1 Introduction

• Since DeLancey (1997), the nature of mirativity, its grammatical encoding, and very existence have been much debated.

• **Reason 1:** Many mirative markers, including the most well-studied ones, also have other non-mirative uses, most notably as indirect evidentials

• **Reason 2:** Different authors have described mirative markers across languages as encoding a family of distinct notions

• Aikhenvald (2012)’s survey article lists the following 5 different notions of mirativity:

  1. ‘new information’
  2. ‘sudden discovery, revelation, or realization’
  3. ‘surprise’
  4. ‘counterexpectation’
  5. ‘unprepared mind’

• What remains unclear is to what extent there is truly cross-linguistic variation in the semantics of mirativity rather than differences in analysis.

In this talk, we examine a mirative marker undiscussed in previous literature on mirativity: Yucatec Maya (YM) *bakáan*, as in (1).

(1) **Context:** We are inside the library. I suddenly look out the window and notice it is raining, which it hadn’t been before, and say:

```
Táan *bakáan* u k’áaxal ja
PROG MIR 3,NOM fall water
‘Oh, it’s raining.’
```
Core claims about bakáan:

Claim I: has a consistently mirative meaning, with no evidential or other non-mirative uses.

Claim II: conventionally encodes a sudden revelation or realization of the speaker, rather than surprise, counterexpectation, or new information.

Claim III: can occur ‘outside the speech act’ including in imperatives (and interrogatives) indicating that the speaker has had a sudden revelation about the illocutionary update the sentence encodes.

2 Background on Yucatec Maya bakáan

• bakáan is part of a small class of elements in YM which typically occur in second position\(^1\) within the intonational phrase, (2a).

• Positions further to the right, (2b) are generally judged acceptable, but are far less frequent.\(^2\)

\[(2)\]
\[
a. \text{K-u jant-ik bakáan puut le áak-o’} \\
\text{IMP-A3 eat-STATUS Mir papaya Def turtle-Distal} \\
‘Oh, the turtle is eating papaya!’
\]

\[
b. \text{K-u jant-ik puut le áak bakáan-o’} \\
\text{IMP-A3 eat-STATUS papaya Def turtle Mir-Distal} \\
‘Oh, the turtle is eating papaya!’
\]

• Similar to other such clitics such as the polar question clitic wáaj (e.g. AnderBois (2009), Verhoeven & Skopeteas (2015)), there is no apparent interpretive difference related to the position.

\(^1\)The sentence-initial topic position constitutes a separate intonational phrase from the rest of the clause, typically followed by a large pause (Avelino (2009), Verhoeven & Skopeteas (2015))

\(^2\)Consultants also sometimes accepted bakáan in topic position, as in (i), with no apparent interpretive difference. Such examples, however, were also sometimes rejected by consultants as well. Moreover, they are exceedingly rare in naturally occurring speech and were not offered by consultants in translation tasks and open-ended question-answer tasks.

\[(i)\]
\[
\text{Bakáan-e’ jats’uts a naj-il} \\
\text{Mir-Top good A2 house-REL} \\
‘Oh, your house is nice!’
\]
3 Bakáan is uniformly mirative

- *bakáan* has been scarcely discussed in previous literature, having been glossed simply as Particle or Counterexpectative or with lexical labels like *gee, well, etc.*

- The most detailed claim regarding the meaning of *bakáan* comes from Hanks (1984), whose main subject is two superficially similar constructions involving the morpheme *je’*(el) plus a clause-final clitic.

- *bakáan* is grammatical in both constructions and Hanks make the following claim about its meaning in the two constructions based on (3):

  “Depending on [linguistic] context, *bakáan* may index either: (i) the speaker feels there is reason to believe X, but is unwilling to vouch for it himself; or (ii) X is verifiably true, but the speaker had not expected it and so is mildly surprised.” – Hanks (1984)

(3) a. **Modal je’ is part of the verbal core, occurs with Topic -e’**

\[
\text{Je’ bakáan u taal-e’}
\]

\[
\text{ASSUR MIR A3 come-Top}
\]

‘He’ll apparently come, so it seems.’ – Hanks (1984)

b. **Presentative je’ plus Distal -o’**

\[
\text{Je’ bakáan k-u taal-o’}
\]

\[
\text{PRES MIR IMP-A3 come-DISTAL}
\]

‘Here he comes (I didn’t think he’d make it).’ – Hanks (1984)

- Despite the cross-linguistic connection between indirectness and mirativity, there is a clear alternative explanation:

  – The combination of *je’*(el) with -e’ has modal semantics and this modality is the source of the indirectness in (3a).

