

Final particles II: 32 ways to make a statement
Linguistics 460/560 - The Structure of Itunyoso Triqui
Week 15 - Spring 2024
Christian DiCanio

- (1) Last time, we discussed 11 of 13 final particles that are used for questions, but there are a large range of final particles that are used to encode additional pragmatic distinctions in the language.
- (2) To review, 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 / *mirativity*
- (3) There are about 32 additional final particles in the language. Of these, we have some notion of the meanings of many of them, but many have fuzzy semantics. I'll look at 18 of these here.
- (4) A listing of the non-interrogative SFPs with some basic notion of their meanings from elicitation and from text analysis.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| bej¹ | strong commands | riaj⁵ | used after giving advice |
| hnej³ | particle used between men | saj³⁵ | counterfactuality |
| kah ¹³ | neither/tampoco | sa ³ yoj ³ | expression goes against what others expect |
| kaj³⁴ | more than you think | soj³ | hope that event will occur |
| manj⁵ | negative focus statement | staj³ | at all, used with negation |
| manh³ | quoted negative | stej³ | already (command) |
| minh ³ | ? | stinh ⁴ | I think, right? |
| nanh¹³ | speaker personal belief | stoj ³ | ? |
| nanj ¹³ | distinction of quantity | sun ²¹ | indicates surprise |
| nanj ⁵ | expression of finality | toj¹ | indicates misunderstanding |
| nej ³ | also, too | t(r)unj⁵ | expression of certainty that event will occur |
| nej ⁵ | negative commands | ya ³ unj ⁴³ | indicates sadness/fear |
| nun ² ne ⁴³ | indication of anger | ya³rij⁵ | particle used between women |
| oj ³ | speaker demands action | yoj³² | non-eyewitness evidential |
| raj¹ | expression of uncertainty | yu³be³² | eyewitness evidential |
| rej³ | hearsay evidential | yu³mej³ | general negative particle |

- (5) There is a lot to unpack here regarding how these might be "grouped." It's not as easy as questions/interrogatives are.

II. Marking evidentiality or shared knowledge (in some way)

- (6) "*Evidentiality* proper is understood as stating the existence of a source of evidence for some information; this includes stating that there is some evidence, and also specifying what type of evidence there is."

(Aikhenvald, Ch.1 in Aikhenvald and Dixon, 2003)

- (7) The types of evidentiality can vastly differ across languages. Minimally there can be a distinction between eyewitness vs. non-eyewitness evidence, but languages can also distinguish how the information was observed or inferred.
- (8) Tsafiki (Barbacoan, Ecuador) (ibid, but originally Dickinson 2000).

bá=xa=k^hi *xów-aqa-nk'e--le*
 then=they.say=3person.agent outwards.move-NONVIS.SENSORY-HEARSAY
 'Then he started to walk out, it is said' (the old man villain, who is blind,
 heard the hero start to walk out)

- (9) Related to these types of distinctions is the notion of *shared knowledge* and *belief*. There are many different distinctions that can be made here.

- a. known or believed by speaker and maybe others
- b. known or believed by *only* speaker and no others (and exclusions can be combined in various ways - only hearer or only speaker/hearer, etc)
- c. known/believed by everyone
- ... many other notions here, including distinctions between certainty and belief

- (10) Perhaps a good place to start is "*How certain are you about a proposition?*" Triqui seems to have six different particles that relate to this in some way and to evidentiality as well.

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| nanh ¹³ | <i>only</i> the speaker believes | t(r)unj ⁵ | expresses emphatic certainty |
| raj ¹ | expresses uncertainty | yoj ³² | non-eyewitness? |
| rej ³ | hearsay | yu ³ be ³² | eyewitness? or certainty? |

- (11) The two most common final particles in the language are *yoj*³² and *yu³be*³². In a 10 hour corpus of corrected Triqui speech (~100K words), the former occurs 1,710 times and the latter 1,122 times.

- (12) It is convenient to talk about things like *eyewitness belief* or *non-eyewitness belief* here just because there is a literature on evidentiality. My consultant agreed that this was basically true here, but then when you look at examples, you scratch your head as to whether this is really the distinction. What do you think?

