.it(3) **think.thus**.of.s.o.(1)

'"..., what **must** he be going to do with what he has taken," I **thought** of him ...'.
(Ahenakew 2000:124, line 1) [translation by EB and RMD]

(31*b*) *"mâk **êtikwê**," ê-**itwê**yâhk mân,*
but **DUBIT** CONJ-**say**(1PL.INCL) always

"ê-kî-isinahk anim, ...".
CONJ-PERF-have.vision(3) that

'"But it **must** have been," we always **say**, "that she had a vision, ..."'.
(Ahenakew 2000:118, lines 12–13)

The embedding of dubitative *êtokwê* under reportative *êsa* is also attested. In (32*a*), the narrator's husband has a dream about how to make medicine. At the time, the narrator's brother-in-law (Austin) is in the hospital and his sister is told about the medicine. Because Austin requests the medicine, the narrator infers that Austin's sister must have visited him in the hospital to tell him about the medicine. (32*b*) is part of a story about a white woman who accidentally falls headfirst into a garbage bin while hanging her clothes; the narrator infers that she must have been doing her laundry.

(32)   REPORTATIVE < DUBITATIVE
(32a) . . . , ***êtikw***   *âwa*   *êkwa*   *nicâhkos*   *aw*
            DUBIT   this   and.then   my.sister-in-law   this

       êkwa   *sêmâk*   ***êsa***   *k-êspayit*   *osîmisa*
       and.then   right.away   **REPORT**   PERF-go(3)   his.brother(OBV)

       ê-asiwasoyit hospital   *ê-nitawâpamât*.
       CONJ-be.inside(3′)   CONJ-go.see(3-3)

    = (*i*) 'and then [**reportedly**] my sister-in-law **must** have gone there
       right away to see her younger brother in the hospital'.
    ≠ (*ii*) 'and it **must** have been **reported** that my sister-in-law went
       there right away to see her younger brother in the hospital'.
    (Ahenakew 2000:70, lines 10–12)

(32b) *êkwa*   ***êtikw***   *âwa*   *môniyâskwêw*   ***ês***
     and.then   **DUBIT**   this   white.woman   **REPORT**

     ê-kî-kisipêkinikêt   ***êsa***, . . .
     CONJ-PERF-do.laundry(3)   **REPORT**

    = (*i*) 'and [**reportedly**] a certain white woman **must** have been doing
       her laundry'.
    ≠ (*ii*) 'and it **must** have been **reported** that a certain white woman
       did her laundry'.
    (Ahenakew 2000:92, line 8)

Observe that even though the dubitative precedes the reportative in (32), it
is interpreted as being within the scope of the reportative, as evidenced by
the unavailability of the interpretations in (32*a–ii*) and (32*b–ii*). The sentence-initial positioning of dubitative *êtokwê* in (32*a*) presumably arises
from the same kind of dubitative movement discussed above in regard to
the [DUBIT < NEG] order.

Taken together, (31) and (32) confirm that IP-external dubitative *êtokwê*
can be contained within the domain of CP-external evidentials such as quotative *itwê-* and reportative *êsa*, as predicted by the present analysis.

2.4.1.4. The morphosyntax of the Plains Cree dubitative. Although
the dubitative in Modern Plains Cree is almost always realized as an independent particle in the form of *êtokwê*, there exists a corresponding affixal
form (*-okwê*, *-kwê*, *-tokê*) which appears in the verb complex. The affixal dubitative is no longer widely used in Modern Plains Cree. A partial paradigm
of the affixal dubitative appears in (33).

(33) PLAINS CREE AFFIXAL DUBITATIVE PARADIGM
        (adapted from Wolfart 1973:44)

		INDEPENDENT		CONJUNCT
VTA	3 > 1	*ni-* . . . *-okwê*		—
	3 > (3OBV)	—		*-â-kwê*[20]
	INDEF > 1	*ni-* . . . *-ikawinâ-tokê*		—
VAI	2	*ki-* . . . *-nâ-tokê*		—
	1PL.INCL	—		*-yahka-kwê* (?)
	3		*-tokê*	*-kwê*
	3PL		*-tokê-nik*	*-wa-kwê*
VTI	3		*-amô-tokê*	*-amo-kwê*
	3PL		*-amô-tokê-nik*	—
	3OBV		*-amiyi-tokê-ni*	—

The affixal Plains Cree dubitative seems to have had the same semantic range as its particle counterpart *êtokwê*. It marks personal inference and is temporally unrestricted. Representative examples are given in (34).

(34)   PLAINS CREE AFFIXAL DUBITATIVE

(34a) . . . , *nipêhikawinâtokê*, . . .
          wait.for (VTA INDEF > 1 INDEP **DUBIT**)

     '. . . , **I wonder** if they are waiting for me, . . .'.
     (Wolfart 1973:44a, S300-15)

(34b) *kaskêyihtamôtokênik*   *aniki*   *nitêhtâwâw.*
         lonely (VTI 3PL.INDEP **DUBIT**)   these   my.co-parents-in-law

     'Surely these co-parents-in-law of mine **must** be lonely'.
     (Wolfart 1973:44a, S130-7)

(34c) *mâh-môminêwak,*   *itah*   *misawâc*
         RED-eat.berry(3PL)   there   in.any.case

        kiw-ôh-pimâtisiwakwê.
        FUT-from-live (VAI 3PL CJ **DUBIT**)

     'They are eating berries from there (the bush), they will be living on
        that, **no doubt**'.
     (Wolfart 1973:44a, S84-11)

---

[20] The form given in Wolfart (1973) is *âhkwê*, but H. C. Wolfart (personal communication) informs us that the correct form is *âkwê*.