  – Bohnemeyer (2002) claims that *je’*el . . . -e’ contributes deontic and/or epistemic modality and locates the described eventuality after the topic time, as in (4):

(4) \[
\text{Je’ u yan-tal k naj-il uts-e’}
\]

\[
\text{ASSUR A3 exist-become A1pl house-REL good-Top}
\]

‘We will have a decent house!’ – Bohnemeyer, (2002, p.313)

4 Bakáan encodes ‘revelation’, not surprise

- As in the case of other miratives cross-linguistically, *bakáan* typically conveys that the speaker has suddenly found out new, surprising, or unexpected information:

(5) **Context:** We are inside the library. I suddenly look out the window and notice it is raining, which it hadn’t been before, and say:

\[
\text{Táan bakáan u k’áaxal ja’}
\]

\[
\text{PROG MIR 3.NOM fall water}
\]

‘Oh, it’s raining.’
Context: The speaker, Ricky, sees a light on in his son Jacob’s room at night and assumes that he is just playing a video game. He walks in and says the following:

¡Taan bakáan u xok-ik le biblia-o’!

PROG MIR A3 read STATUS DEF bible-DISTAL

‘Oh, he’s reading the bible.’

Web example

Context: The speaker is approaching shadowy figures in the distance and as they approach realizes that the figures are her parents:

...leti’ bakáan in yuum-o’ob k-u náats’-al-o’ob-e’

they MIR A1 parent-PL IMP-A3 close STATUS-PL-TOP

‘Oh, it’s my parents that are approaching.’

Literary Example

While typical, such examples leave open the question of what part of this description is semantic (i.e. conventionally encoded) vs. arising pragmatically in context.

4.1 Relations between conceptions of mirativity

As noted in the introduction, previous literature has given several distinct but related characterizations of mirative semantics (e.g. Aikhenvald (2012)):

1. ‘new information’
2. ‘sudden discovery, revelation, or realization’
3. ‘surprise’
4. ‘counterexpectation’
5. ‘unprepared mind’

While these many or all of these conceptions are distinct in principle, some of these notions are intrinsically related to one another.

– For example, Peterson (t.a.) suggests that sudden revelation, 2, is a necessary component of surprise, 3.
– Relatedly, Rett & Murray (2013) suggest that new information, 1, is a necessary component of surprise, 3.
– Similarly, psychologists (e.g. Huron (2006)) have characterized surprise, 3, as a biological/primary emotional response to expectation violation, 4.

Although these different conceptions are related and many examples, (5-7), are consistent with all of them, they nonetheless can be distinguished.

– In particular, what is needed, we claim, are felicity/acceptability judgments of sentence-context pairs consistent with a proper subset of the above definitions.

---

3 https://www.jw.org/yua/j%C3%B3o%CA%BCanilo%CA%BCob/revista%CA%BCob/w20150115/yeetel-kiimak-ooolal-binoob-santaj-nueva-york/

4 U yóok’otilo’ob áak’ab, p. 60-61
4.2 Bakáan as a marker of revelation

- Two kinds of differentiating contexts:

I. Speaker’s prior expectation is suddenly met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Felicitous in ‘expectation met’ scenario?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 New Information</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Revelation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Surprise</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Counterexpectation</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- As seen in (8-10), bakáan is felicitous in scenarios of this sort and therefore is not of Type 3 or 4:

(8) **Context:** I am supposed to meet my friend Juan, who is very punctual, at the library at 3pm. It is almost exactly 3pm and I suddenly see him walking up to the meeting spot and I say:
Juan-e’ j-k’uch-∅ bakáan.
Juan-TOPIC PfV-arrive-3SG.ABS MIR
‘Oh, Juan’s here (lit. Juan arrived).’

