CHAPTER 14

Southern Athapaskan Quotative Evidentials

A Discursive Areal Typology

ANTHONY K. WEBSTER

This chapter concerns an areal discursive typology of the Southwest, that is, a typology of discourse features irrespective of language family. I take as the center of this comparative project the Southern Athapaskan languages. I compare the use of an independent verb of speaking with dependent enclitic markings for quotative evidentials. I then compare the resulting division with selected Northern and Pacific Athapaskan languages and finally with other Southwestern languages (see Rice, this volume, on the general outlines of the Athapaskan language family). I then make (1) an internal division of Southern Athapaskan languages based on a discursive typology, (2) a genetic comparison of that division with related Northern and Pacific Athapaskan languages, and (3) an areal comparison with unrelated Southwestern languages. In doing so, I argue that a discursive typology (based on form and function) cross-cuts earlier divisions based on lexical and phonological distinctions within Southern Athapaskan languages. I conclude by suggesting that such a division may be explained by two possible hypotheses (both in need of further testing): a more prolonged presence for Southern Athapaskan speakers in the Southwest and/or a more intensive interactional relation between what I term the Eastern discursive Apachian sub-group and non-Apachian peoples. This chapter also suggests that there was only one migration into the Southwest (see also Webster 2008). Finally, in respect to methodology, I argue that ethnopoetics may be of crucial value in historical linguistics, especially a historical linguistics that focuses on discursive typologies.

Both Krokrity (1998) and Beier et al. (2002) argue for approaching areal linguistics from a discursive perspective (both investigate evidentials). By a discursive approach to areal linguistics, I mean that it is not enough to simply note the presence or absence of certain grammatical features; rather, we need to understand their discursive use as well. For example, as noted by Krokrity (1998), Rio Grande Tewa, Arizona Tewa, and Hopi all have an “evidential particle” that marks information as outside firsthand experience. Rio Grande Tewa and Arizona Tewa are related languages, whereas Hopi is a Uto-Aztecan language and
**TABLE 14.1. Division Based on /t/ → /k/ Split.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>western Apachean /t/</th>
<th>eastern Apachean /k/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>‘water’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>tó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua Apache</td>
<td>tó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescalero Apache</td>
<td>tú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Apache</td>
<td>tóó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

not related to the Kiowa-Tanoan Tewa languages. However, both Arizona Tewa and Hopi use the evidential particle (ba and yay, respectively) far more commonly in genres of traditional narratives than do Rio Grande Tewa. Kroskrity (1998) argues that it is the influence of Hopi rhetorical patterns on Arizona Tewa that has led to a “discursive convergence.” Thus while all three languages have a putative evidential particle, an examination of the discursive use of that particle reveals historical connections and interactions.

**TWO TRADITIONAL WAYS OF DIVIDING SOUTHERN ATHAPASKAN LANGUAGES**

I begin by briefly discussing two ways that Southern Athapaskan languages have been divided into Eastern and Western language groupings. The first way concerns phonology. As Hoijer (1942) noted, there is a general division based on a /t/ → /k/ shift in Southern Athapaskan languages. Navajo, Chiricahua Apache, Mescalero Apache, and Western Apache all have a stem initial /t/. On the other hand, Jicarilla Apache, Lipan Apache, and Plains Apache all have a stem initial /k/. Table 14.1 gives the East/West division and a prototypical emblem of that shift (the word for water).

Haas (1968) noted that in Chipewyan (Northern Athapaskan) there is also an internal East/West /t/ → /k/ shift. According to Haas (1968), the Yellowknife Chipewyan dialect had shifted from the base Athapaskan /t/ to /k/. More recently, Cook (1989) has suggested that the shift is not peculiar to any particular dialect of Chipewyan, but rather can be found in various Chipewyan dialects, though it seems localized in Pond du Lac, Saskatchewan, and Snowdrift, Northwest Territories. Indeed, Saville-Troike (1974) has suggested that there was an internal /t/ → /k/ dialect difference that followed the Lukachukai and Chuska Mountains and separated an internal East/West division. If so, then Navajo
Table 14.2. Divergence Times (in Years) Based on Cognates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Navajo</th>
<th>Chiricahua</th>
<th>San Carlos</th>
<th>Jicarilla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jicarilla</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipan</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From Holzer 1956a:226.

resembled Chipewyan in having an internal distribution of /t/ → /k/ (see, however, Brugge, this volume).