(34*d*) *tânisi   ê-itinikêkwê*.
     how   CONJ-fare (3 VAI CJ **DUBIT**)

'**I wonder** how he is faring'
(Wolfart 1973:44*a*, T91p20)

(34*e*) . . . , *tânitê   mîna   wêhtinâhkwê*
       from.where   also   take.s.o..from.there (VTA 3-(3′)CJ **DUBIT**)

    askihkwa.
    pail(NA 3′)

'. . . , **I wonder** where he got a pail'.
(Wolfart 1996:405*b*: 1973:44, §4.2.3.3, P200-35)

The fact that earlier forms of Plains Cree made more extensive use of the affixal form of the dubitative provides indirect support for our claim that Modern Plains Cree *êtokwê* is IP-external. In particular, in light of the clausal structure argued for in Déchaine (1999), the placement of the dubitative affix is consistent with the claim that it is IP-external. On the basis of the linearization of agreement affixes, Déchaine (1999) proposes that the verb-stem domain forms a phrasal IP constituent which is sandwiched between proclitic and enclitic agreement (35).

(35) [[[PERS/CONJ= [IP] =PERS/NUM] =NUM/OBV]]

The proclitic position corresponds to person agreement in the independent mode, and to the conjunct prefix in the conjunct mode.[21] The first enclitic position corresponds to person/number agreement, while the second enclitic position corresponds to number/obviation agreement. The question that arises is how the affixal dubitative is integrated into this clausal structure. The partial paradigms provided by Wolfart (1973:44*a*) indicate that in the independent mode the dubitative precedes plural agreement (36*a*), but that in the conjunct mode the dubitative follows plural agreement (36*b*).

(36*a*) . . . *-tokê-nik*
       DUBIT-3PL(INDEP)

(36*b*) . . . *-wa-kwê*
       3PL-**DUBIT**-(CONJ)

The placement of the dubitative relative to plural agreement reflects a historical distinction between two forms of agreement (D. Pentland, personal communication). The so-called external plural (*-*aki* or *-*iki*) occurs in the independent mode and conjunct mode participial forms. The so-called inter-

---

[21] See Blain (1997; 1999) for an analysis of the conjunct prefix as a complementizer.

nal plural (*-*wa:*) occurs in the conjunct mode only. This distinction is reflected in Plains Cree, where (external) number/obviation agreement follows the dubitative in the independent mode (37*a*), but (internal) number/obviation agreement precedes the dubitative in the conjunct mode (37*b*).

(37*a*) PLAINS CREE AFFIXAL DUBITATIVE IN INDEPENDENT MODE
[[[[PERS = [IP] =PERS/NUM] =**DUBIT**] =NUM/OBV]]

(37*b*) PLAINS CREE AFFIXAL DUBITATIVE IN CONJUNCT MODE
[[[[CONJ= [IP] =PERS/NUM] =NUM/OBV] =**DUBIT**]]

In contrast to the affixal dubitative, which occurs within the verb complex, the dubitative particle *êtokwê* occurs outside the verb complex and is introduced at the left edge of the clausal domain, as in (38).[22]

(38) PLAINS CREE DUBITATIVE PARTICLE
[**DUBIT** [[[PERS/CONJ= [IP] =PERS/NUM] =NUM/OBV]]]

Our analysis claims that, independent of its status as an affix or an independent particle, both variants of the Plains Cree dubitative are IP-external. This raises the question of whether one form of the Plains Cree dubitative predates the other. At least in Modern Plains Cree, it is clear that the dubitative particles coexist along with the affixal form, as indicated by Wolfart's (1973:44*b*) observations:

> *êtokwê* occurs very freely both with independent and conjunct order verbs, as well as in non-verbal sentences. Statistical studies (*cf.* Wolfart and Pardo, 1972) show that *êtokwê* is exactly ten times more frequent in the Alberta texts than in Bloomfield's texts. Stylistics, dialect differences, the time difference, etc. undoubtedly must be taken into account in this matter. But the most interesting question, which has to remain completely open at the present time, is whether there is an observable decline in the frequency of dubitative verb forms which would correlate with the increasing frequency of the non-verbal dubitative marker *êtokwê*.

The coexistence of the dubitative particle and the affixal dubitative is not specific to Plains Cree. Historical evidence indicates that both have coexisted for

---

[22] Consistent with the IP-external status of Plains Cree dubitative *êtokwê*, some speakers permit it in the pre-verb domain, as in (*i*) below. This is consistent with the looser collocational restrictions of the pre-stem position; see Wolfart (1973:76*b*, §7.52) for relevant discussion. In the present analysis, the morphosyntactic structure of such examples would be as in (*ii*).

(*i*) . . . ; *nikî-sâki-~   nikî-**êtokwê**-aya-sâkihik   wîsta,* . . .
PERF-love-~   PERF-**DUBIT**-well-love(3>1)   he.too

'. . . ; he, too, **must** have loved me . . .'.
(Minde 1997:60, line 7)

(*ii*) [[[PERS/CONJ= [. . . **DUBIT** . . . [IP]] =PERS/NUM] =NUM/OBV]]

a long time: both are reconstructed in Proto-Algonquian and so predate any possible Cree development by two or three thousand years (D. Pentland, personal communication). This leads us to conclude that in Plains Cree (and also in Proto-Algonquian), there are two ways of marking dubitative evidential force: with a particle or an affix. In Modern Plains Cree, the particle occurs with greater frequency and its affixal counterpart is no longer widely used.

2.4.2. Plains Cree nonfactual *êska*. The other IP-external evidential is the nonfactual marker *êska* (or *iska*); it is associated with situations indicating that something is counter to fact or expectation, and typically expresses the speaker's surprise. *Êska* is an invariant particle, and whether it has any temporal restrictions is unclear at this point. In (39), nonfactual *êska* is embedded inside quotative *itwê-*. The context is one in which the speaker is expressing surprise that it is the dead owl which has been hooting.