(9) **Context:** I have a stomachache and say:
K’an-a’an bakáan in janal, wáa ma’e’ yan in k’oja’an-tal
NEC MIR A1 eat if NEG-TOP OBLIG A1 sick-BECOME
‘Oh, I need to eat. If I don’t, I’ll get sick.’

(10) **Context:** I had no prior belief that you were anything but smart when you make a really insightful comment. I say:
(Jach) yaan bakáan a na’at.
very exists MIR A2 understanding
‘Oh, you’re (really) smart!’

II. Speaker forgets and suddenly remembers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Felicitous in ‘just remembered’ scenario?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 New Information</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Revelation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- As seen in (11-13), YM bakáan is felicitous in such scenarios.

- We therefore conclude that bakáan is Type 2, encoding sudden revelation or realization on the part of the speaker.

---

5I set aside 5, ‘unprepared mind’, as it is not clear to me from previous literature exactly what this notion refers to and in particular how to distinguish it from the other four analyses.
(11) **Context:** I hunted yesterday, but forgot for a second. I suddenly remember and say:

\[
\text{T-in ts'oon-aj bakáan jun túul kej.}
\]

\[
Pfv-1.sg.erg hunt-Cmp Mir one Cl.Anim deer
\]

‘Oh yeah, I hunted a deer yesterday.’

(12) **Context:** I heard a week ago that our mutual acquaintance Juan got married. I realize during our conversation I didn’t yet tell you the news and say:

\[
\text{Juan-e’ ts’o’ok-∅ bakáan u beel.}
\]

\[
Juan-Top finish-B3 Mir A3 path
\]

‘Oh yeah I forgot to tell you, Juan got married (lit. Juan’s path finished).’

(13) **Context:** I was describing what I did earlier and then add on the following:

\[
\text{T-in k’aay-aj bakáan jun p’el k’aay.}
\]

\[
Pfv-A1 sing-Status Mir one Cl song
\]

‘Oh yeah, I sang a song’

- Factors that make forgetting seem more likely enhance felicity (e.g. time passing, speaker being drunk, old)

---

**Use of bakáan in religious revelation:**

- In addition to occurring in cases of everyday revelation, *bakáan* is extremely frequent in a certain genre of revelatory religious use.

- For example, Monforte et al. (2010), includes a story where a *j-meen* (a traditional priest) recounts a religious recitation which includes numerous instances of *bakáan*:

> “Tu k’aakbiiiil Chan Sabacche’ te ba’al bin a wu’uyik tu káakabil bakáan chan Sabacche’ [...] bey u kiiko’obo’ bakáan jump’él sujuy primicia bakáan tu no’oj a k’ab bakáan Dios yuumbil.”

> “In the dirt of Chan Sabacche’ to the thing that goes for you to feel in the dirt of, oh, Chan Sabacche’ … like the sisters, oh, of a virgin’s first appearance, oh, to the right hand, oh, of lord God.”

---

5 **Bakáan ‘outside the speech act’**

- Thus far, we have considered examples of *bakáan* in declarative sentences and argued that it encodes a sudden realization or revelation on the part of the speaker.

- We turn now to the use of *bakáan* in other sentence types and more generally to argue that it is an illocutionary operator.
We focus here on imperatives, but the data and analysis are parallel for interrogatives (See Appendix A).

5.1 Evidentials ‘outside’ the speech act

- For some evidentials, one prominent analysis holds that they are illocutionary operators modifying the speech act updates contributed by sentences (e.g. Faller (2002), Murray (2014), Thomas (2014))
- Key evidence: interactions between evidentials and non-declarative sentences.
- In particular, ability of reportative evidentials to occur ‘outside’ of non-declarative sentences as in (14):

(14) Context: I am sitting with my younger brother at the dining room table. Our mother is in a different room and she has told me to have my brother eat his bread.

Kainin mo daw ang tinapay mo eat.PAT.TRIG you.INDIR REP DIR bread your ‘Eat your bread (Mom orders).’

