

# Mood in Wá·šiw narratives: A first look\*

M. RYAN BOCHNAK

*University of British Columbia*

## 1 Introduction

This paper presents a first look at the use of mood morphemes in narratives in Wá·šiw (also known as Washo, Washoe; isolate; California and Nevada, USA). I examine the use of mood morphemes in four versions of the story *Coyote and Lizard* as told by four different Wá·šiw speakers across time, with special attention given to the independent mood *-i* and dependent mood *-aʔ*. I compare the distribution of these mood markers found in the texts with the predictions of the analysis of mood markers by Bochnak and Hanink (2022) and Bochnak (2023). Of particular interest is the distribution of the dependent mood marker *-aʔ*, which is referred to by Jacobsen (1964) as a “narrative tense”, a label suggestive of its relative prominence in narratives and texts. And indeed, this study confirms that the distribution of *-aʔ* in narratives is wider than predicted under recent theoretical accounts. Some avenues for possible ways of analyzing the narrative use of the dependent mood are explored, and I suggest that a comparison with the reportative subjunctive in German may be apt.

## 2 The mood system in Wá·šiw and predictions of previous analyses

In Wá·šiw, there is a set of inflectional morphemes that appear towards the end of the verbal complex and form a finite clause. These are called “final suffixes” by Jacobsen (1964), since only nominalizing or adverbializing morphology and switch reference can appear to their right. These morphemes are re-cast as moods by Bochnak (2016), and this label con-

---

\* Congratulations on your birthday Hotze! *gahamuʔaŋawšému!* Thank you for being a wonderful colleague and mentor. The topic for this paper was inspired by Hotze’s interest in the grammar of narratives, and by Reisinger, Matthewson, and Rullmann’s (2022) corpus study of modals to test the predictions made by Rullmann and Matthewson (2018). Funding from a Hampton Research Grant and a Mellon Foundation Fellowship is gratefully acknowledged.

tinues to be used in subsequent work.<sup>1</sup> The set of mood morphemes is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Moods in Wá·šiw

<i>-i</i> independent	<i>-hi</i> optative	<i>-le</i> redundant
<i>-aʔ</i> dependent	<i>-hulew</i> hortative	$-\emptyset$ imperative

At issue in this paper is the distribution of the independent mood marker *-i* and the dependent mood marker *-aʔ*. In contrast to the other moods, which are used for expressing certain semantic notions related to the modal and/or informational status of a clause (Bochnak 2023), the distribution of the independent and dependent moods is largely predictable based on the syntactic environments in which they appear. According to Bochnak and Hanink (2022), the dependent mood *-aʔ* is used in various types of adjunct clauses, such as temporal adjunct clauses with a temporal overlap interpretation, concessive clauses which convey some sort of contrast with the matrix clause, and complement clauses in non-factive attitude reports. Meanwhile, the independent mood *-i* is the default mood for matrix clauses, and is required in certain subordinate clauses, such as relative clauses and complement clauses in factive attitude reports. This distribution is summarized in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Distribution of *-i* and *-aʔ* (adapted from Bochnak 2023)

	<i>-i</i>	<i>-aʔ</i>
matrix clauses	✓	*
relative clauses	✓	*
factive complements	✓	*
non-factive complements	*	✓
temporal adjunct clauses	*	✓
concessive clauses	*	✓

In Bochnak and Hanink's analysis, they treat the independent mood as the elsewhere case, inserted whenever another mood marker, including the dependent mood, cannot be. In particular, the default mood for matrix clauses is the independent, whereas the dependent is restricted to

<sup>1</sup> See Bochnak (2023) for explicit argumentation that these should be treated as moods in the sense of Portner (2018).

subordinate clauses. Problematic for this analysis is the qualitative observation that the dependent mood appears to have a wider distribution in narratives, where it appears, at least on the basis of translations, to be used in matrix clauses.<sup>2</sup> As Jacobsen writes: “it [the dependent mood — MRB] is often used as a narrative tense, the tense in which tales are told” (1964: 663). Jacobsen’s comments suggest that the dependent mood may even be the default for narratives.

In this paper, I take the first steps towards investigating the use of the independent and dependent moods in Wá·šiw narratives. Specifically, I quantify the use of these moods in four versions of the *Coyote and Lizard* story. My goal is to uncover to what extent the distribution of these moods conforms to Table 2, and to what extent the distribution of the dependent mood *-a?* occurs outside of those environments, specifically in (apparent) matrix clauses.

### 3 The texts and methodology

For this study, I examined four versions of *Coyote and Lizard*, which is a folklore tale that explains why human hands are shaped the way they are. Coyote and Lizard argue with each other over what type of hands humans should have. After some shenanigans, Lizard is ultimately the winner, and humans have hands that look similar to Lizard’s with extended fingers rather than Coyote’s paws.

In Table 3, I give the following information for each text: the speaker who told the story orally, the date it was recorded, the person who collected the story, and the total number of clauses in the narrative. I also include a reference code that is used in example sentences to refer to the version of the text it comes from. Example sentences from texts also contain the sentence number that they come from.

This particular set of texts was chosen for many reasons. First, they are versions of the same story, which mitigates possible effects of genre as an influence of mood choice. Second, there is a balance between male and female speakers. Third, there are two generations of speakers represented, with two texts being recorded in the 1950s, and two being recorded in the late 1990s to early 2000s. Fourth, these texts all already had morphological parses available, though the level of detail of those parses varied.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> As such, this use of the dependent mood, which is otherwise restricted to subordinate clause types, appears to be a case of insubordination (Evans 2007).