(39) . . . , *"awa*   ***êska***   *awa,"*   ***itwêw,***
         this   NON.FACT   this,   **say**(3)

   "êwako   *awa*   *awa*   *kâ-kî-cimahak*   *awa*
   the.very.one   this   this   CONJ-PERF-place.upright(1>3) this

     mistik,"   ***itwêw,***
     post   **say**(3)

   "êkotê *awa*   *awa*   *ôhow*   *awa* *kâ-tahkopisot,"*   ***itwêw,*** . . .
   there   this   this   owl   this CONJ-be.tied.fast(3) **say**(3)

   '. . . , "and **imagine my surprise**," she **said**, "on the post I had set up," she **said**, "to which the owl was tied," she **said** . . .'. [it was that one which was hooting]. . . .
   (Whitecalf 1993:42, lines 24–26)

To our knowledge, (39) is the only example of nonfactual *êska* that occurs in the texts of Wolfart and Ahenakew (1998). Its occurrence seems to be extremely restricted in Modern Plains Cree usage. This single example does not provide enough data for analysis except to say that nonfactual *êska* must be occurring in an IP-external position since it may be embedded under quotative *itwê-*. We therefore position nonfactual *êska* in the same IP-external domain as dubitative *êtokwê*. Although the evidence in support of this in Plains Cree is moot, we shall see below that analyzing the nonfactual as IP-external is consistent with its distribution in other dialects.

As discussed in James et al. (1998), in older forms of Plains Cree, nonfactual *êska* often co-occurs with verbs marked with the "subjective" suffix *-wa*, typically in contexts where a speaker is presenting a mental construct:[23]

---

[23] Lacombe (1874*b*:61) refers to the subjective as the *dubitatif suppositif* (lit. "supposing dubitative"), as distinct from the *dubitatif ordinaire* ("ordinary dubitative" marked by *-kwe*) and the *dubitatif probable* (lit. "dubitative of probability" marked by *-kuban*).

"The most basic use of the subjective form is to indicate that the assertion is not being presented as something factual or true in the real world, but instead as a mental construct of the speaker's (or in an appropriate context it could be the mental construct of some person mentioned in the sentence). . . . [T]he subjective form indicates how things seem or seemed to the speaker (or to some person mentioned in the sentence)—it describes his or her subjective perception or impression of how things are or were" (James et al. 1998:2).

An example illustrating the co-occurrence of Plains Cree nonfactual *êska* with subjective *-wa* is given in (40), where 'arrive' is inflected with the subjective. As discussed by James et al. (1998:2), in such examples the subjective conveys how the speaker views the state of affairs described without making a commitment to the truth of the proposition.

(40) ***iska***   *takusin**wa***
     NON.FACT   arrive.**SUBJ**

     'Il faut croire qu'il est arrivé' / 'It seems that he has arrived'.
     (Lacombe 1874*b*:61; cited in James et al. 1998:7; 1999:5)

Across the Cree dialect continuum, the subjective form is typically used in the narration of dreams (Ford 1979, Martin 1983, Baraby 1984, Drapeau 1986, and James et al. 1998). For example, for Plains Cree, Lacombe (1874*b*) describes the subjective form as occurring in the narration of dreams and nocturnal visions, as in (41).

(41) *wabame**wa***
     see.**SUBJ**

     'Il le voit (dans une vision)' / 'He sees him (in a vision)'.
     (Lacombe 1874*b*:131; cited in James et al. 1998:4; 1999:2)

Note that the nonfactual marking occurs at the right periphery of the verb complex, after the person/number enclitics, as shown in (42).

(42) PLAINS CREE NONFACTUAL PARADIGM
     (adapted from Lacombe 1874*b*:68)

1	*ni*	*pimipattâ-n-**a***	'Probablement que je courais' 'I was probably running'
2	*ki*	*pimipattâ-n-**a***	'You were . . .'
3		*pimipattâ-w-**a***	'S/he was . . .'
1PL	*ni*	*pimipattâ-nân-**e***	'We were . . .'
1PL.INCL	*ki*	*pimipattâ-nânow-**e***	'We (inclusive) were . . .'
2PL	*ki*	*pimipattâ-nâwâw-**e***	'You (plural) were . . .'
3PL		*pimipattâ-wok-**e***	'They were . . .'

Plains Cree nonfactuals display a transitional pattern. In archaic Plains Cree, although nonfactual *êska* and the subjective suffix *-wa* often co-occur, they are also attested independently of each other. Moreover, as James et al. (1999) observe, the Plains Cree nonfactual particle *êska* is not part of the verb complex, as evidenced by the fact that it may be separated from the verb complex by intervening material. This is illustrated in (43), where the demonstrative *ani*[*ma*] 'that' intervenes between nonfactual *êska* and the verb complex.

(43) **isk'âni**   *sipwettewa*
      NON.FACT.that   leave.**SUBJ**

'Il faut supposer qu'il est parti' / 'It seems that he has left'.
(Lacombe 1874*b*:61; cited by James et al. 1999:14)

Further reinforcing the independence of the nonfactual from the subjective suffix is the fact that in Modern Plains Cree, the subjective suffix is no longer used, but the nonfactual continues to be attested (though rarely). Based on these considerations, we posit the structures in (44) for Plains Cree nonfactuals and subjective forms. In both archaic and modern Plains Cree, nonfactual *êska* is IP-external. As for subjective *-wa*, for concreteness we assume that it precedes number/obviation agreement.[24]

(44*a*) ARCHAIC PLAINS CREE: NONFACTUAL + SUBJECTIVE
        NON.FACT [[[PERS/CONJ= [IP] =PERS/NUM] =**SUBJ** =NUM/OBV]]

(44*b*) MODERN PLAINS CREE: NONFACTUAL
        NON.FACT [[[PERS/CONJ= [IP] =PERS/NUM] =NUM/OBV]]

2.5. Summary of Plains Cree evidentials. We have proposed that Plains Cree evidentials fall into two classes syntactically, according to whether they are CP-external (quotative *itwê-* and reportative *êsa*) or IP-external (dubitative *êtokwê* and nonfactual *êska*). Morphosyntactically, Plains Cree evidentials are heterogeneous: some are verbs (the quotative), others are particles (the reportative and the nonfactual), and yet others have a dual status as particles and affixes (the dubitative). Semantically, Plains Cree evidentials present perspectival information that indicates the speaker's degree of commitment to the truth of what s/he is uttering, based on the evidence available. The four Plains Cree evidentials treated so far may be further distinguished according to whether the speaker has direct evidence for the event or situation being presented (quotative *itwê-*) or indirect evidence (reportative *êsa*, dubitative *êtokwê*, nonfactual *êska*). These results are summarized in (45). As we shall see immediately below, the contrast between direct and indirect evidentials manifests itself differently in other Cree dialects.