Another way that Southern Athapaskan languages have been divided has been based on lexico-statistics, or glottochronology; (see also Rice, this volume). Holzer (1956a, 1971) presented lexico-statistic data that were used to augment his (1938a) earlier division of Southern Athapaskan languages based on phonological features (see Table 14.1). And while lexico-statistics has faced enormous (and I believe devastating) scrutiny by several linguists, including Holzer (1956b) himself, it is interesting to note that Holzer's lexico-statistic evidence suggested a more complicated view of Southern Athapaskan languages. In Table 14.2, I reproduce Holzer's (1956a) results for time of divergence based on a comparison of 100 core words for Navajo, Chiricahua, San Carlos, Jicarilla, and Lipan Apache.

As Holzer (1956a) notes, the above numbers suggest that the Southern Athapaskan languages diverged only relatively recently, a little more than four hundred years ago. However, this method, as Holzer notes, completely obscures the phonological differences revealed in the /t/ → /k/ split. Chiricahua Apache, a /t/ language, shares more cognates with Jicarilla Apache, a /k/ language, than it does with San Carlos Apache, a fellow /t/ language, which is roughly the same amount it shares with Lipan Apache, another /k/ language. Chiricahua Apache is nearest to Navajo, also a /t/ language. Below I present one plausible division based on the lexico-statistic results (this is a decidedly Chiricahua Apache-centric view):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Navajo</th>
<th>Lipan</th>
<th>San Carlos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jicarilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a division flies in the face of the historical information we have. As Holzer (1956a:226) notes, “These discrepancies may well result from the fact that all five languages have been in more or less close contact for the last two or three hundred years. The same factor may account for the generally low times of divergence.” In other words, Apachean peoples have continued to talk to one another.
### TABLE 14.3. Quotative Evidentials Used in Southern Athapaskan Languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>EVIDENTIAL USED IN TRADITIONAL NARRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>jiní (ji + ní) 'one says, they say' (Sapir and Hoijer 1942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua Apache</td>
<td>-ná 'a 'they say, so they say' (Hoijer 1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jicarilla Apache</td>
<td>-ná 'so they say, how it is told' (Tuttle and Sandoval 2002: 111; Sandoval 1984:163)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipan Apache</td>
<td>-ná 'they say' (Hoijer 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescalero Apache</td>
<td>-ná 'a 'so they say' (Hoijer 1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Apache</td>
<td>ch'íí 'it is said' (ch’í + -ní)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lók'eh ‘it is said’ (de Reuse 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lêmi ‘it’s said to have happened’ (Nevins and Nevins 2004:286)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A Discursive Typological View

Hoijer’s point, that we must take into account the interactional histories of languages, seems warranted here. It is also crucial to view these interactional histories not so much as “languages” but rather as clusters of speakers who have interacted. A discursive typological approach does just this. In what follows I present the results of a survey of six of the seven generally recognized Southern Athapaskan languages. Plains Apache has been excluded due to a lack of relevant data. For purposes here, I have used the following data sets:

1. Chiricahua Apache: Hoijer 1938b
2. Mescalero Apache: Hoijer 1938b
3. Jicarilla Apache: Goddard 1911
4. Western Apache:
   - White Mountain Apache: Goddard 1920
   - San Carlos Apache: Goddard 1919
5. Lipan Apache: Hoijer 1975
6. Navajo: Sapir and Hoijer 1942; Goddard 1933

In inspecting these texts, I have attempted to discern the ways that certain evidentials are used. Specifically, I have been concerned with how traditional narratives are marked by the repeated use of evidential devices. In work by Toelken and Scott (1981), Webster (1999a, 1999b, 2004, 2006), and de Reuse (2003), the use of evidentials has been described for Navajo, Chiricahua, Mescalero, Lipan, and Western Apache. Indeed, for all six languages under consideration here (Chiricahua, Mescalero, Navajo, Lipan, Western Apache, and Jicarilla), traditional narratives that are understood to be outside the narrator’s firsthand experience are marked by the recurrent use of an evidential marker. In Table 14.3 I provide the relevant information.