REP w/ imperative (Tagalog)

- In these cases, the reportative contributes not to the propositional content, but instead modifies the illocutionary update the sentence encodes.

5.2 Bakáan in imperatives

- For miratives, the question of whether analogous cases exist is to my knowledge unexplored.\(^7\)
- However, YM bakáan occurs in imperatives in an ‘outside the speech act’ use:

(15) Context: A mother is in the kitchen cooking and remembers that there are no beans in the house because she forgot to tell her son to go buy some and says:

Xeen bakáan a maan bu’ul te’ tiiyenda-o’.
go.IMP MIR 2.ERG buy.SUBJ beans there store-DISTAL ‘Oh (I meant to tell you), go buy some beans.’

(16) Context: The addressee has been causing trouble in a store. The store owner says:

Ma’ bakáan a ka’a-suut
NEG MIR A2 REPET-return ‘Oh yeah, I meant to tell you, don’t come back again!’

(17) Context: My friend is about to tell a secret of mine which I told him. I had meant to tell him not to say anything to anyone, but forgot and now that the conversation is on a related topic, I say to him:

---

\(^7\)One partial exception is Rett & Murray (2013), who note that the narrative evidential in Cheyenne has mirative uses in declaratives, but not in interrogatives. However, they also report that the narrative evidential (as well as the reportative in Cheyenne) does not have ‘outside the speech act’ uses of the sort discussed here with interrogatives in the first place. The (arguably) illocutionary uses ‘evidential flip’ uses are possible with both but only on reportative uses, not mirative ones.
Mik bakáan a wa’al ti’ mix-máak
ADMON MIR A2 say.SUBJ PREP no-person
‘Oh yeah, don’t tell anyone!’

- One thing to note across the above examples is that they all appear to be remembering scenarios, a fact we return to below.

5.3 Bakáan outside the update in declaratives

- For declaratives as well, we find uses where the speaker’s revelation concerns the speech act rather than the fact of the matter:

(18) Jo’oljeak-e’ k’uch bakáan Maruch cafeteria.
yesterday-Top arrive.Pfv MIR María cafeteria
‘Oh (yeah), yesterday, María went to the cafeteria.’
  a. Context A: I forgot that my friend Maruch had gone to the cafeteria.
  b. Context B: I forgot that I had wanted to tell you that Maruch had gone to the cafeteria, but had not forgotten that she had.

(19) Context: We are talking about birds and I suddenly remember that I have a question about birds which I wanted to ask:
Yaan ten jun p’êl k’aatchi’ bakáan.
exists me.DAT one Cl. question MIR
‘Oh yeah, I have a question.’

(20) Context: The last line in a story about a teacher’s dream about showing up to class and there not being any students there. The last line reveals that the story was all a dream:
Chéen bakáan t-u náay.
just MIR PREP-A3 dream
‘Oh, it was just a dream.’

- Summarizing, we find that bakáan is felicitous in all major sentence types with only ‘illocutionary’ uses in interrogatives and imperatives

6 Bakáan as an update modifier

- Looking across all of the data seen thus far, we can summarize as follows:
  - For all sentence types: uses where bakáan conveys the speaker’s sudden revelation that they should perform a speech act using the sentence in question.
  - For declaratives only: uses that are about the evidence supporting the claim, i.e. the fact of the matter.

8http://en.calameo.com/read/00080548746ceec699246c
9The only systematic exception I am aware of is the interaction of bakáan with the conjectural miín. Despite the fact that miín has a distinct syntactic distribution (AnderBois (2013)), the two, to my knowledge, cannot co-occur in the same sentence.
This section: argue that recent work on the nature of declarative updates unifies these two and gives a lens into the structure of non-declarative updates in general.

6.1 Two sides of assertion

- Literature on the speech act of assertion has considered various accounts (see MacFarlane (2011) for a very helpful survey).
- Among linguists, Stalnaker (1978)’s idea has been the most influential: that assertions are proposals to update the Common Ground (CG) of the conversational participants.
  - Recent literature: declarative updates conventionally encode such a proposal (e.g. Farkas & Bruce (2010), Murray (2014), Malamud & Stephenson (2015))
  - Farkas & Bruce (2010) and AnderBois et al. (2015) have tied this proposal nature to the QUD/Table.
- Many authors have also argued that declarative updates conventionally encode an update of the speaker’s public commitments, DC
  - Northrup (2014) and AnderBois (2014) have tied this to the strength/kind of evidence underlying this commitment.