---

[24] This is the same position as the Plains Cree affixal dubitative in the independent mode.

(45)   PROPERTIES OF PLAINS CREE EVIDENTIALS

(45*a*) Quotative *itwê-*

EVIDENTIAL BASE:	direct (auditory evidence)
PERSPECTIVE:	speaker's or someone else's
MORPHOSYNTAX:	verb
SYNTAX:	CP-external

(45*b*) Reportative *êsa*

EVIDENTIAL BASE:	indirect (speaker did not witness event)
PERSPECTIVE:	speaker's
MORPHOSYNTAX:	particle
SYNTAX:	CP-external

(45*c*) Dubitative *êtokwê*

EVIDENTIAL BASE:	indirect (personal inference)
PERSPECTIVE:	speaker's
MORPHOSYNTAX:	particle or affix
SYNTAX:	IP-external

(45*d*) Nonfactual *êska*

EVIDENTIAL BASE:	indirect (counter to fact or expectation)
PERSPECTIVE:	speaker's
MORPHOSYNTAX:	particle
SYNTAX:	IP-external

3. The heterogeneity of Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi evidentials. We now turn to the evidential systems of the eastern varieties of Cree found in the CMN complex. We begin by looking at CP-external quotatives as an instance of direct evidentials (**3.1**). We then turn our attention to IP-external indirect evidentials, examining their semantics (**3.2**) and their morphosyntax (**3.3**).

3.1. CP-external evidentials in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi: quotatives. Quotatives in CMN are used to present evidence in historical and personal narratives. The CMN quotative is verbal, based on the stem *it-* 'say', and it usually follows the clause it is construed with. Representative examples are given in (46).

(46*a*) . . . *tipa:tshimu:pan   peikua:u   Ma:ni* . . .   "*anite   nu:tshimi:t*
      she.told.about.it   once   Mary   there   in.the.bush

    *anite   auen   sha:uenit,"   **it**eu.*
    there   someone   he.is.hungry   she.**says**

    '. . . Mary talked about it once . . . "Someone was hungry, there in the bush," she **said**'.
    (SSVP, text 20, pp. 3–4; cited in James et al. 1996:140, ex. 6; 2001:237, ex. 9)

(46*b*) *ekuan*   *ne*   *kue*   *nipinit*(*sh*)*i:*   **it***a:kanu*
     that's.the.one   that   then   he.is.dead   it.is.**said**

    '"He died," it is **said**'.
    (SSVP, text 92, p. 5; cited in James et al. 1996:141, ex. 7; 2001:237,
      ex. 8)

Quotatives in CMN and Plains Cree show a similar range of properties. Semantically, quotatives in both CMN and Plains Cree present direct discourse. In terms of the perspectival information they introduce, the CMN quotative differs slightly from its Plains Cree counterpart. According to James et al. (1996:140; 2001:237), CMN quotative *it-* is used to present secondhand information ('s/he said') or thirdhand information ('it is said'). As such, the CMN quotative verb appears with third-person agreement. This contrasts with Plains Cree quotative *itwê-* which, in addition to presenting secondhand and thirdhand information, is also used to present the point of view of speech act participants. Thus, the Plains Cree quotative may be inflected for any person value, i.e., first, second, or third person. Morphosyntactically, both the CMN and the Plains Cree quotative have the status of verbs; this correlates with the fact that their temporal value is unrestricted. Syntactically, they are both CP-external. This is summarized in (47).

(47) QUOTATIVES IN CREE/MONTAGNAIS/NASKAPI AND PLAINS CREE

	Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi	Plains Cree
	QUOTATIVE *it-*	QUOTATIVE *itwê-*
SEMANTICS	direct evidence	direct evidence
PERSPECTIVE	[−SPEECH ACT PARTICIPANT][25]	[±SPEECH ACT PARTICIPANT]
TEMPORAL VALUE	unrestricted	unrestricted
MORPHOSYNTAX	verb	verb
SYNTAX	CP-external	CP-external

Thus, direct evidentials, in the form of the quotative, seem to exhibit the same range of semantic and syntactic properties in CMN as they do in Plains Cree.[26] We now turn to indirect evidentials where, as we shall see, there are significant semantic and morphosyntactic differences across the two dialect areas.

3.2. IP-external evidentials in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi: indirect evidentials. CMN indirect evidentials seem to have undergone a semantic

---

[25] Descriptions in the literature suggest that CMN quotatives are restricted to third-person forms; for this reason, we classify the CMN quotative as [−speech act participant].

[26] In Montagnais, as described by Drapeau (1986:191), in foregrounding contexts, nonembedded verbs can alternate between the dubitative and the indicative as a way of marking the relative saliency of events. Given that the quotative verb is often nonembedded, this means that

realignment. Within the CMN complex, this plays out in two different ways, with Montagnais/Naskapi exhibiting one pattern and East Cree exhibiting another. What corresponds in Plains Cree to the contrast between dubitative *êtokwê* and reportative *êsa* (48*a*) is in Montagnais/Naskapi a distinction between present (*-tak*) versus past (*-shipan*) indirect inferred evidence (48*b*). As for the Plains Cree nonfactual (*êska*), it corresponds to the Montagnais/Naskapi subjective ((*is)ka-* . . . *-ua*). And in East Cree (48*c*), the contrast is between present (*-tak*) versus nonpresent (*-shipan*) indirect inferred evidence. Notably, the East Cree nonpresent forms group together past (*-shipan*) and nonfactual ((*is)ka-* . . . *shapan-ua*) indirect inferred evidence.