- (13) One of my consultant's observations is that *yu³be*³² is more natural as a response.

- (13) a. Line 95: CMC, '*Cómo se prepara huipiles anteriores*'
 si³ ttunj² tu³kwa³chih³ nun³² rian³² ru³hnun⁴ ku³ndu³ ta³ a⁴ta⁴³
 comp eight thread.pair be.in face huipil short DEM say.1S

yoj³²

NONEYEWITNESS.EVID

'Eight pairs of threads are inside that short huipil, I would say (about).'

- b. Line 33: NLG, '*Cómo se prepara huipiles anteriores*'
 un³taj³ yu³hbej³ ni³kaj³ ngo² tu³kwa³chih³ ta³ hyaj³
 how.many thread carry one thread.pair DEM do

cha¹ngah¹=nej³

kaj¹

truly=3P

FORGOT.TAG

'How many threads are in one of those thread pairs really again?'

- c. Line 96: CMC, '*Cómo se prepara huipiles anteriores*'
 cchih², cchih² yu³hbej³ bbij¹ ni³kaj³ ngo² tu³kwa³chih³ **yu3be32**
 10 10 thread two carry one thread.pair EYEW.EVID

'10, 10 threads of two are in a thread pair.'

- (14) If this was firsthand knowledge, then why would the same speaker use *yoy³²* in (13a) but then not use it in (13c)? Maybe it's just about responding to someone else with your own view of things? What other evidence is there for this?

- (15) a. Ni² u³sin³ ni² ri³²=sij³ ni³manj³ kwe⁴nta⁴³ **WCM**
 and what and take.out=3M heart.TOP for
 k-a²ra² sun³²=sij³ nga¹ nih² ra³sun³² ta³ oh¹
 POT-construct work=3M with PL thing DEM CONTENT.Q

'For what (reason) were they taking out its heart in order to use with all those things?'

- b. Ta³si² si¹kah¹ toj³ ma²han³ **yu³bej³**, si³ toj³ **CCR**
 because hard more *this* EYEW.EVID that more
 ni²ko³ yyoh³ **yu³be³²**, ni² si³si² cchrun³ chi³ra³ ni²
 some year EYEW.EVID and so.that tree/wood back.TOP and
 u³yu¹ unj¹³ nan² **yu³be³²**. *'Sobre los arboles'*
 fold simply.TOP DIR EYEW.EVID 10/6/14, WCM, CCR

'Because it is harder. It lasts for more years. And it's that the tree bark easily folds.'

- (16) In the exchange in (15), the speaker WCM is asking about why the center of a type of wood is cut out for different purposes. The interlocutor CCR is slightly older and is explaining the use of the wood in the conversation. The eyewitness evidential is used here, but this is not necessarily about an event that could be witnessed, but a purpose that the speaker is aware of.
- (17) So, perhaps a better notion is that *yu³be³²* has to be used when two conditions are met:
- the interlocutor is responding to another speaker
 - the interlocutor has certainty/confidence in their answer
- (18) If this is true, it predicts that you can never start a conversation with *yu³be³²* at the end of the first exchange.
- (19) It appears though that you don't have to be answering someone to use *yu³be³²*. You can instead be in the middle of a monologue discussing how to deal with toxic men. The excerpt below is from *Derechos de mujeres triquis*, line 58, by Nieves López Guzmán.

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|---------|------|-------------|
| Si3 | ki3-ninh3 | nu3kwanh3 | a3hmin32=sij3 | si2 | taj13 | nga1 | toj3 |
| NEG | PERF-fall.1P | word | speak=3M | b/c | like.so | with | more |
| nga1 | kkij2 | a3hmin32=sij3 | ni3hyaj3=sij3=yunh1 | ni2 | ta1 | toj3 | nga1 |
| with | ugly | speak=3M | see=3M=1P | and | even | more | with |
| ki3-ninh3 | sa3ni2 | si3 | ki3-ninh3 | taj13 | nnanj23 | nga1 | ta3hbih4 |
| PERF-fall.1P | but | NEG | PERF-fall.1P | like.so | to.here | with | ought.to.1P |
| k-a2bih2 | neh2 | rian2 | k-unh2 | yu3be32 | | | |
| POT-leave.1P | toward | future | POT-go.1P | EYEW.EVID | | | |

'We won't fall for the words he speaks because the dirtier he speaks, seeing if we will fall, but we won't fall like this here and we ought to go forward toward the future.'