- Taking these two parts together, we arrive at the following conventional effects for a declarative update:

\[(21) \text{Effects of a declarative update } U \text{ with propositional content } p: \]

\[a. \text{ Proposal to add } p \text{ to the } \text{CG}_{\{\text{Spkr, Addr}\}} \text{ (i.e. putting } p \text{ on the Table)} \]

\[b. \text{ Adding } p \text{ to } \text{DC}_{\text{Spkr}} \]

- Returning to YM bakáan, then, we see that the two uses we have seen for YM bakáan in declaratives are to convey the speaker’s revelation about one of these two components:
  - In ‘illocutionary’ cases like (22a), the speaker’s revelation is about (26a).
  - In ‘fact of the matter’ cases like (22b), the speaker’s revelation is about (26b).

\[(22) \text{a. Context: I forgot that I had wanted to tell you that Maruch had gone to the cafeteria, but had not forgotten that she had.} \]
\[\text{Jo’oljeak-e’ k’uch bakáan Maruch cafeteria.} \]
\[\text{yesterday-TOP arrive.PFV Mir María cafeteria} \]
\[\text{‘Oh (yeah), yesterday, María went to the cafeteria.’} \]
\[\text{‘Illocutionary’} \]

\[b. \text{ Context: We are inside the library. I suddenly look out the window and notice it is raining, which it hadn’t been before, and say:} \]
\[\text{Táan bakáan u k’áaxal ja’} \]
\[\text{PROG Mir 3.Nom fall water} \]
\[\text{‘Oh, it’s raining.’} \]
\[\text{‘Fact of the matter’} \]
Summary: In addition to performing a speech act using the update $U$ associated with the rest of the sentence, a speaker who utters *bakáan*($U$) conveys a sudden revelation regarding this update.

6.2 The structure of non-declarative updates

- Having argued based on declaratives that *bakáan* encodes a speaker’s revelation about the update the sentence encodes, we can use this to examine the updates encoded by other sentence types.

- For imperatives, a number of recent works have argued that they encode an update involving effective preferences (EP) (e.g. Kaufmann (2012), Condoravdi & Lauer (2012), Starr (2013))

- As in assertions, this preference update can be plausibly thought of as a proposal to update shared preferences (e.g. von Fintel & Iatridou (t.a.), AnderBois (2015)).

Analogous to $DC_x$ in declaratives, there are also proposals such as Davis (2009), Condoravdi & Lauer (2012) which hold that imperatives conventionally encode the speaker’s preference.

- As seen in (23b), however, imperatives with *bakáan* are infelicitous in contexts where the speaker’s revelation is about their individual preference.

  - cf. (23a), repeated from (15)

(23) Xeen *bakáan* a maan bu’ul (te’ tiiyenda-o’).
go.IMP Mir 2.Erg buy.SUBJ beans there store-DISTAL
‘Oh, go buy some beans.’

- ✓ *Context:* A mother is in the kitchen cooking and remembers that there are no beans in the house because she forgot to tell her son to go buy some and says

- ✗ *Context:* A mother is in the kitchen cooking and realizes that there is no beans in the house and therefore suddenly wants the son to go buy beans.

Functionally similar examples with *bakáan* in a declarative are fully acceptable:

(24) *Context:* (same as (23b))
Mina’an *bakáan* bu’ul. Xeen a maan te’ tiiyenda-o’.
NEG.EXIST Mir beans go.IMP 2.Erg buy.SUBJ there store-DISTAL
‘Oh there’s no beans. Go buy some at the store!’

(25) *Context:* (same as (23b))
In k’aat *bakáan* káa a maan bu’ul
A1 want Mir for A2 buy.SUBJ beans
‘Oh (I just realized) I want you to go buy beans.’