(48)	INDIRECT EVIDENTIALS IN CREE/MONTAGNAIS/NASKAPI AND PLAINS CREE		
(48*a*) PLAINS CREE	*êtokwê*	*êsa*	*êska*
	DUBITATIVE	REPORTATIVE	NONFACTUAL
(48*b*) MONTAGNAIS/ NASKAPI	*-tak*	*-shipan*	*(is)ka-* . . . *-ua*
	PRESENT	NONPRESENT: PAST	NONPRESENT: SUBJECTIVE
(48*c*) EAST CREE	*-tak*	*-shipan*	*(is)ka-* . . . *-shapan-ua*
	PRESENT	NONPRESENT: PAST	NONPRESENT: NONFACTUAL

While Plains Cree reportative *êsa* is CP-external, the corresponding *-shipan* forms in the eastern dialects are IP-external. This syntactic distinction has semantic consequences: while CP-external reportative *êsa* has a past orientation (cf. **2.1.2** above), its eastern counterparts are past tense markers with evidential force.[27] The details of the semantic realignment differ in each dialect: while Montagnais/Naskapi has a tripartite division between present, past, and subjective, East Cree has a bipartite division between present and nonpresent (with the latter marked by either *-shipan* alone or in combination with subjective morphology). We begin by examining the historical basis for the temporal realignment of CMN indirect evidentials (**3.2.1**) and then consider their functions as reportatives (**3.2.2**), dubitatives (**3.2.3**), distantives (**3.2.4**), and nonfactuals (**3.2.5**).

---

in foregrounding contexts the quotative can be inflected with the dubitative, as in (*i*). According to Drapeau, such forms function as a kind of historical present.

(*i*)	*Eukuan*	*ekue*	*it-e-tshe:* . . .
	existential.pronoun	then	**tell**.TA-3>3′-INDEP.DUB

    'So he told him: . . .'.
    (Drapeau 1986:188)

[27] CMN *-shipan* parallels Quechua *-sqa*, which is analyzed by Faller (2003*a*) as a past tense indirect evidential. Quechua *-sqa* functions as a reportative, marks indirect inference, indicates surprise, and is used to report dreams (Howard-Malverde 1990 and Levinsohn 1991).

3.2.1. Historical basis for the temporal realignment of indirect evidentials. We argue that the reportative/dubitative contrast (that still obtains in Plains Cree) has been reanalyzed in CMN along temporal lines. On independent grounds, James et al. (1996; 2001) suggest that the past tense orientation of CMN -*shipan* is attributable to the fact that it is a reflex of the Proto-Algonquian reportative *-(*e*)*sapan*, which combines *-(*e*)*san* with the preterit *-*pan*, as in (49*a*). We further speculate that the present tense orientation of CMN -*tak* is a temporal realignment of the dubitative, as in (49*b*).

(49)   HISTORICAL SOURCE CMN INDIRECT EVIDENTIALS

(49*a*) -***shipan***, indirect inferred evidence, past tense
         [< Proto-Algonquian assertive mode ***-(*e*)*sapan*, *-(*e*)*san***
           (Goddard 1979; 1995 and Proulx 1990)]
         [***-(*e*)*sapan*** < ***-*san*** + ***-*pan*** preterit (James et al. 1996: 2001:247)]

(49*b*) -***tak***, indirect inferred evidence, present tense
         (cf. James et al. 2001:246, n. 15)
         [< Proto-Algonquian dubitative inflection ***-*toke:*** (cf. Ellis 1971)]

The CMN indirect evidentials have collapsed the reportative/dubitative distinction and so occur across a wider range of semantic contexts than do their Plains Cree reportative and dubitative counterparts. We illustrate this in the following subsections.

3.2.2. Indirect evidentials with a reportative function. The use of the past tense indirect evidential -*shipan* as a reportative is attested in both Sheshatshiu and Lower North Shore Montagnais. Consider first the Sheshatshiu examples in (50). In (50*a*), the indirect evidential -*shipan* is used as a past tense reportative in response to the question, "Did Manitesh have a lot of children?" In (50*b*), -*shipan* is used in a context where the speaker does not have firsthand knowledge but is inferring the existence of a bird on the basis of an observable result, reasoning, or a verbal report.

(50)   MONTAGNAIS (SHESHATSHIU): INDIRECT EVIDENTIAL AS REPORTATIVE

(50*a*) *ehe,   mihcetini:**shipan**i: utawa:ssi:ma   ciya:*
         yes   be.many.**IND.EVID**.OBV   his.children   eh

         'Yes, it **seems** he had a lot of children, eh?'
         (James et al. 1996:143, ex. 11)

(50*b*) *pileshi:sha . . .   pipa:mina:shi:ni:**shipan**i: ante   pi:hitakamihc*
         bird   it.flew.around.**IND.EVID**.OBV   there   inside

           ni:cina:hc
           our.place

         'It **turned out** that a bird had flown around in our tent'.
         (James et al. 1996:143, ex. 12)

Similarly, in the Lower North Shore Montagnais example in (51), the speaker has just been told by an interlocutor: "Have you heard the news? The king has arrived." The speaker then reports this news using *-ha* (< *-hipan*), the past tense indirect evidential.

(51) Montagnais (Lower North Shore): indirect evidential as
      reportative
     *tukuhini**ha**   tshiheutshimau*
     he.arrive.**IND.EVID**   king

     'The king has arrived'.
     (Cyr 1990:163; cited in James et al. 1996:141, ex. 8)

3.2.3. Indirect evidentials with a dubitative function. CMN indirect evidentials also occur in contexts of inferred evidence (where Plains Cree would use dubitative *êtokwê*). This is illustrated in (52) for the present tense indirect evidential *-tak*, and in (53) for the past tense indirect evidential *-shipan*.

(52)   CMN indirect evidentials as (present tense) dubitatives
(52*a*) *tsh∂peta:tn   tsh∂tsh∂eyna:**t∂k**   stogw∂n*
       I.hear.you   you.close.it.**IND.EVID**   door

     'I hear you, you **must** be closing the door'.
     (Baraby 1984:153, orthography regularized; cited in James et al.
       1996:139, ex. 2)

(52*b*) *pa:ste**t∂k**   st∂gwuf*
       dry.**IND.EVID**   coat

     'The coat **must** be dry'.
     (Baraby 1984:153, orthography regularized; cited in James et al.
       1996:140, ex. 55)

(53)   CMN indirect evidentials as (past tense) dubitatives
     *sha:sh   ci:-kutawe**shipan**,   cishiteshinu*
     already   PAST-he.make.a.fire.**IND.EVID**   it.is.warm

      tekushinu:ci:hc
      when.we.arrived

     'He **must** have already made a fire, it was warm when we arrived'.
     (Baraby 1984:153; cited in James et al. 1996:139, ex. 1)

3.2.4. Indirect evidentials with a distantive function. In addition to their reportative and dubitative functions, CMN indirect evidentials are used in contexts where a speaker is distant from the situation being described. This use of the indirect evidential may have a literal locative construal, as in

(54*a*) with the present tense indirect evidential *-tak*, and in (54*b*) with the past tense indirect evidential *-shipan*.

