I. **Theoretical and typological preliminaries**

(1) What is a final particle? A sub-type of discourse marker.

(2) Discourse markers used in different languages to indicate speech act type, illocutionary force, attitudes towards different propositions, evidentiality, turn-taking strategy, and other pragmatic categories.

(3) While all languages have discourse markers, there is a strong tendency for languages to indicate pragmatic meanings either at the beginning or end of an utterance.

(4) "A fundamental characteristic of discourse markers is that they operate beyond the propositional content of the communication" (Fox Tree 2010)

"...discourse markers focus on the way communication is negotiated rather than on its content" (ibid)

(5) Whereas the literature on discourse markers includes a very large set of possible markers in an utterance, e.g. um, well, you know, there is a sub-set of heavily grammaticalized particles found in many East/Southeast Asian languages which occur in utterance-final position (Panov 2020).

(6) The preponderance and complexity of such particles in these languages is often related to the limitations of encoding pragmatic properties via intonation in complex lexical tone languages (Brunelle et al 2012, Sybesma and Li 2007).

(7) Though such particles are robustly found in East and Southeast languages, i.e. in Vietnamese (Brunelle et al 2012, Brunelle 2016) and in Cantonese (Sybesma and Li 2007), they are also attested in Mande languages (Sherwood 2020), in Niger-Congo languages (Hyman and Monaka 2011), and Otomanguean languages (Bueno Holle 2019).

(8) In the sentence below in Isthmus Zapotec, it would be ungrammatical with the final lá.

(Bueno Holle 2019)

¿(ñée) biiyalu laabe lá?
ñee\(^{H}\) bi-uuya=lu’ laa=be\(^{LH}\) la\(^{H}\)

Q COMPL-see=2SG BASE=3.HUM LA

‘Did you see him/her?’
(9) The example below shows the use of *ma* in Mandarin as a final question particle, the use of *ka* in Japanese as another final question particle (here, a tag question), and the use of *khráp/kā* in Thai as a gender-specific politeness marker (that doubles as a question particle) - data from Panov (2020).

Mandarin (Sino-Tinetan; China):

```
tā mǎi fāngzi le ma²
3SG buy house FP FP
```

‘Did (s)he buy a house?’

(Li & Thompson 1989 [1981]: 239)

Japanese (Japonic; Japan):

```
Sore dake ka ne
only it FP FP
```

‘Only it, right?’

(Alpatov et al.: 464)

Thai (Tai-Kadai; Thailand):

```
pay nāy khráp
go where FP
```

‘Where are you going?’ (a male asking)

```
klāp bān khā
go home FP
```

(Smyth 2002: 126)

‘I am going home.’ (a female responding)

(10) The Thai example is notable because it illustrates that pragmatic meaning may be packaged differently by language - things like politeness or evidentiality or speech act may be combined within the same particle.

II. Methodology

(12) Itunyoso Triqui has an extensive set of approximately 40-45 final particles which encode many distinct pragmatic meanings in Triqui discourse.

(13) I’ve collected a number of here from a corpus of 30 hours of Triqui narratives/conversations and in the process of translating these recordings I’ve examined their meanings to a limited degree.

(14) In the process of transcribing/ translating, my consultants and I encounter new words or SFPs not in the dictionary. These get added to the dictionary with a temporary type of gloss, but then we investigate them later.
The methods for examining final particles usually involve questions surrounding elicited utterances - often text examples can be overly complex and this makes it hard to determine the meaning.

My translated fieldnotes from 12/20/22, below, on the particle *ka³⁴*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final particle</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaj⁵</td>
<td>debe ser /kaj34/ (tono /34/)</td>
<td>'más que se piensa' (Basi tiene certeza) 'more than you think' (Basileo is certain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-significa que es más de lo que dices/calculas.
-it means that it is more than you say or more than you've estimated

a  Ki³ranj⁴  Maria  toj³  kaj³⁴  My elicitation - it is grammatical  
    perf-buy  Maria more final.part  
    'Mariya compró más de lo que pensaba en comprar.'  Basileo's translation  
    'Maria bought more than what she was thinking about buying'  

b  K-u⁴nanj⁴=sij³  kaj³⁴  My elicitation - grammatical  
    perf-run=3m  final.part  
    'Él corrió más que el otro.'  Basileo's translation  
    'He ran more than the other.'  