The evidentials in the table all occur in various traditional narrative genres. For example, most of these forms occur in Coyote narratives (a traditional genre of trickster narratives). In Navajo the evidential jiní seems to act as a
verse-marking device (depending on the speaker, it can also act as a framing device or a line-marking device). Likewise, -nda seems to work as a line-marking device in Chiricahua Apache but functions more as a verse-marking device in Mescalero Apache (Webster 1999a, 1999b). There seem to be a variety of Western Apache forms, but here we restrict ourselves to ch'inf it is said because it is the most common form found in the Goddard texts.

Below I provide an example of each, culled from one of the above-mentioned sources. For purposes here, an underline indicates nasality on the vowel, an acute accent indicates high tone, [L] is a glottal stop, and [i] is a voiceless lateral fricative. The relevant forms are in boldface.

Navajo example:
'alk'idaagu ma'il jooldlosh, jinfi
long ago coyote trotting along it is said (Sapir and Hoijer 1942:20)

Chiricahua Apache example:
yiitindin'a
He (Coyote) said to him, they say. (Hoijer 1938b:16:22:2)

Jicarilla Apache example:
Dáko didé ákeeniádiidá'ítí, áán koshí igaliná
He had on a big warm coat, they say. (Tuttle and Sandoval 2002:111)

Lipan Apache example:
tsinaaslá dá'ití goktda'yaaná.
Pairs of Stones Lie About right there [was] their country, it is said. (Hoijer 1975b:8, 25)

Mescalero Apache example:
'ákoo ingoodina'na
And then he went away, they say. (Hoijer 1938b:157)

Western Apache example:
akogo Geda dezla tćiinn
Then they planted them they say (Goddard 1919:151)

In Southern Athapaskan narrative traditions, we see two general forms of the quotative evidential. In one group we have independent verb forms that have the fourth-person subject pronominal prefix, used for persons who are "socially distant" (i.e., relatives by marriage and the dead). Navajo is an example of this. Here we see the verb of speaking -nf prefixed with the fourth-person subject pronoun ji-, which lends a glossing of "one says." This fourth-person pronominal can be found in all Southern Athapaskan languages. In Navajo and Western...
Apache, the quotative evidentials give a sense that one is citing the words of the ancestors. In the other grouping of languages, we find an enclitic that is attached to the final verb in a clause or sentence within a traditional narrative. This form, -ña’ or -ná, is not segmentable into readily apparent morphemes like the Western Apache or Navajo forms.

We should also note that while there are two basic forms, jiní and -nda’/-nda, the quotative evidential appears to function in a similar manner across languages and its relative placement clause finally is also consistent. In reviewing the literature regarding the function of these quotative evidentials, we find that they are commonly cited as organizing devices within certain genres of traditional narratives (see Basso and Tessay 1994; Nevins and Nevins 2004; de Reuse 2003; Toelken and Scott 1981; Webster 1999a, 1999b, 2004). It would appear that while Southern Athapaskan languages use quotative evidentials as ethnopoetic organizing devices within narratives (that is, the evidentials aid in organizing narratives into a series of poetic lines), they differ between independent verbs of speaking and dependent “narrative” enclitics. The function, then, is roughly the same, but the form varies (more work needs to be done to validate this impression). Organizing Southern Athapaskan languages along a discursive typological axis based on relatively dependent and morphologically opaque forms (enclitics) versus independent and morphologically analyzable forms (pronoun plus verb of speaking) of quotative evidentials reveals the grouping shown in Table 14.4.