(54)   MONTAGNAIS INDIRECT EVIDENTIALS AS DISTANTIVES

(54*a*) *te**tak**at*   *a:tshukuat*   *nite*   *ta:ukam*
there.**IND.EVID**.3PL   seals   there   out.in.the.water

'There are seals **out there** in the water'.
(Drapeau 1984:30 and James et al. 2001:241, ex. 18)

(54*b*) *mi:tshus**hǝpǝn**t*   *na:pewt*
eat.**IND.EVID**.3PL   men

'Some men are eating [**over there**]'.
(Baraby 1984:153; cited in James et al. 2001:241)

The use of indirect evidentials to mark the speaker's distance from the situation may also be metaphorical, as in (55) where the past tense indirect evidential *-shipan* is used to indicate that the speaker's reflection in the mirror is distinct from the speaker.

(55)   EAST CREE INDIRECT EVIDENTIAL AS DISTANTIVE
*niwa:pisina:**tik***
I.am.white.**IND.EVID**

'I look white' [in a mirror, television, etc.].
(LS/EL, 5/26/92; cited in James et al. 1996:145, ex. 17; 2001:241, ex. 20)

3.2.5. Indirect evidentials with a nonfactual function. The final type of indirect evidential to be considered is the nonfactual. Recall that in Plains Cree, nonfactual *êska* is used to express surprise at an unexpected outcome. In East Cree, nonfactuals are marked in the subjective form with the discontinuous affix (*is*)*ka-* . . . *-ua:* and are typically used in dream contexts, as in (56*a*). In (56*b*), we see a Naskapi subjective verb occurring in a context where the narrator indicates that it seems he has been given a message, hence the use of the (nonfactual) subjective form.

(56*a*) EAST CREE INDIRECT EVIDENTIAL AS NONFACTUAL
pepunit   ma:k eku   peua:tat   ne   na:peu ekute
in.winter   and   then   he.dreamed   the(that)   man   that's

*anite.   eukuannua   **ka**-utiniku**shapanua:***   *ishineu*
there   that's.the.one **SUBJ**-he.was.taken.**INDIR.SUBJ** he.dreamed

'In winter, the man dreamt that that person was taken (i.e., abducted), **he dreamt**'.
(LITP, "Bear Man" text; cited in James et al. 1998:139, ex. 3; 2001:243, ex. 23)

(56*b*) NASKAPI SUBJECTIVE FORM AS NONFACTUAL

*u   ânuhch   **ki**-nit-iyâimwâwâikunawâ*, . . .
this   now   **SUBJ**-I.say.VTA.**SUBJ**(INDEP.INDIC)

'What I **seem** to be saying is this, . . .'.
(Jancewicz 2000:171, unit 079)

3.3. The morphosyntax of Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi indirect evidentials. In addition to the semantic differences in the deployment of indirect evidentials across the Cree dialect continuum, another difference lies in the fact that CMN indirect evidentials appear as affixes within the verb complex, while their Plains Cree counterparts are independent particles. Morphosyntactically, CMN indirect evidentials occur within the verb complex, preceding number/obviation agreement, as in (57). Observe that CMN indirect evidentials are restricted to the independent mode.[28]

(57) AFFIXAL CMN INDIRECT EVIDENTIAL (RESTRICTED TO INDEPENDENT
     MODE)
     [[[[PERS = [IP] =PERS/NUM] =**IND.EVID**] =NUM/OBV]]

4. Conclusion. Across the Cree dialect continuum, CP-external evidentials include quotatives (in Plains Cree and CMN) and reportatives (in Plains Cree) (58*a*). IP-external evidentials include dubitatives and nonfactuals (in Plains Cree), as well as indirect evidentials (in CMN) (58*b*).

(58) SYNTAX, SEMANTICS, AND DISTRIBUTION OF CREE EVIDENTIALS

	SYNTAX	SEMANTICS	DISTRIBUTION
(58*a*)	CP-external: **Evid** [$_{CP}$ . . . [$_{IP}$ . . .]]	Quotative	Plains Cree and CMN
		Reportative	Plains Cree
(58*b*)	IP-external: **Evid** [$_{IP}$ . . .]	Dubitative	Plains Cree
		Nonfactual	Plains Cree
		Indirect Evidentials	CMN

This survey of evidentials across the Cree dialect continuum leads to the following conclusions. First, internal to Plains Cree, the affixal dubitative is now relatively rare, and the corresponding dubitative particle is more widely attested (cf. Wolfart 1973). Second, for all Cree dialects, the quotative is stable and is always realized as a verbal form.

Perhaps the most significant finding is that indirect evidentials show considerable variation across the Cree dialect continuum. Morphosyntactically, CMN indirect evidentials are suffixes inside the verb complex and are

---

[28] This reverses the Proto-Algonquian pattern, where dubitative inflections can be unambiguously reconstructed in the conjunct but are less clearly reconstructed in the independent order (D. Pentland, personal communication).

restricted to the independent order.[29] In contrast, Plains Cree indirect evidentials—reportative *êsa*, dubitative *êtokwê*, and nonfactual *êska*—are independent particles and are mostly attested with the conjunct order, though they may also occur with the independent order.[30]

Semantically, CMN indirect evidentials collapse the reportative, dubitative, and nonfactual functions, while Plains Cree assigns these functions to three distinct morphemes. Thus, indirect evidentials have undergone temporal realignment in CMN and are consequently attested in a wider range of contexts than their Plains Cree counterparts. This clarifies an otherwise puzzling difference in the semantic functions of evidentials in Cree dialects.