c  K-oh¹  ku³man¹  kaj³⁴  My elicitation - grammatical  
    pot-hit rain  final.part  
    'Va a llover más que pensamos.'  Basileo's translation  
    'It is going to rain more than we think'  

d  Ngo⁴³  rian³²  la³riaj³=soh¹  kaj³⁴  si³  na³rij³  rian³¹=reh¹  yu³be³²  
    anger face asshole=2s  final.part  than  find.top face=2s  final.part  
    A colorful text example  
    'Eres más pendejo que se te apareció.'  Basileo's translation  
    'You are an even greater asshole than it seemed to you'  

Note that the sentences in (16a) - (16c) are fairly simple sentences with simple verbs. The fact that these are grammatical allows us to get closer to the meaning of the SFP, even if it is a bit decontextualized.

From 2021 - 2022 Juergen Bohnemeyer and I worked on how to organize the set of final particles better and did some additional, targeted elicitation. However, our findings were a bit difficult to interpret since pragmatic research often requires that you ask a speaker to "think of a context where A and B are true and then you say C." This asks the speaker to do a metalinguistic work. Research on SFPs is ongoing.
III. Triqui final particles

(19) Several dimensions emerge as important in distinguishing between final particles in the language:
   a. Speech act (declarative, interrogative, imperative, performative, quotative, etc)
   b. Negation
   c. Evidentiality
   d. Propositional attitude
   e. Shared knowledge / common ground

(20) Certain final particles are very difficult to interpret, but others are easier.

   - **nih**⁴: polar question particle
   - **oh**¹: content question particle (WH question)
   - **oj**¹: questions you already know the answer to
   - **noh**¹: repeated question; follow-up question
   - **koh**¹: question if the speaker knew but forgot the answer
   - **aj**³ / **aj**⁵: tag question particle used with imperfective/perfective verbs
   - **kaj**¹: tag question particle used with potential verbs
   - **ah**³ / **anh**³: negative focus question particle
   - **runj**³: reported speech tag question, i.e. 'they say?'
   - **unj**⁴: why particle
   - **sah**¹: which, used for questioning among items in a list

(21) Unlike English, no change in constituent order is observed with questions, but final particles are usually required (at least with polar questions).

(22) **Polar (yes/no) questions** are typically marked with *nih*⁴.

(23) \[\text{Ki}³\text{-ranj}⁴=\text{sij}³ \quad \text{cha}³\text{chunj}⁵ \quad \text{nih}⁴? \quad | \quad \text{Ki}³\text{-ranj}⁴=\text{sij}³ \quad \text{cha}³\text{chunj}⁵ \quad \text{PERF-buy}=3\text{M} \quad \text{bread} \quad \text{POLAR.PART} \quad | \quad \text{PERF-buy}=3\text{M} \quad \text{bread} \quad \text{POLAR.PART} \]
   'Did he buy bread?' \quad | \quad 'He bought bread.'

(24) \[\text{ba}² \quad \text{si}³ \quad \text{ra}⁴\text{i}=\text{reh}¹ \quad \text{nih}⁴? \quad | \quad \text{exist} \quad \text{COMP} \quad \text{want}=2\text{S} \quad \text{POLAR.PART} \]
   'Is there something that you want?' \quad ~ \quad 'Do you want something?'

(25) \[\text{ka}³\text{hbe}³ \quad \text{k-u²\text{nun}²=reh}¹ \quad \text{nih}⁴? \quad | \quad \text{POT.able} \quad \text{POT-understand}=2\text{S} \quad \text{POLAR.PART} \]
   'Do you understand (me),'#

(26) Typical **content questions** are marked with a final particle *oh*¹, but as we will see, there are three other similar looking particles that also are used for content questions but where the shared knowledge has a different status.
Content questions require WH-words. Recall that these are compositional in Triqui and formed by combining the word *un³*, meaning something like 'which' with any noun, e.g.

*un³ sin³ 'which thing' = 'what' lexicalized [u³si³]*
*un³ cchej³² 'which path' = 'where' lexicalized [u³tʃeh³]*
*un³ ngwi³¹ 'which person' = 'who'*
*un³ chu³ku³ 'which animal'...