Notice that such an organization cross-cuts both the lexical and phonological divisions. It should be stated explicitly here that a fourth person plus a verb of speaking (jiní) exists in Chiricahua, Jicarilla, Lipan, and Mescalero Apache, but it is not used in the same rhetorical or ethnopoetic manner as it is in Navajo and Western Apache. On the other hand, as far as I have been able to discern, a concomitant narrative enclitic (-nda’/-nda’), as found in the Eastern typological branch, has not been recorded in either Navajo or Western Apache. The narrative enclitic appears to be restricted to Jicarilla, Chiricahua, Mescalero, and Lipan. Throughout the rest of this chapter I use this division of Apachean languages.

It should be noted that simply looking at the presence or absence of the narrative enclitic in traditional narratives gives us a division that has some support.
from Southern Athapaskan kinship. Opier (1936) divided Southern Athapaskan kinship into two general patterns based on the kinship terms of the seven languages. These he called "Chiricahua" and "Jicarilla":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chiricahua</th>
<th>Jicarilla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mescalero</td>
<td>Lipan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plains Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Apache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navajo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an even more basic way to divide Southern Athapaskan groups based on kinship. We may simply note the presence or absence of clans (specifically matrilineal clans). Such a division reveals the following groupings:

**Clan:**
- Navajo, Western Apache

**No Clan:**
- Chiricahua Apache, Jicarilla Apache,
  - Lipan Apache, and Mescalero Apache

This division is exactly the same as the division based on the presence of a narrative enclitic in traditional narratives. Note that the Hopi also have matrilineal clans and use an independent quotative in their narratives (see below).

**NORTHERN AND PACIFIC ATHAPASKAN MARKING**

Having introduced a discursive typology to distinguish an Eastern and Western Apachean grouping, I now turn to a comparison with Athapaskan languages found in Canada and Alaska and on the American Pacific Coast. In doing so, I wish to investigate any potential discursive influences from genetically related languages. Let me first make clear that what follows is a tentative first approximation. The comparison is not complete, and the current results are suggestive rather than definitive. Here again, more work needs to be done.

I looked at six Northern Athapaskan languages and three Pacific Coast Athapaskan languages. I present the results of the survey of the use of quotative evidential devices in traditional narratives in Table 14.5.

We see three patterns here, I believe. First, many Northern Athapaskan languages are not reported to have a quotative evidential that functions in the same way as Southern Athapaskan devices. In Chilcotin there is a framing device—Yedanx'egūůh, sedanx 'Long ago, before my time'—which locates the following narrative within a set of genre expectations (Dinwoodie 2002:72). This form works very much like the Navajo formula Alk'/ddą́́ ʼ adajini nít'éé́ 'Long ago they say', which can be found at the opening of various traditional narratives. Of the six Northern Athapaskan languages I looked at, only Tsetsault appears to have a narrative enclitic. This form seems to function like a narrative enclitic
TABLE 14.5. Quotative Evidentials in Selected Athapaskan Languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Athabaskan Languages</th>
<th>Quotative Evidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chipewyan (Goddard 1917a)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver (Goddard 1917b)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koyukon (Atla 1989)</td>
<td>Kk'edon Ts'ednee 'the distant past, it is said'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsetsault (Boas and Goddard 1924)</td>
<td>-d'e'⁹ 'it is said'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten'a (Jetté 1908)</td>
<td>tsedênî 'we say' tsedênî 'one says'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilcotin (Dinwoodic 2002)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pacific Coast Athabaskan Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Quotative Evidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wailaki (California) (Seaburg 1977)</td>
<td>ya'nin 'they say' reduced ya-ch'i-n-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolowa (Northern California) (Collins 1998)</td>
<td>-lah 'it is said'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galice (Oregon) (Jacobs 1968)</td>
<td>-h&quot;a&quot; 'so people say'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in the Tsetsault narrative collected by Boas, that is, it occurs at least twenty-nine times in the short narrative presented and like its Southern Athapaskan counterpart it does not occur within quoted speech within the narrative but rather frames the narrative as quoted speech of the ancestors. Nevertheless, it seems to be directly related to either the Tsetsault verb form 'to speak' -de or 'to talk' -de (my impression is that these forms may be identical; they also — according to Goddard (Boas and Goddard 1924) — appear to be cognate with the Navajo form -ti 'to talk'). In Ten'a (Koyukon) we see the use of a fully formed verb of speaking siedênî [ts'ednee] 'we say' that Jetté (1908:304) translates as 'says the old tradition.' Atla (1989) gives these forms as a verb of speaking in the framing device kk'edon ts'ednee 'the distant past, it is said' or 'in legendary times, it is said' (Jetté and Jones 2000:437). Again, ts'ednee is a verb of speaking. These forms are, then, similar to the Navajo and Western Apache examples. However, judging from a review of Jetté's Ten'a texts, it appears to occur only at the beginning of traditional narratives. (As a comparative note, one Navajo consultant has suggested a preference for that usage with jînt.)