- (20) The speaker, NLG, produces this as **the last line** of a 2-3 minute monologue at the beginning of the recording. It is notable that this is *the only time* this particle is used in this monologue with 58 utterances. NLG is speaking from experience, but in generic terms and can not be referring to a specific witnessed event.
- (21) Another possibility is that *yu³be³²* is used to mark the end of a response that one feels strongly about. This is rather vague in terms of evidentiality though.
- (22) The other major particle *yoy³²* reflects speaker belief and usually requires an answer.
- (23) The particle *nanh¹³* is used to express that the speaker believes that the expression is true, but *not* the interlocutor. One might perhaps translate this in English as "Well *I* think it's going to rain a lot."

- (24) koh2 ni2hrua43 ku3man1 si3ruaj3 **nanh13**
 POT.hit a.lot rain seem *believe*
 'It seems like it is going to rain a lot, *I think*.'

- (25) Unlike *yoj*³², which seems to be more generic in specifying that it is the speaker's belief, *nanh*¹³ emphasizes that it is specifically the speaker's belief and this is a view that is not shared by others. So, it emphasizes unshared beliefs, e.g. "Well, *I* like this boardgame."

- PGM: rian32 nne3 **cornelio demetrio* run4 ni2 **yoj32**
 where be.sitting *Cornelio Demetrio* again and then
 '(it was) where Cornelio Demetrio was, then.'

- CCR: sa3ni2 se4 ta3kuj3 ta3 ka3-nne3 cha1ngah1=sih4 **nanh13**
 but NOT ascent DEM PERF-sit truly=3M.EMPH *believe*
 'but it wasn't (on) that ascent where *he* really was, I think'

- (26) So far we've looked at particles marking certainty and responses that express strong beliefs. The final particle *raj1* indicates uncertainty, but it seems to be derived from *ra43* 'to want', which is used to express speaker feeling/emotion.

- (27) nih4 taj1 k-a3bi32=sij3 **raj1**
 who.knows how PERF-leave=3S UNCERTAIN.EVID
 'Who knows how he left.'

- (28) NLG: ni2 si3si2 to1toh1 ka2nunh2 **raj1**
 and if little.by.little POT.weave.1P UNCERTAIN.EVID
 'and if we were to weave little by little?'

- CMC: si2 to1toh1 to1toh1 ka4nunh4 ni2
 if little.by.little little.by.little PERF.weave.1P and

 anj3 ki2-hya3 taj13 bbij1 ya3bi32 nan3
 ? POT-do.TOP like.so two months here
 'If little by little we wove, then it would take two months here.'

- (29) In (28), two women are discussing how long it would take to weave parts of a huipil. The translation of NLG's speech is as a question, but perhaps it is better understood as indicating hesitation with the answer that speaker CMC then provides.

- (30) The final particle *rej3* is an evidential marker for reported speech but where no speaker is specified. However, speakers may include the verb *a3taj2* 'to say' marked with a generic topic *a3ta3* say.TOP. I am not clear about the choice between these two. My impression is that the latter is preferred in contexts where there were clear speakers the interlocutor interacted with as opposed to the former, which is more generic.