WH-words are obligatorily sentence-initial and the sentence-final *oh¹* usually occurs along with them, as shown below. Occasionally the SFP will be missing if the question is the first among many clauses.

un³-sin³  ki³-hyaj⁴=reh¹ oh¹  (or frequently, r-oh¹)
what  PERF-do=2S CONTENT.Q
'What did you do?'

un³-cchej³²  ka'hanj³²=sij³ oh¹?
where  PERF.go=3S CONTENT.Q
'Where did he go?'

But what if you are asking a question and you already know the answer? In these contexts you are asking the question and the answer is part of *shared knowledge* instead of knowledge known only to the addressee.

a.  Ki³-ranj⁴=sij³ cha'chunj⁵ nih⁴?
PERF-buy=3M bread POLAR.PART
'Did he buy bread?' (Speaker does not know the answer.)

b.  Ki³-ranj⁴=sij³ cha'chunj⁵ oj⁴?  Ki³-ni³ʔih³ si³
PERF-buy=3M bread SHARED.INFO.Q PERF-see.1S COMP

ki³-ranj⁴=sij³ cha'chunj⁵ PERF-buy=3M bread
'Did he buy bread? I saw that he bought bread.'

The inclusion of the additional sentence in (32b) demonstrates that having shared knowledge shifts the type of SFP that is used.

This final particle can also be used in non-question contexts where the speaker is signalling some agreement with the addressee (they have shared knowledge after all).
'Who knows in what (month) these flowers blossom, it seems to me, comadre?'

Basileo (my consultant) notes that, in the example above (from a text), the speaker (NLG) is signalling that she knows the answer to the question but she wants her comadre to answer the question, e.g. while at the doctor's office "And what year were you born, Grandma?"

It is unclear if this is used only to signal shared knowledge or if it is also being used respectfully - it is rude in Triqui culture to speak for someone who is your respected elder.

'I don't like that we're working today. Today, let's drink moonshine, eh?'

In (38), Basileo notes that a relationship between interlocutors must exist since the speaker is assuming the addressee will be in agreement - the idea of skipping work is a shared sentiment. It is infelicitous to say something like this with someone you do not know.

There is another SFP used if there are a series of questions being asked - noh¹. Here, in (41), the speaker (NLG) is asking her cousin a series of questions about how her parents managed to feed her family of 14 people.

'So, if you answer a question with another question, you use noh¹.'
(43) **Speaker A:** Taj¹ tu³kwaj⁴=reh¹ ni³'kyanj⁵ oh¹?
    how drive=2s Tlaxiaco CONTENT.Q
    'How do you drive to Tlaxiaco?'

**Speaker B:** Taj¹ tu³kwaj⁴=reh¹ ni³'kyanj⁵ noh¹?
    how drive=2s Tlaxiaco REP.Q
    'How do you drive to Tlaxiaco??'

(44) **Juan:** Ki¹-ran¹ ngo² ka³'min⁴³ xi³
    POT-buy.1S one car big
    'I will buy a big car.'

**Tú:** Taj¹ tu²'hbe³ oh¹/*noh¹? Un³'taj² sa³'hanj²
    how expensive CONTENT.Q/REP.Q how.much money

    ni³'kaj¹=reh¹ noh¹/*oh¹?
    carry=2S CONTENT.Q/REP.Q

    'How expensive is it? How much money are you bringing?'

**Juan:** Ni¹'ka¹ sa³'hanj².
    carry.1S money
    'I have money.'

(45) Note that noh¹ is infelicitous in an initial question, but oh¹ is infelicitous with a follow-up question. It can be used in either content or echo follow-up questions. So, this SFP is specifically sensitive to previous questions in the discourse.

(46) Yet, not all knowledge is exactly shared the same way. What if you knew something but forgot it. You might ask a question in such a way to indicate that it is forgotten knowledge.

(47) What was the name of that film? vs. What was the name of that film again?

(48) In Triqui, you use another SFP - koh¹.

(49) Ni² un³ sinj⁵ bin³ sinj³ ki³-n-a⁴'tuj⁴ rian³²=sij³ ta³
    and which man be man PERF-ITER-enter face=3M DEM

    koh¹ mah³?
    FORGOT.Q compadre.Q

    'And which man was the man who replaced him again, compadre?'

Line 21: WCM, 'Historia de autoridades que se murieron en la presidencia'
(50) In this text, the speaker (WCM) knew the answer to who replaced the last town president/mayor, but does not recall it at the moment.