10 These ideas are at least partially implicit, I believe, in Kaufmann (2012), where imperatives are analyzed as contributing modal semantics at the propositional level and in Starr (2013), where imperatives update a single discourse object reflecting information, issues, and preferences.
• I therefore argue that imperative updates conventionally encode only an update of a shared discourse component:

(26) Effects of a imperative update \( U \) with propositional content \( p \):
   a. Proposal to add \( p \) to \( \text{EP}_{\text{Spkr}, \text{Addr}} \)
   b. Adding \( p \) to \( \text{EP}_{\text{Spkr}} \)

• The pair in (27) provides another example:

(27) a. **Context:** I told my friend a secret and told him not to say anything to anyone. Now that the conversation is on a related topic, he sounds like he’s starting to tell my secret:
   #Mak bakáan a chi’
   shut Mir A2 mouth
   ‘Shut your mouth.’

b. **Context:** My friend is about to tell a secret of mine which I told him. I had meant to tell him not to say anything to anyone, but forgot and now that the conversation is on a related topic, I say to him:
   Mik bakáan a wa’al ti’ mix-máak
   ADMON Mir A2 say SUBJ PREP no-person
   ‘Oh yeah, don’t tell anyone!’

• Summarizing, we see that across sentence types, bakáan encodes the speaker’s revelation about the update the rest of the sentence encodes.

• There is therefore a sense in which bakáan is an illocutionary modifier.

• However, as Murray (2010), Murray (2014) has stressed for ‘illocutionary’ analyses of evidentials, what is modified is the conventionally encoded ‘illocutionary update’, rather than the speech act itself.

7 Conclusions

• In this talk, I have argued for three core claims about YM mirative particle bakáan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Core claims about bakáan:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Claim I:** has a consistently mirative meaning, with no evidential or other non-mirative uses.

**Claim II:** conventionally encodes a sudden revelation or realization of the speaker, rather than surprise or counterexpectation.

**Claim III:** can occur ‘outside the speech act’ including outside of declaratives, indicating that the speaker has had a sudden revelation about the illocutionary update the sentence encodes.
• Beyond the analysis of bakáan itself, this talk contributes to our understanding of the typology of miratives in two ways:

1. Used context-relative felicity judgments to distinguish between existing conceptions of mirativity.
2. Showed that mirative markers may have illocutionary uses, including in imperative (and interrogative) sentences.

• Looking beyond miratives, I have argued that the interactions with bakáan sheds light on the structure of sentence updates.

• In particular, this evidence suggests that declarative sentences encode a two-part update targeting individual discourse commitments and a proposal to update a shared discourse component.

• In contrast, its more limited usage pattern in imperatives and interrogatives suggests only an update of the latter kind.
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Abbreviations used for glosses for Yucatec Maya examples
CL: numeral classifier, DEF: definite article, IMP: imperfective aspect, IMPER: imperative, INCEP: inceptive aspect, NEG: negation, NEG.CL: negative/extrafocal clitic, PFV: perfective aspect, PASS: passive, PL: plural, PREP: preposition, PROG: progressive aspect, REL: relational noun suffix, SS: ‘status’ suffixes, SUBJ: subjunctive mood, TERM: terminative aspect, TOP: topic marker, For agreement morphology, I follow the terminological tradition among Mayanists, referring to Set A (∝ Ergative/Nominative) and Set B (∝ Absolutive/Accusative) markers, e.g. A3 = 3rd person Ergative/Nominative. B3 is phonologically null and therefore left unglossed. All examples are from my elicitations unless otherwise noted.

Orthography
The orthography used is that codified in Briceño Cheł & Can Tec (2014), with the exception that we make use of the question mark. It differs from the IPA in the following possibly non-obvious ways: orthographic j is used for IPA [h], x for [ʃ], a’a for creaky voice [a], b for the implosive [b], y for [j], and r for [r]
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Appendix A: *bakáan* in interrogatives

- As in imperatives, *bakáan* is felicitous in interrogatives with similar ‘outside the speech act’ uses:

(28) **Context:** You told me something earlier about work, but I got distracted and forgot.

\[\text{Ba’ax t-a wa’alaj bakáan?} \]
\[\text{what PFV-A2 say Mir} \]
\[\text{‘Oh (wait), what did you say?’} \]

(29) **Context:** My dog was right beside me a moment ago while we were talking, but then left. We keep talking and I notice that he is no longer where he was and ask:

\[\text{Tu’ux yaan bakáan in peek’?} \]
\[\text{where exists Mir 1sg.Gen dog} \]
\[\text{‘Oh (yeah), where’s my dog?’} \]

- Interrogatives similarly suggest that the revelation that *bakáan* encodes is limited to the update the interrogative mood encodes.