- (31) A: un3sin3 ka3-bin3 **oh1**
 what PERF-be CONTENT.Q
 'What happened?'
- B: ka3min43 ku3-ru3min3 **rej3**
 car PERF-turn.over REPORT.EVID
 'A car flipped over, they say.' ~ 'They say that a car flipped over.'
- (32) si2-kwe2ntu2 ra3ha3-chu3manj3 ta3 bin3 ni2
 POSS'D-story.PP Cuquila DEM be and
- bbij1 bbij1 cha31=chuj3 **rej3** ni2 ngo2 cha3ta32 xi3 bin3=chuj3
 two two head=ANIM REPORT.EVID and one eagle large be=ANIM
- 'This is the story of Cuquila. And two, two heads, they say, were on one large eagle.'
- (33) The particle *t(r)unj⁵*, pronounced either as [trũh⁵] or [rũh⁵] or [tũh⁵], expresses speaker certainty with emphasis. Example (33b) expresses more doubt than (33a), according to my consultant.
- a. Ka3hanj2 cha1ngah1=sij3 tunj5
 PERF.go really=3M CERTAIN.EMPH
 'He really went/left!'
- b. Ka3hanj2 cha1ngah1=sij3
 PERF.go really=3M
 'He really went.' (more doubtful)
- (34) The text example here, along with the exclamation point, seems to illustrate this point as well. Perhaps this is just "emphasis" and not analyzable in terms of evidentiality.
- "Chi3hi4 nne32 ri1hi1 roh4+hya3 raj4 trunj5"
 defecate water of.urine seem want.1s CERTAIN.EMPH
- a3taj3=sij3 ngaj23=sij3 nga1=unj3.
 say=3m be.lying=3m with=3f
- "I really have to pee, it seems!" he says as he is lying with her.
Line 30, Cuento de señora que engañó a su esposo, Marcelino Hernández Pérez

III. Particles translated as 'already/yet'

- (35) There are two particles that we might translate as 'already' or 'ya' (en español). I do not understand the different pragmatics of these particles, especially around *bej'*, but perhaps it is just that the latter is used with commands and the former is not.

nanj5 'already'
bej1 'already' with commands

- (36) k-u4nanj4=nih2=sij3 **nanj5**
 PERF-run=PL=3S already
 'They ran already!'

- (37) ni2 yyaj13 ni2 cha3kaj3 cha1ngoh1 ni3koh3
 and now and marry truly.1P spouse.1P

ni2 be4 ta3 bin3 si3 ki3-hyoh4 **nanj5**
 and TOP DEM be that PERF-do.1P already

'Y ahora nos juntamos en serio nuestros esposos y eso es lo que hicimos ya...'
 'And now we get married for real to our husbands and that's what we've already done.'

- (38) cha2=reh1 **bej1**
 POT.eat=2S already
 'Eat already!'

- (39) sa3ni2 nga13 un3 **bej1** si3 n-a3nun32=nej3 ngo2 si3 nalkal **bej1**
 but when um then that ITER.put=3P one that new already
 'pero cuando pues? que vuelven a poner uno nuevo pues?'
 'But when then, (when is it) that they design another (huipil) then?'

- (40) In (39), /**bej1**/ is used with an imperative (marked by using potential aspect on the verb) but in (38), it has a rather different meaning. Perhaps the meaning of 'already' or 'yet' is missing in the translation.

- (41) Another elicited example:

Na3hbe3 k-a2hmin2 **bej1**
 NEG.able POT-speak.1S already
 'No pude hablar ya.' / 'I couldn't speak yet.'

IV. Directive particles

- (42) In Itunyoso Triqui, if two speakers have either a relation of dominance (younger speaking to older) or if they are compadres/comadres, then almost all utterances must end with a word establishing this relationship.

- (43) So, most dialogues of this sort look like:
 A: What do you think, my compadre?
 B: I don't know, my compadre.
 A: I thought you did, my compadre.
 B: Not really, my compadre.

- (44) So, the final word used in these utterances is always a noun indicating the kinship relationship. However, there seem to be two particles that are used more generically to indicate some sort of relation (between women or between men)

hnej5 'directive' particle between men
ya3rij5 ~ rij5 'directive' particle between women

- (45) I do not know if by ending an utterance with these particles the speakers are expressing some other sort of relation or perhaps the fact that they have no specific relation.

V. Negative particles

- (46) Three particles seem to occur under negation.

/manj5/ used under negation with negative focus
/staj3/ negative assertion/polarity, e.g. 'at all!'
/ya3mej3 ~ yu3mej3 ~ mej3/ used under negation more generally

- (47) se4 ni3gyanj5 ka3hanj3=sij3 **manj5** ma3kaj5 ka3hanj3=sij3 **aj5**
 not Tlaxiaco PERF.go=3S NEG.FOCUS Mexico.City perf.go=3S TAG.Q
 'He didn't go to Tlaxiaco, he went to Mexico City, eh?'