(51) There is another, good example of this but it reveals a plot point in our text we're working on!

(52) **Tag questions** are often also formed by *tags*, e.g. *right? isn't that so?* For tag questions in Triqui, either *aj³* or *aj⁵* are used. I believe that they are simply allomorphs conditioned by the preceding word's tone:
a. *aj³* [af³] occurs after a preceding /43, 4, 5/ tone (upper register)
b. *aj⁵* [af³] occurs elsewhere.

(53) **ka³hanj²=ni³h²=sij³ nga¹=nej³ aj⁹?**
**PERF.g0=PL=3S with=3P TAG.Q**
'They went with them then?'

(54) **ni²-chanh¹ u²-rua⁴³ baj³ a³'nanj⁴=neh⁴=aj⁹?**
and pretty very go.3TOP weave=1P.INCL-TAG.Q
'What we weave is very pretty, eh?'

(55) The tonal conditioning is observed in the person marking too, but this is a hypothesis that needs to be explored further.

(56) Just like tags in English, *aj³* can be used in non-interrogative contexts too, though I'm not sure if this is something like English 'eh?'

(57) **cha² ngo² na³'to³² ra⁴³=reh¹** Speaker A
**POT.eat one banana want=2S**
'You're going to eat a banana.' ~ 'You want to eat a banana'

**anh³ chaj¹ aj³** Speaker B
Yes **POT.eat.1S TAG.Q**
'Yes, I will eat (it).'</name>

(58) Note that the tag question SFP *aj¹/³* is only used with imperfective or perfective verbs. When we use a verb in the potential aspect, we must instead use *kaj¹* for irrealis states (contexts where the tag does not reflect possible shared knowledge?)

(59) **ka³hanj¹=reh¹ ni³'gyanj⁵ ku³'ki³ aj⁴/*kaj¹**
**PERF.g0=2S Tlaxiaco yesterday TAG.Q/IRR.TAG.Q**
'You went to Tlaxiaco yesterday, eh?'

(60) **ka³hanj²=reh¹ ni³'gyanj⁵ a³'hyoj³ kaj¹/*aj⁵**
**POT.g0=2S Tlaxiaco tomorrow IRR.TAG.Q/TAG.Q**
'You will go to Tlaxiaco tomorrow, eh?'
(61) As it turns out though, *kaj¹* is more general than that. It is used to mark tag questions for which there is just no certainty. So, using *nih⁴* 'who knows' can permit it to be used with perfective verbs.

(62) *nih⁴ a³si² k-a³bi³²=sih⁴ ka³han³²=sij³ nih⁴ kaj¹*

Who knows if PERF-leave=3M.EMPH PERF.go=3M who.knows IRR.TAG.Q

'Who knows if he went away, eh?'

(63) There is a separate set of tags for questions involving negative focus. The SFP *ah³* is used here. There is an allomorph of this - *anh³* - that is used when the preceding vowel on the preceding word is nasalized.

(64) *se⁴ xwan⁴⁴ ki³-ranj⁴ anh³?*

not Juan PERF-buy NEG.TAG.Q

'It wasn'tJuan that bought (it)?'

(65) *ttaj⁵ ni¹ko³ ngo² ma³ka²ra², ttaj⁵ toj³ ttaj⁵ (NLG)*

be.above many one hand.measure, be.above more be.above

rianj³ si³raj³ ah³

face.3TOP seems NEG.TAG.Q

'There are a few hand measures across it, I think even more, right?'

(Person estimating how long thread has to be for a huipil design.)

(66) The example in (65) does not seem to be a negative question, but this sentence is part of a larger exchange between two women where they are discussing how to set up a *telar* for traditional weaving. As is very typical for Triqui speakers, they are coming up with an explanation together, so there is a lot of verification of information between them. The sentence above is from a younger woman who is leading the interview/discussion but she is also deferring to the expertise of the older woman in knowledge of traditional weaving. So, we could surmise that some uncertainty is expressed by the speaker.

(67) If we examine what the following sentence is, we find some evidence for this hypothesis. The older speaker responds with an exact quantity here and uses another final particle, *yu³be³²*, which is used as a general evidential for marking confidence as to the truthhood of the assertion.