The Pacific Coast examples present a division very similar to what we see in the Southwest. While Seaburg (1977:330) describes for Wailaki the form ya'nin as a “narrative enclitic,” he also reconstructs it as a reduced fully inflected verb of speaking ya-ch'i-n-in 'they say'. The reduction in form is similar, I should add, to what one finds in Navajo concerning jînt where that form can be reduced to a monosyllabic form (either jînt or jîn). It might be better to call ya'nin a narrative quotative evidential and not an enclitic and restrict enclitic to the examples we find in the Eastern Apachean languages and the forms we find in Galice, -h"a" 'so people say', and Tolowa, -lah 'it is said'. Jacobs (1968:183) described the function of the Galice enclitic as follows: “Mr. Simmons tagged it unpredictably to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>QUOTATIVE EVIDENTIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Tewa</td>
<td>ba 'so they say' (Kroskity 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopi</td>
<td>yaw 'it is said' (Shaull 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Paiute</td>
<td>ukwa (quotative demonstrative), -pixai (narrative past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Bunte 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>inoote 'long ago' (Tedlock 1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohono O'odham</td>
<td>na'ana 'once upon a time, long ago' (Saxton and Saxton 1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonkawa</td>
<td>-lakno'ob 'so they say' (Hymes 1987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one word or another word, more often a phrase-final, in every third or fourth utterance in both myth and non-myth dictations." Without giving it the thorough investigation it deserves, I can at minimum suggest that it functions very much like the narrative enclitic in Mescalero Apache (where it seems to mark larger discourse units than a line, as we find in Chiricahua Apache). Like other quotative evidentials in Athapaskan, it does not appear inside quoted speech. It is of some interest to see a North/South split concerning the verb of speaking versus a narrative enclitic in the Pacific Coast (north having the narrative enclitic and south the verb of speaking). Again, these are tentative results.

A final note, before we turn to the Southwest again, concerns the comment Jacobs made that the narrative enclitic occurs in both myths and nonmyths. More work needs to be done to understand Athapaskan ethnopoetics and the uses of these quotative evidentials. Far from being a minor element in linguistic anthropology, I believe ethnopoetics will prove to be of fundamental value in historical linguistics, especially a historical linguistics that focuses on discursive typologies.