- (48) This actually makes *aj5* look less like it's marking tag questions and more like it's a positive assertion used in contexts where the interlocutor assumed otherwise.

- (49) Nun3 ni3hin4=reh1 ki2-hyaj3 sun31=reh1 **staj3**
 NEG know=2S POT-do work=2S *at.all*
 'No sabes trabajar para nada!'
 'You dont know how to work at all!'

- (50) There are rather few examples of this in texts though, perhaps because it is restricted to negative commands or sentiments. Monologues and dialogues do not have many commands.

- (51) The SFP *ya³mej³* is used as a general final negation marker.

- (52) CLG: se4 chu2ru3hbe32 binj5 **ya3mej3**
 NEG owner/rich be.1S NEG.PART
 'No soy rico' / 'I am not rich.'

Context: The previous utterance is produced by a different speaker and it discusses how everyone used to be very very poor in the town and now some people have money.

- (52) NLG: be4 si3ruaj3 ni2 ta3 si3 baj23 sa3ni2 un3sin3
TOP seemingly and DEM if exist.TOP but what
- ki3-hya3 bin3 si3si2 cchej32-ka2han2 ni3taj2 a4tuj4 nga13 na4 **ya3mej3**
PERF-do.TOP be if path-to.go NEG.EXIST enter time past NEG.PART

'Tal vez aunque hubiera, lo que hizo es que no hubo carreteras y no entraban desde hace ese tiempo pues.' // 'Perhaps, but even if there were, what they did was, there were no highways that entered at that time.'

VI. Additional particles (that I can't really categorize)

- (53) Triqui particles are sensitive to how much something has been repeated in discourse. Recall that the final particle *noh'* is only used when a question follows another question. If you have to repeat yourself because something was misunderstood, there's a particle for that too - *toj'*.

- (54) Speaker 1: mman1 kkwej32 cha3bi32 **nih4?**
exist quelite - chabi Q?
'Is there any quelite chabi?'
- Speaker 2: ni3taj2 kkwej32 na4nun43.
NEG.exist quelite quintonil.
'There is no quintonil.'
- Speaker 3: kkwej32 cha3bi32 a3taj3=sij3 **toj1**
quelite chabi say=3SM PART
'He is saying 'quelite chabi'!'

- (55) Statements to the contrary of what has been stated also use *toj'*. Observe the interaction below from a conversation.

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|-------------|-----------|----------|------------|------------|-----------------|
| rian32 | rku3si1 | chu4ba43 | cchej32 | ta3 | yu3huj2 | PGM | |
| face | cross | inside | road/path | DEM | hole/place | | |
| ta3 | ngaj23 | ngaj23 | yu3hbe32, | yu3hbe32 | ni2 | ta1 | ka32 |
| DEM | be.lying | be.lying | plaza | plaza | and | up.to | PERF.exist |
| taj13 | n-a3chinj3 | ka3han3 | nda2 | nan3 | yun4 | nan2 | yu3be32 |
| like.so | ITER-walk.TOP | PERF.go.TOP | up.to | here | again | DIR | CONFIDENCE.EVID |

'On the crossing of the roads it lies (it was), the plaza was (held) there, the plaza, it was like so and it went up to here again, then.'

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------|------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| ri3ki3 | nu4bi43 | nan3 | a3taj3=sij3 | toj1 | CCR |
| back | church | this | say=3M | PART | |

'Behind this church, they say (on the contrary).'