Finally, CMN indirect evidentials are used as "distantives," a function that is unattested in Plains Cree.

According to the Evidential Domain Hypothesis proposed here, while all evidentials introduce speaker-oriented information, they fall into different subclasses according to the syntactic position they occupy: CP-external, IP-external, AspP-external, and vP-external. We have argued that Cree evidentials are of two types (CP-external and IP-external) and that individual dialects show a predictable range of variation in how "indirect evidence" is mapped onto CP versus IP domains.

REFERENCES

AHENAKEW, ALICE. 2000. Âh-âyîtaw isi ê-kî-kiskêyihtahkik maskihkiy: They Knew Both Sides of Medicine (Cree Tales of Curing and Cursing told by Alice Ahenakew). Edited, translated, and with a glossary by H. C. Wolfart and Freda Ahenakew. Publications of the Algonquian Text Society. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

BARABY, ANNE-MARIE. 1984. Aspects de la morphologie des flexions verbales en montagnais de Sheshatshit. M.A. thesis, Université de Montréal.

BLAIN, ELEANOR M. 1997. Wh-constructions in Nêhiyawêwin (Plains Cree). Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia.

——. 1999. Complementizer kâ- in Nêhiyawêwin (Plains Cree). Papers from the Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Native American Languages, ed. Leora Bar-el, Rose-Marie Déchaine, and Charlotte Reinholtz. M.I.T. Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17:1–12.

BLAIN, ELEANOR M., AND ROSE-MARIE DÉCHAINE. 2005. Evidential marking across the Cree dialect continuum. Paper presented at the Texas Linguistic Symposium, University of Texas at Austin, November 2005.

---

[29] This may be related to the observation that in eastern varieties of Cree, the independent is used for backgrounding information, while the conjunct is used for foregrounding information (Cyr 1991 and Jancewicz 2000). The restriction of CMN indirect evidentials to the independent may indicate that the perspectival information coded by evidentials is background information. Hockett (1958:556) observes that the independent can be used to mark direct quotations or parenthetical explanations in literary narratives.

[30] Wolfart (1996:405) observes that Plains Cree dubitative forms "occur in both the independent and conjunct order."

_____. 2006. The Evidential Domain Hypothesis. Proceedings of WSCLA II, ed. Atsushi Fujimori and Maria Amélia Reis Silva. University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics 19:12–25.

BLAIN, ELEANOR; CLARE COOK; ROSE-MARIE DÉCHAINE, AND JEFFREY MUEHLBAUER. 2006. Plains Cree evidentials: Major and minor modes. Paper presented at the SSILA Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico, January 8, 2006.

BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. 1962. The Menomini Language. Edited by Charles F. Hockett. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

BRANIGAN, PHIL, AND MARGUERITE MACKENZIE. 2002. Word order variation at the left periphery in Innu-aimûn. Papers of the Thirty-third Algonquian Conference, ed. H. C. Wolfart, pp. 110–19. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

CHAFE, WALLACE. 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology, ed. Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols, pp. 261–72. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

CHAFE, WALLACE, AND JOHANNA NICHOLS, eds. 1986. Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

CINQUE, GUGLIELMO. 1999. Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

COLLINS, CHRIS, AND PHIL BRANIGAN. 1997. Quotative inversion. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 15:1–41.

COOK, CLARE; ROSE-MARIE DÉCHAINE; AND JEFFREY MUEHLBAUER. 2005. The form of rhetoric: An analysis of a Plains Cree kakêskihkêmowin (counseling speech). Paper presented at A Linguist Looks at Literature: A Workshop on Linguistics and Literature, University of Texas at Austin, May 9, 2005.

CURNOW, TIMOTHY JOWAN. 2001. Evidentiality and me: The interaction of evidentials and first person. Proceedings of the 2001 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society, ed. Cynthia Allen. Canberra: Australian National University.

CYR, DANIELLE. 1990. Approche typologique du système aspectuel montagnais, de la morphologie à la pragmatique. Ph.D. dissertation, Laval University.

_____. 1991. Algonquian orders as aspectual markers: Some typological evidence and pragmatic considerations. Papers of the Twenty-second Algonquian Conference, ed. William Cowan, pp. 58–88. Ottawa: Carleton University.

DÉCHAINE, ROSE-MARIE. 1999. What Algonquian morphology is really like: Hockett revisited. Papers from the Workshop on Structure and Constituency in Native American Languages, ed. Leora Bar-el, Rose-Marie Déchaine, and Charlotte Reinholtz. M.I.T. Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17:25–72.

DÉCHAINE, ROSE-MARIE, AND MARTINA WILTSCHKO. 2002. The position of negation and its consequences. Paper presented at WSCLA 7, University of Alberta, March 23, 2002.

_____. 2003. Negation at the left periphery: Evidence from Algonquian and Salish. Proceedings of WECOL 2001, ed. L. Carmichael, C.-H. Huang, and V. Samiian, pp. 104–17. Fresno: California State University.

DÉCHAINE, ROSE-MARIE, AND H. C. WOLFART. 1998. Towards a syntax of Negation in Plains Cree. Paper presented at the Thirtieth Algonquian Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, October 1998.

_____. 2000. La negation comme indice de structure syntaxique dans le cris des plaines. Paper presented at the Thirty-second Algonquian Conference, McGill University, October 2000.

DRAPEAU, LYNN. 1984. Le traitement de l'information chez les montagnais. Recherches amérindiennes au Québec 14, no. 4:24–35.

_____. 1986. Entre le réve et la realité: Le mode subjectif en montagnais. Actes du dix-septième congrès des algonquinistes, ed. William Cowan, pp. 101–20. Ottawa: Carleton University.

ELLIS, C. DOUGLAS. 1971. Cree verb paradigms. IJAL 37:76–95.

FALLER, MARTINA T. 2002. Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

———. 2003a. Propositional- and illucutionary-level evidentiality in Cuzco Quechua. Proceedings of SULA 2 (The Semantics of Under-represented Languages in the Americas), ed. J. Anderssen, P. Menendez-Benito, and A. Werle. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.