*ngo² ma³ka²ra² ni² ya⁴kwa⁴han⁴ ra³ha³ ba³² rian³² ru³hnun⁴* (CMC)

one hand.measure and another.four hand be on huipil

*che¹he¹ ta³ yu³be³²*

long DEM CONF.EVID

'Una medida de mano y otros cuatro manos están en ese huipil largo pues'

'One hand measure and another four hands again on that long huipil then.'
(68) So, is $ah'$ possible even when the interlocutor feels *doubtful* without any overt negation expressed? This is so far unclear but this could be investigated in the corpus further.

(69) We have already seen that Triqui pragmatics are sensitive to whether information is quoted or not. If the tag question involves reported speech, a different SFP is used - $runj'$. 

(70) $Taj^{13}$ $ku^vhnaj^1=sij^3$ $a^{taj^2}=sij^3$ $runj^3$?  
'He's called that, they say?'

(71) $Ni^2$ $nga^{13}$ $a^{3hijn}^j=nej^3$ $yu^vbej^3$ $le^vra^{43}$ $runj^3$?  
'We have already seen that Triqui pragmatics are sensitive to whether information is quoted or not. If the tag question involves reported speech, a different SFP is used - $runj$.

(72) Why questions involve a unique final particle $un43$.

(73) $a^{taj}=reh^1$ $sta^{3hanj^3}$ $sti^vlaj^{43}$ $un43$  
'Why are you talking in Spanish?'

(74) But like most of the SFPs here, it has an extended use as a type of emphatic question. In the context below in (75), the speaker (NLG) is asking her aunt to tell the story of the sun and the moon well and to explain the different characters.

(75) $Un^3$ $yu^vhunj^2$ $bin^{3}=unj^3$ $oh^1$?  
'What woman is she? Tell it, tell it well then. What woman is she!?'

(76) Just as the particle $noh'$ is sensitive to repeated questions, a special particle $sah$ is used when questioning choices among a list of items.

(77) $un^3$ $sinh^3$ $bin^3$ $oh^1$? $sinh^v$ $cha^vna^1$ $nih^v$ $sinh^3$ $sno^vho^{43}$ $sah$?  
'What is the child? A girl or a boy?'

(78) Another term for this is an *alternative question*. Note that after the *which* question in (79), the speaker (NLG) offers an an alternative and completes the question with $sah$. 

Context: Speaker (NLG) is eliciting information from an older speaker about older weaving customs. So, the older speaker is reporting what used to happen.
Line 61: NLG, *Cómo se prepara huipiles anteriores*

IV. Discussion

(80) Apart from the 11 particles mentioned already, there are at least an additional 32 or so. Within these, there are a few *more* question particles that I do not yet understand.

\[ \text{beh}^1 \text{ synonymous with } \text{oh}^1 \]

\[ \text{runh}^1/\text{runj}^5 \text{ similar to } \text{runj}^3, \text{ but unclear in its use} \]

(81) What dimensions seem to be encoded in question SFPs? All the speech acts here are *interrogative*, so this is left unmentioned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Speech act sub-type</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Information perspective</th>
<th>Polarity</th>
<th>Assumptions about who knows the info</th>
<th>Presupposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nih⁴</td>
<td>polar:neutral</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>listener knows</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh¹</td>
<td>content</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>listener knows</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oj¹</td>
<td>polar:neutral</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>speaker knows</td>
<td>shared knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noh¹</td>
<td>content</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>listener knows</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koh¹</td>
<td>content</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>speaker <em>knew</em></td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aj³/aj⁵</td>
<td>tag</td>
<td>realis</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>speaker can know</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaj¹</td>
<td>tag</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>speaker can not know</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ah³</td>
<td>tag</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>focus-sensitive</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>listener knows</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>runj³</td>
<td>tag</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>reported speech</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>un⁴³</td>
<td>polar:emphatic</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>listener knows</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sah¹</td>
<td>content</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>listener knows</td>
<td>prior mention:list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(82) These dimensions seem to capture the differences, but extended uses are not immediately clear. Notions like doubt and certainty also need to be included in the set of dimensions. For instance, *oj¹* and *aj³* each express greater certainty than *nih⁴/oh¹* and *kaj¹* do. These reflect evidentiality. My encoding of this feature is not great so far (see "assumptions about who knows"), but standard categories are hard with questions.
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