- (56) The use of *toj'* in (55) is understood as reflecting contrary information to what has been stated by speaker PGM.
- (57) We already discussed one of the final particles - *kaj*³⁴ - that means something like 'more than you expected.' Perhaps we can gloss this as "UNEXP.EVID" or something like this. It is clearly related to not just *shared knowledge*, but expected beliefs.
- (58) a Ki3ranj4 Maria toj3 **kaj34**
 PERF-buy Maria more UNEXP.EVID
 'Maria bought more than what she was thinking about buying'
- b K-u4nanj4=sij3 **kaj34**
 PERF-run=3M UNEXP.EVID
 'He ran more than the other.'
- c K-oh1 ku3man1 **kaj34**
 pot-hit rain final.part
 'It is going to rain more than we think'
- d Ngo43 rian32 la3riaj3=soh1 **kaj34** si3 na3rij3 rian31=reh1 yu3be32.
 anger face asshole=2S UNEXP.EVID than find.TOP face=2s CONF.EVID
 'You are an even greater asshole than it seemed to you'
- (59) Some final particles also seem to indicate modality. The final particle *saj*⁵ ~ *sa*³*aj*⁵ is most easily translated as '*should have done.*' It expresses a preferable state that does not exist relative to the expression (*counterfactuality*). A verb in the potential aspect is required.
- (60) Ka3min43 nan3 ki2-ni4ka43 saj35
 car DEM POT-carry.1S CFACT.MOOD
 I should have brought *this car*.
- (61) In the above sentence, there were two cars that were being considered by the speaker. The car that was chosen was not the one that was preferred and they regret the decision.
- (62) Without this modal, the sentence above does not express possibility counter to the state of things observed in the current world, as (63) shows.
- (63) Ka3min43 nan3 ki2-ni4ka43 aj5
 car DEM POT-carry.1S TAG.Q
 I am going to bring this car, eh?
- (64) We can use the same final particle with negation. Recall that since negation involves an obligatory "flip" in verb aspect. So, the form looks like a perfective verb here, but since it is still *irrealis mood*, then the counterfactual SFP still works.

- (65) Nun3 ki3-ni4ka43 ka3min43 nan3 sa3aj5.
 NEG POT-carry.1S car DEM CRAFT.MOOD
 'I should not have brought this car.'
- (66) There is no possible interpretation with a perfective verb - these are both ungrammatical.
- a. *Ko4ho43 ba4su43 nne32 sa3aj5.
 PERF.drink.1S glass water CRAFT.MOOD
- b. *ba4su43 nne32 ko4ho43 sa3aj5.
 glass water PERF.drink.1S CRAFT.MOOD
- (67) Ki3-ni4na43 yyaj13 ki3-si43 ya3kwej3 ku3ki3. Ko1hoj1
 PERF-be.tired.1S when PERF-arrive.1S Oaxaca yesterday POT.drink.1S
- ngo2 ba4su43 nne32 sa3aj5.
 one glass water CRAFT.MOOD
- 'I got tired when I arrived in Oaxaca yesterday. I should have drunk a glass of water.'

- (68) To go from 'will/may' to 'would', you can simply add sa³aj⁵ to the clause with potential aspect.

- (69) un3taj3 chu3manh3 a3hmin32 sta4hanj4=nih2 oh1
 how.many town speak language=1P CONTENT.Q
- ka2taj2=reh1 saj5 un3taj3 tulkwih1=sij3 bin3 oh1?
 pot.say=2s CRAFT.MOOD how.many of.family=3m be CONTENT.Q

'How many towns speak Triqui? How many would you say? Of how many families are they?' (Line 10, CCR '*Los tres hermanos triquis*')

VII. Quoted speech particles

- (70) In addition to the hearsay particle *rej*³, some Triqui particles are restricted to speech acts involving quotation. These are phonologically similar to the non-quoted SFP. The speaker is indicating the pragmatics of the quote as opposed to their own pragmatics in their report.
- (71) The final negative focus particle is *manj*⁵, in (47) above, is used in non-quoted contexts, but *manh*³ is used in quoted contexts.
- (72) nun3 na2rih2 nulkwejl=unj4 manh3" a3taj3 nulkwejl=sij3ni2
 NEG POT.find both=1P.EXCL NEG.QUOTE say both=3M and
 "Neither of us found him", they both were saying.

(Line 87, RMS; '*Cuento sol y luna*')

(73) Similarly, the particle *soj*³ is something similar to *yoy*³², but found with quoted speech. The meaning of *yoy*³² is vague (epistemic possibility?), so it is similarly kind of difficult to find very clear cases of what might *soj*³ means.