AN AREAL DISCURSIVE TYPOLOGICAL VIEW OF THE SOUTHWEST

I want now to turn to the final pieces of data to be presented in this chapter. Here I survey a number of Southwestern languages outside the Athapaskan languages we have so far discussed. Again, the focus is on quotative evidentials (narrative devices) that occur in traditional stories. In Table 14.6 I present the results of a survey for quotative evidentials in the following languages: Arizona Tewa (Kiowa-Tanoan) (Kroskity 1998), Hopi (Uto-Aztecan) (Shaull 2002), Tohono O'odham (Uto-Aztecan) (Saxton and Saxton 1973), Southern Paiute (Uto-Aztecan) (Bunte 2002), Tonkawa (language isolate) (Hymes 1987), and Zuni (language isolate) (Tedlock 1972). I chose these languages for several reasons: (1) all of them have been analyzed ethnopoetically so we can more easily understand the discursive uses of the quotative evidentials, (2) all have had extended contact and interaction with Southern Athapaskan-speaking people, (3) and all have had narratives published in the Native language original.
Zuni, in the example published by Tedlock (1972), does not appear to have a quotative evidential used in Coyote narratives. Instead, as Tedlock describes, the rhetorical and poetic structuring of Zuni narratives seems to rely on pause structures. Tedlock notes the use of a framing initial word *inoote* `long ago`, but this does not seem to have an evidential quality to it. The Tohono O’odham form *na’ana* seems to act as a framing device at the beginning of narratives (similar to the Chilcotin and Navajo examples above). Like the Zuni form, they do not have a quotative feel to them, and unlike the forms found in Southern Apachean languages or the other Southwestern forms that I now turn to, they do not recur. Arizona Tewa, Hopi, and Tonkawa all use quotative evidentials pervasively in traditional narratives. As Kroskrity (1998) has documented for Arizona Tewa, the function of the evidential particle *ba* seems to be a convergence with Hopi rhetorical uses of their evidential particle *yaw*. There are, however, some differences. For example, in Hopi traditional narratives *yaw* can occur sentence or clause initially and repeatedly within a sentence, whereas in Arizona Tewa there are no attested examples of *ba* occurring clause or sentence initially. Instead, it can appear multiple times within a sentence (Kroshkrt 1998). The related Southern Paiute gives us two forms, *ukwa* or *-pixai*. Neither acts exactly like the Arizona Tewa or Hopi quotative evidential, though *ukwa* comes closer. Also, neither consistently occurs clause or sentence finally, but—in distinction to Arizona Tewa and Hopi—they can occur clause finally. It is important to note here that the Southern Paiute, who live at Kaibab-Paiute Reservation and in the San Juan communities within the Navajo Nation, have a long history with the Navajo.

Tonkawa has a narrative enclitic *-lakno*’o ‘so they say’. This form attaches to the final verb of a clause. Tonkawa, like Apachean languages and Hopi, is generally an SOV (Subject Object Verb) language. Arizona Tewa is a verb-final language, but the word order is relatively fluid. In many respects, *-lakno*’o seems to function very much like Chiricahua Apache *-nda*.

Table 14.7 compares Arizona Tewa, Hopi, Tonkawa, Eastern Apachean, and Western Apachean, and certain patterns and connections can be noted. First, I think we can make a strong argument that the use of quotative evidentials in traditional narratives is a discursive areal feature in the American Southwest. Languages from three language families and a language isolate all use some form of a quotative evidential in traditional narratives. They differ, however, in clause placement, in recurrence within a sentence or clause, in their morphological form, and in their independence. These differences are most likely due to language-specific factors and, as Kroshkrt (1998) notes, certain rhetorical convergences we see between Hopi and Arizona Tewa. It is worth noting that the Eastern Apachean division and Tonkawa look very similar. We know that the Tonkawa historically interacted with Mescalero and Lipan Apaches (Webster 1999b) and resided to the east of the Apachean-speaking peoples in Texas. The Western Apachean group looks similar to the Southern Paiute, the Arizona Tewa, and the Hopi (though, as Kroshkrt (1998) notes, the Arizona Tewa...
TABLE 14.7. Comparison of Selected Languages and Quotative Evidentials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona Tewa</th>
<th>Hopi</th>
<th>Southern Paiute</th>
<th>Tonkawa</th>
<th>Eastern Apachean</th>
<th>Western Apachean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent enclitic or independent form</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Enclitic</td>
<td>Enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb of speaking</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single or multiple occurrence per clause</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause final</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

probably looks similar to Hopi because of convergence). They differ in the use of a verb of speaking versus a quotative particle. Based on the above comparison, we might, tentatively, offer the following grouping:

- Hopi
- Southern Paiute
- Arizona Tewa
- Navajo
- Western Apache
- Tonkawa
- Chiricahua Apache
- Jicarilla Apache
- Mescalero Apache
- Lipan Apache