———. 2003b. The evidential and validational licensing conditions for the Cuzco Quechua enclitic -mi. Belgian Journal of Linguistics 16:7–21.

———. 2004. The deictic core of "non-experienced past" in Cuzco Quechua. Journal of Semantics 21:45–85.

FORD, ALAN. 1979. Une ambiguité structurale de surface en montagnais. Papers of the Tenth Algonquian Conference, ed. William Cowan, pp. 218–26. Ottawa: Carleton University.

FRASER, BRUCE. 1996. Pragmatic markers. Pragmatics 6:167–90.

FRANTZ, DONALD. 1991. Blackfoot Grammar. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

GODDARD, IVES. 1979. Comparative Algonquian. The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment, ed. Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, pp. 70–132. Austin: University of Texas Press.

———. 1995. Notes on Fox (Mesquakie) inflection: Minor modes and incompletely described morphemes. Papers of the Twenty-sixth Algonquian Conference, ed. David H. Pentland, pp. 124–50. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

HOCKETT, CHARLES F. 1958. A Course in Modern Linguistics. New York: Macmillan.

HOWARD-MALVERDE, ROSALEEN. 1990. The Speaking of History: 'Willapaakushayki' or Quechua Ways of Telling the Past. London: Institute of Latin American Studies.

IZVORSKI, ROUMYANA. 1997. The present perfect as an epistemic modal. SALT 7, ed. A. Lawson and E. Cho, pp. 222–39. Ithaca, N.Y.: CLC Publications, Department of Linguistics, Cornell University.

JAMES, DEBORAH; SANDRA CLARKE; AND MARGUERITE MACKENZIE. 1996. Indirect evidentials in the Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi of Quebec and Labrador. Papers of the Twenty-seventh Algonquian Conference, ed. David H. Pentland, pp. 135–51. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

———. 1998. Dreams, surprises, and relative clauses: 'Subjective' forms in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi. Paper presented at the Thirtieth Algonquian Conference. Boston, Massachusetts, October 1998.

———. 1999. Dreams and surprises in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi: The semantic history of a modal inflection. Paper presented at the Fourteenth International Congress on Historical Linguistics, University of British Columbia, August 1999.

———. 2001. The encoding of information source in Algonquian: Evidentials in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi. IJAL 67:229–63.

JANCEWICZ, B. 2000. Naskapi: Analysis of a contemporary text. Papers of the Thirty-first Algonquian Conference, ed. John D. Nichols, pp. 161–99. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

KÂ-NÎPITÊHTÊW, JIM. 1998. ana kâ-pimwêwêhahk okakêskihkêmowina: The Counseling Speeches of Jim Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw. Edited, translated, and with a glossary by Freda Ahenakew and H. C. Wolfart. Publications of the Algonquian Text Society. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

LACOMBE, ALBERT. 1874a. Dictionnaire de la langue des cris. Montréal: C. O. Beauchemin et Valois.

———. 1874b. Grammaire de la langue des cris. Montréal: C. O. Beauchemin et Valois.

LEVINSOHN, STEPHEN H. 1991. Variations in tense–aspect markers among Inga (Quechuan) dialects. Language Change in South American Language, ed. Mary Ritchie Key, pp. 145–65. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

MARTIN, PIERRE. 1983. Le système verbal montagnais 2: Les modalités. Langues et linguistique 9:177–201.

MINDE, EMMA. 1997. Kwayask ē-kî-pê-kiskinowâpahtihicik: Their Example Showed Me the Way (A Cree Woman's Life Shaped by Two Cultures, told by Emma Minde). Edited, translated, and with a glossary by Freda Ahenakew and H. C. Wolfart. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

MUEHLBAUER, JEFFREY. 2005. Word order and the interpretation of nominals in Plains Cree. Ms., University of British Columbia.

MUYSKEN, PIETER. 1995. Focus in Quechua. Discourse Configurational Languages, ed. K. Kiss, pp. 375–93. New York: Oxford University Press.

PENTLAND, DAVID. 1984. New modes in Old Ojibwa. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics 9:11–17.

_____. 1988. More new modes in Old Ojibwa. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics 13:47–51.

PROULX, PAUL. 1990. Proto-Algonquian verb inflection. Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics 15, no. 2:100–145.

RAMIREZ, HENRI. 1997. A fala tukano dos Ye'pâ-Masa. Vol. 1: Gramática. Manaus: Inspetoria Salesiana Missionária da Amazônia and Centro "Iauareté" de Documentação Etnográfica e Missionária Manaus.

REINHOLTZ, CHARLOTTE. 1999. The syntax of Cree negation. Paper presented at WSCLA 4, University of British Columbia, March 1999.

SIEWIERSKA, ANNA. 1992. Layers in FG and GB. Layered Structure and Reference in a Functional Perspective, ed. Michael Fortescue, Peter Harder, and Lars Kristoffersen, pp. 409–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

SPEAS, MARGARET. 2004a. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. Lingua 114:255–76.

_____. 2004b. Evidential paradigms, word variables and person agreement features. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

WHITECALF, SARAH. 1993. Kinêhiyâwiwininaw nêhiyawêwin: The Cree Language Is Our Identity (The La Ronge Lectures of Sarah Whitecalf). Edited, translated, and with a glossary by H. C. Wolfart and Freda Ahenakew. Publications of the Algonquian Text Society. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

WILLETT, THOMAS. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. Studies in Language 12:51–97.

WOLFART, H. C. 1973. Plains Cree: A Grammatical Study. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s., vol. 63, pt. 5. Philadelphia.

_____. 1996. Sketch of Cree, an Algonquian language. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 17, Languages, ed. Ives Goddard, pp. 390–439. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

_____. 1998. Commentary and notes. ana kâ-pimwêwêhahk okakêskihkêmowina: The Counseling Speeches of Jim Kâ-Nîpitêhtêw, edited, translated, and with a glossary by Freda Ahenakew and H. C. Wolfart, pp. 139–237. Publications of the Algonquian Text Society. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

WOLFART, H. C., AND FREDA AHENAKEW. 1998. The Student's Dictionary of Literary Plains Cree. Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics, Memoir 15. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.