(74) The speaker below, Concepción Martínez Cruz, is reenacting an exchange between people in a text. (Lines 90 - 91 CCM '*Historia de cuatro muertos en San Martín*')

a. a3nin1 chah1 sah1 a1skwa1ha3 **soj3** mah3 unj5
 explode truly good while.ago QUOTE.EVID compadre EMPH.SFP
 " 'It really was exploding (bullets) a while ago, compadre?!' ...

b. sun21 man43 si2 re1ngah1 a3nin1 cchrun3 ni2 sij4 ni2
 whoa excessively that be.seen explode wood/gun and later and
 ' Whoa!, the explosions were excessively seen' and then..." (says Margarito)

(75) And on lines 112 - 113 of the same text.

a. a3kwaj4=sij3 a3taj3=sij3 eh4 **soj3**
 yell=3M say=3M eh QUOTE.EVID
 "he was yelling, he says, eh?"

b. "a3kwaj4=nej3 tu3kwa4 sun32" a3taj3
 yell=3P house.of work say
 " 'They were yelling/announcing (it) in the mayor's office', they say"

(76) This SFP also seems to be used in contexts where the speaker wants to emphasize that the information comes from a secondary source, similar to the hearsay evidential, but perhaps with different pragmatics.

(77) ni2 be4 ke1 cchrinh3 cha43 nu1kwejl=chuj3 na1ya3
 and TOP only grass PERF.eat dual=ANIM now

soj3 mah3 unj5 se4 se4...
 QUOTE.EVID compadre EMPH.SFP not not...

'And it's only grass that they each eat now, compadre eh? Not, not...'
 (Line 25, MHP '*Relato de por qué no se come caballos y burros*')

(78) In this text, the speaker, Wilfrido Cruz Martínez, is verifying what the other speaker is asserting. If we believe that it is really just used with quotes, we might translate this as something like the use of scare quotes as one is speaking, but more research is necessary to examine this.

VIII. Concluding remarks

- (79) If this all seems *kind of* random, it is! I am still really trying to work out how to best organize information about the final particles.
- (80) There have been three approaches in grammar writing to discourse particles.
- a. Ignore them completely. These involve discourse and interaction and if linguists are working primarily with elicited examples, you might not observe many of these things anyways. See Butler (1988) for an example in Zapotec or Palancar (2009) for an example in Otomí.
 - b. Discuss them only as they relate to common speech act types (questions, commands). This seems to be the approach taken by both Macaulay (1996) on Chalcatongo Mixtec and Hollenbach (1992, 2013) on Copala Triqui and Magdalena Peñasco Mixtec.
 - c. Include them to the maximal extent possible. I do not know of many examples of this in the literature of this, but generally speaking, linguists have not written grammars with an attention to discourse.
- (81) My approach with my grammar will probably be to provide a general outline of what these particles are doing in Triqui discourse/speech alongside the types of examples you have seen here. More fieldwork will be needed for this.

References:

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. and Dixon, R., editors (2003). *Studies in Evidentiality*. Typological Studies in Language (TSL). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Butler, I. M. (1988). *Gramática zapoteca: Zapoteco de Yatzachi el Bajo*. Serie de Gramáticas de Lenguas Indígenas de México, 4. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, A.C.
- Hollenbach, B. E. (1992). A syntactic sketch of Copala Trique. In Bradley, C. H. and Hollenbach, B. E., editors, *Studies in the syntax of Mixtecan Languages*, volume 4. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.
- Hollenbach, E. E. (2013). *Gramática del mixteco de Magdalena Peñasco (Sa'an ñuu savi)*. Serie gramáticas de lenguas indígenas de México, 13. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, A.C.
- Macaulay, M. (1996). *A Grammar of Chalcatongo Mixtec*, volume 127 of University of California Publications in Linguistics. University of California Press.
- Palancar, E. (2009). *Gramática y textos del hñöñhö, Otomí de San Ildefonso Tultepec, Querétaro*, volume 1. Universidad Autónoma de Querétaro: Plaza y Valdés.