In a previous article (Webster 1999b), I noted that in the attested versions of Coyote narratives in Lipan Apache (one in Hoijer n.d. and fragments in Goddard n.d.) the narrative enclitic does not occur. It does, however, occur in the long narrative told by Augustina Zuazua (Hoijer 1975) when Zuazua is recounting the early movements of the Lipan Apache as told to her by an elderly Lipan Apache. For a variety of reasons (see Webster 2007), I believe Zuazua had greater command of Lipan Apache than did Lisandro Mendez, the narrator of the Coyote story in Hoijer n.d. I now believe that the exclusion of the narrative enclitic in Mendez’s Coyote story either was due to socio-linguistic factors related to the indexing of Lipan-ness or was an indicator of the rapid decline in use of the Lipan Apache language.

When we compare Northern Athapaskan quotative evidentials with Southern Athapaskan evidentials, we see that the quotatives are relatively uncommon in the Northern corpus I examined. However, when they do occur, they are either an enclitic or an independent verb of speaking, but in both cases they are traceable to a verb of speaking. The Tsetsault form is clearly related to the verb forms of ‘to talk’ and ‘to speak’. This matches the Navajo and Western Apache uses of a verb of speaking. Tsetsault differs from Navajo and Western Apache in the independence of the form, but over time, one can see how the verb of speaking might become reduced and attached to the clause final verb. Note that in
both Navajo and Wailaki an independent verb of speaking is often reduced in form. From the comparison described above, we can suggest that the narrative enclitic as a single semi-bound morpheme does not appear to occur in Northern Athapaskan languages. The narrative enclitic does appear in both the Pacific Coast and the Southwest. The Tsotsault form seems to mirror the rhetorical use in the Southern Athapaskan languages of the quotative evidential. The Ten'a (Koyukon) forms seem to function rhetorically in a way similar to at least one Navajo consultant's view of how jin' should be used.

The Pacific Coast Athapaskan data seem to mirror the Southwest Athapaskan data. There are two general patterns: an independent verb of speaking and a dependent enclitic. And, at least according to Seaburg (1977), the Wallaki form was a narrative enclitic.

**Inferences from a Comparison of Athapaskan Forms**

First, I think it plausible that the narrative enclitics began as independent verbs of speaking and were reduced and attached to the clause final verb over time. Thus Navajo, Wailaki, and Ten'a (Koyukon) show the older form to varying degrees. Where there is no use of quotative evidentials in the Northern Athapaskan languages, I suspect that the form has been lost completely. Such a reduction is obviously not obligatory, as the Tsotsault example suggests. Likewise, reduction to a narrative enclitic is also not obligatory, as the Navajo and Wallaki examples attest. The process can be diagrammed as follows (where parentheses indicate optional processes):

Verb of speaking (→ narrative enclitic (→ zero))

That Navajo and Western Apache show the older form suggests that the migration south occurred before a complete reduction in the north. Likewise, the fact that the phonetic shapes of the narrative enclitics in the north, the Pacific, and the Southwest do not align could suggest that the migration occurred before the reduction to narrative enclitics. The logic behind this claim would be that, in essence, each group had to create its own phonological path to the narrative enclitic. More work needs to be done on this.

**Inferences from a Comparison with the Southwest**

In the Southwest, we see three general patterns from an areal discursive typological view. The first pattern is the zero occurrences of quotative evidentials. We find this in Zuni and to a large degree in Tohono O'odham, where we find a framing device used at the beginning of traditional narratives. More common is the second pattern, in which we find the use of independent quotative particles. Hopi, Southern Paiute, Arizona Tewa, and Western Apachean all exhibit this pattern. Finally, a third pattern is found in Tonkawa and Eastern Apachean, in which a narrative enclitic is used.
CONCLUSION

