

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE REPORTATIVE EVIDENTIAL

#### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

The Reportative evidential is used to mark information acquired from another person. A sentence with the Reportative evidential differs from reported speech because the Reportative evidential does not require a lexical verb such as 'said' or 'tell'. Sentences without the Reportative evidential are grammatical sentences, but using the Reportative evidential is indispensable for Luchuan speakers to clarify that the speaker acquired the information from someone else. Folktales and news are marked by Reportative evidential as well.

The reportative evidential *ndi* can appear in reported speech, similar to the complementiser *that* which appears in English with a lexical verb such as 'said' or 'tell'. One might therefore be tempted to think that *ndi* is simply a complementiser like *that* in English. *ndi* does in fact behave like a complementiser in that it can be used with verbs such as 'think' and 'know'. However, when *ndi* appears alone, without any lexical verbs, the sentence marked with *ndi* always has the meaning of reportative. No one considers that a lexical verb such as 'think' or 'know' is ellipted. From this perspective, reportative *ndi* is not a complementiser, though it might have been diachronically derived from a complementiser.

It is difficult to discuss how different direct speech and indirect speech is in Luchuan because there is no syntactic agreement of tense or person as there is in English. However, it is obvious that sentences with the Reportative evidential are different from direct speech because the first person 'I' cannot appear in the subject position of the embedded clause. I will discuss this in section 4.2.1. Since there is no overt subject of the lexical verbs (such as '*John* said...' or '*They* told...'), it can be difficult to distinguish who is the source of information of sentences with the Reportative evidential. This will be discussed in section 4.2.2.

The Reportative evidential plays a crucial role in demonstrating the conceptual differences between evidentiality and modality because reportative *ndi* does not convey the speaker's degree of certainty; it only conveys evidential meaning. I will demonstrate this in section 4.3, providing

the tests which determine whether or not the three indirect evidentials of Luchuan including *ndi*, encode the speaker's degree of certainty. The Direct evidential tends to be related to the speaker's certainty since obtaining direct evidence contributes to the speaker's certainty. Nevertheless, I have claimed that evidentiality should be separated from modality because it is not cross-linguistically universal for the Direct evidential to indicate the speaker's certainty (and in fact many languages distinguish them (Aikhenvald 2004)). Also, indicating the speaker's degree of certainty does not exclude indicating evidentiality (recall that we covered the different points of view about whether evidentiality and modality should be regarded as distinct categories in Chapter 1.5, reviewing the proposals of Faller (2002), McCready and Ogata (2007), and others). The fact that the Reportative evidential *ndi* carries purely evidential meaning suggests that the concept of evidentiality should be identified as a separate grammatical category. This issue will be discussed in section 4.3.

In this chapter, I will attempt to clarify the functions of *ndi*, focusing on the following three points:

- (1) What kind of evidence licenses the use of *ndi*
- (2) How *ndi* interacts with aspect/tense and the direct evidential *-N*
- (3) Whether *ndi* can appear in negative or interrogative sentences

Point (1) will be discussed in section 4.2.1 so that we can understand the spheres which the Reportative evidential covers. Points (2) and (3), which clarify the morphosyntactic functions of *ndi*, will be discussed in sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.3 respectively.

## 4.2 THE REPORTATIVE EVIDENTIAL *NDI*

### 4.2.1 *Evidence Licensing the Use of Ndi*

The typical usage of the Reportative evidential is to convey "information acquired through somebody else's report, without any claim about the exact authorship or the speaker's commitment to the truth of the statement" (Aikhenvald 2004:176–177). The reportative evidential in Luchuan can indeed mark information acquired from someone else with or without explicitly clarifying the source of information. Basically the speaker needs to have obtained the information from someone else apart from the hearer. The information can have as its source the agent of the sentence reporting him/herself or someone else. Let me introduce an example.