- As speech acts, questions and requests both typically convey that speaker’s desire for the addressee to respond in a particular way.

- However, interrogatives with *bakáan* are infelicitous in contexts where the only revelation concerns this desire:

(30) Je’ bakáan a majantik ten taak’in-e’
\[\text{ASSUR Mir A2 lend me.DAT money-TOP} \]
\[\text{‘Can you loan me money?’} \]
\[\text{a. X Context A: I just realized that I don’t have any money and therefore want you to loan me some money and ask now.} \]
\[\text{b. ✓ Context B: I had asked you for money previously but we got interrupted and so you didn’t give me any. So I ask again now.} \]
\[\text{c. ✓ Context C: I had wanted to ask you for money earlier, but didn’t. Having remembered that I wanted to ask you, I ask you now.} \]

(31) **Context:** My friend hates to dance, but asks me if I am going and I respond:

\[\text{a. Yaan a bin óok’ot?} \]
\[\text{OBLIG A2 go dance} \]
\[\text{‘Are you going to go dance?’} \]
\[\text{b. Yaan, kux teech (#bakáan)} \]
\[\text{OBLIG CONTR you Mir} \]
\[\text{Intended ‘I am, oh, are you?’} \]
\[\text{(b’) Yaan, kux leti’ bakáan} \]
\[\text{OBLIG CONTR you Mir} \]
\[\text{‘I am. Oh yeah, is he (our other friend we had been discussing) going?’} \]
Appendix B: Miratives encoding revelation in other languages

**English oh**
- As the translations throughout have suggested, sentence-initial English *oh* has a similar range of uses to YM *bakáan*.
- We leave detailed investigation to future work, but note two differences.
- First, *oh* is often accompanied by other elements like *yeah*, *by the way*, and *wait* in some of the functions we have seen for *bakáan*.
- Second, *oh* is at least typically infelicitous in imperatives, as in (32):

  (32) **Context:** A mother is in the kitchen cooking and remembers that there are no beans in the house because she forgot to tell her son to go buy some and says:
  
  #?Oh, buy beans!

**Tagalog pala**
- Schachter & Otanes (1972) describe a second position mirative clitic in Tagalog: *pala*.
- Preliminary results show the same patterns of judgments as YM *bakáan*:

  (33) **Context:** I look outside my window and suddenly see that it’s raining outside.
  
  Umuulan na [pala] sa labas.
  
  ‘Oh, it’s raining outside.’

  (34) **Expectation-met context:** I am supposed to meet my friend Juan at the library at 3pm. It is almost exactly 3pm and I suddenly see him walking up to the meeting spot and I say:
  
  (Ah) ayun na [pala] si Juan
  
  PRT there now MIR DIR Juan
  
  ‘Oh, Juan’s here now!’

  (35) Sino [pala] ang nagsasalita ng Cebuano?
  
  who MIR DIR speak.IMPF INDIR Cebuano
  
  ‘Oh by the way, who speaks Cebuano?’
  
  a. ✓ **Context:** I had been wanting to ask you who speaks Cebuano.
  
  b. ✗ **Context:** I hear Cebuano being spoken and suddenly am curious who is speaking it.

  (36) Bumili ka [pala] ng monggo.
  
  buy.IMPF you MIR INDIR mung.beans
  
  ‘Oh, by the way, you should buy some mung beans.’
  
  a. ✓ **Context:** A mother is in the kitchen cooking and remembers that there are no beans in the house because she forgot to tell her son to go buy some.
  
  b. ✗ **Context:** A mother is in the kitchen cooking and realizes that there is no beans in the house and therefore suddenly wants the son to go buy beans.