To conclude, I wish to construct a possible accounting for the division found in Southwest Athapaskan uses of quotative evidentials. Judging by a comparison with Northern Athapaskan and Pacific Coast Athapaskan, it is entirely possible that the proto-Apachean-speakers had both the dependent and independent forms when they migrated into the Southwest. As the data concerning Chipewyan and Navajo /t/–/k/ suggest, two divergent forms can be held at the same time in Athapaskan languages (both Chipewyan and Navajo have internal phonological variation between /t/ and /k/). Thus proto-Apacheans on the migration southward may have begun reducing the verb of speaking to a narrative enclitic. It is also likely that they had the Western Apachean system when they entered the Southwest. What is not likely is that they had only the Eastern Apachean system, which then became elaborated. Reduction is more likely than addition. This leads to two questions: (1) Why did Navajo and Western Apache not reduce to a narrative enclitic or lose the form completely? and (2) Why did Eastern Apachean languages stop at the narrative enclitic, that is, why did they not completely lose the form (though Lipan seems to be doing some of that)?

I think the answer to this question may be found in the interactions of proto-Apachean peoples with speakers of other languages. We know from historical and ethnohistorical records that the Lipan Apache and Mescalero Apache interacted frequently and extensively with the Tonkawa. We know that the Mescalero and Lipan Apache also interacted with the Jicarilla and the Chiricahua. Because of the level interaction with the Tonkawa, who used a narrative enclitic in traditional narratives which bears a surface phonological resemblance to the Eastern Apachean narrative enclitic (\(\text{\textasciitilde}k\text{\textasciitilde}n\text{\textasciitilde}o\text{\textasciitilde}\) and \(-\text{\textasciitilde}d\text{\textasciitilde}a\text{\textasciitilde}, -\text{\textasciitilde}d\text{\textasciitilde}\)), there may have been a stabilizing influence produced by an extended cross-linguicultural interaction. Likewise, the Southern Paiute and Hopi have had extended interactions with theNavajo, and the Navajo have had extended interactions with the Western Apache. The influence of the two Uto-Aztecan groups—and especially the Hopi—may have provided a stabilizing influence for retaining an independent quotative evidential. Thus the influence of the discursive areal feature of the use of a quotative evidential has led to a stabilizing of a quotative evidential in the two Southern Athapaskan divisions. However, inter-linguicultural interaction between Eastern Apachean and Tonkawa and between Western Apachean and Hopi, Arizona Tewa, and Southern Paiute has led to what form the quotative evidential has been stabilized as, either dependent or independent.

As Krookrity (1998) notes, Arizona Tewa–speakers take pride in their language as an identity marker. This may suggest why there has been a discursive convergence without a concomitant borrowing of a Hopi form. Arizona Tewa has borrowed a discursive device, but it uses an Arizona Tewa form. As Holjer (1939) and Young (1989) have pointed out for Southern Athapaskan languages, they appear relatively resistant to borrowings of outside lexical items (see also
de Reuse, this volume). Instead, lexical elaboration and innovation using existing lexical stock is the norm. Thus we would not expect either the Western or Eastern Apachen groups to borrow discursive evidentials from Uto-Aztecan or Tonkawa. Instead, as I have argued, the convergence of discursive function influenced the shape or form of the evidential. Such discursive convergence may have occurred as people sat and told stories to each other, listening to the poetics of each language. We need to avoid thinking that ethnopoetic structurings arose in isolation; rather, we should seek to glimpse dialogue in the calibration of ethnopoetic structurings.

This chapter has been an initial attempt at outlining a discursive areal typological accounting of the use of quotative evidentials in the American Southwest and beyond. I have attempted to use the evidential as way to understand the migration history of the Southern Athapaskans and to suggest a possible accounting for the division in form of the quotative evidential. This is clearly a preliminary report: more work needs to be done on Northern Athapaskan languages as well as on a wider comparison of languages of the Southwest. However, I hope this chapter suggests two methodological points: (1) ethnopoetics, far from being a marginal pursuit, can be of great value to historical reconstructions of past migrations, and (2) a discursive areal typological perspective can lead to new and interesting ways to understand the interactions of peoples who spoke distinct languages but still engaged in linguacultural exchanges.
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