<sup>3</sup> Thanks to Emma Wilcox and Alan Yu who completed some of the parses with

**Table 3:** Versions of *Coyote and Lizard* used in this study

Code	Speaker	Date	Collected by	Total # of clauses
JW	John Wiger	29 Nov 1955	William Jacobsen	142
BH	Bertha Holbrook	18 July 1956	William Jacobsen	112
SA	Sylvia Andrews	ca. 1997	Laura Fillmore	50
SJ	Steven James	20 Aug 2004	Alan Yu	42

For each text, I counted the total number of matrix and subordinate clauses, the total number of clauses containing the independent *-i* and the dependent *-aʔ*, the number of matrix and subordinate clauses containing moods *-i* and *-aʔ*, and whether each use of *-i* or *-aʔ* is predicted by the distribution given in Table 2. Arriving at the final numbers was not an easy task or an exact science. Namely, the classification of matrix vs. subordinate clause is already an analytical choice. Since the research question of this paper asks to what extent the dependent mood *-aʔ* appears outside of its predicted distribution, I could not use the presence of *-aʔ* as indicating that a clause is necessarily subordinate. Instead, I considered a number of factors — both in the morphology of the clauses and their interpretation — to arrive at the count of matrix and subordinate clauses with each mood type. Those factors essentially align with the summary in Table 2 of the distribution of the independent and dependent moods.

For independent *-i*, its presence was predicted in the context of relative clause marking (*-gi* or *-ge*), sequential marking (*-ud*), or other overt markers of subordination (e.g., the adverbializer *-da*). These are cases where *-i* occurs in subordinate clauses,<sup>4</sup> and where the dependent *-aʔ* is not possible. Beyond that, the independent mood is predicted in matrix clauses. The sentence in (1) shows both an instance of *-i* in a subordinate clause and an instance of *-i* in a matrix clause. The first *-i* in the sentence appears in a clause that also contains relative clause marking (*-gi*). This form of subordination is used in (1) to mark the complement of the modal verb *-eʔ*. The independent mood *-i* is correctly predicted, since it is the only mood marker that can co-occur with *-gi* (Jacobsen 1964). The matrix clause also shows the default use of *-i* in matrix clauses, in this case

me.

<sup>4</sup> The term ‘independent’ simply refers to the fact that this mood is the default in matrix clauses, even though this mood can also appear in certain types of embedded clauses, as shown in Table 2.

marking the modal *-eʔ*.<sup>5</sup>

- (1) Context: Lizard says that humans will be like him and have five fingers. Coyote disagrees and says,

lé:duŋ	ʔéʔuʃgabigi	k'éʔi
le:-duŋ	ʔ-eʔ-uš-gab-i-gi	k'-eʔ-i
1-like	3-be-DUR-DIST.FUT-IND-SUBJ.REL	3-MOD-IND

'They will be like me.'

(BH: 8)

For dependent *-aʔ*, the situation is a bit trickier, since this mood is largely used by itself to mark that a clause is subordinate, rather than co-occurring with overt subordinating morphology. Thus, there are many clauses containing *-aʔ* where there is no other morphological marking that unambiguously identifies a clause as subordinate. An instance of *-aʔ* was counted as being predicted by Table 2 under the following conditions. First, if it occurred in a clause to the left of a clause whose main verb was a verb of thinking or saying, indicating that the *-aʔ*-marked clause is a non-factive complement. Such an example is given in (2), where the clause marked with *-aʔ* is the complement of *ʔi:demelʔgi* 'they said'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The orthography used is slightly modified from Jacobsen (1964), where most characters have their typical IPA value, with the following exceptions: M = [m̥], š = [ʃ], y = [j]. The colon : represents a long vowel. I use the following glosses: 1, 3 = 1st, 3rd person; CAUS = causative; DEP = dependent mood; DIST.FUT = distant future; DIST.PAST = distant past; DUR = durative; IND = independent mood; INS = instrumental; LOC = locative; MOD = modal; PAST = past tense; PRO = pronoun; Q = question; RED = reduplication; REDUND = redundant mood; REFL = reflexive; SEQ = sequential; SR = switch reference; SUBJ.REL = subject relative; THEME = anaphoric theme; TOP = topic change; TRAD = traditional.

<sup>6</sup> The use of the subject relative marker *-gi* at the end of the final clause in (2) also appears to be a case of insubordination, i.e., a morphologically subordinate form used as a main clause. The clause in which it appears does not seem to be subordinate to any clause within (2) or in the next sentence that follows in the text.

- (2) Context: First sentence of the text

wi:diʔ pítelihak'a géwe  
 wi:diʔ piteliʔ-hak'a gewe  
 this lizard-with coyote

guMitgá:k'ululiyaʔ  
 Ø-guM-itga:k'u-lul-li-aʔ  
 3-REFL-disagree-DIST.PAST-long.ago-DEP

ʔi:demelʔgi  
 ʔ-i:d-emelʔ-i-gi  
 3-say-TRAD-IND-SUBJ.REL

‘They said that this lizard and the coyote had a disagreement with each other.’ (JW: 1)

Second, to identify temporal adjunct or concessive uses of *-aʔ*-marked clauses, I looked for English translations that included “while”, “when”, “as”, or “but”, or a gerund verb form indicating temporal simultaneity with a superordinate clause. (3) represents such an example, where the first clause marked with *-aʔ* is interpreted as a temporal adjunct clause.<sup>7</sup> Meanwhile, the second clause was counted as a case of a matrix use of *-aʔ*, since it does not appear to be in an obvious subordinate relationship with any other clause in this sentence or in the following sentence in the text.

- (3) Context: Lizard and Coyote are arguing.

píteliʔ Múʔšamušgap'ilaš géwe  
 piteliʔ Ø-Mu-iʔiš-am-uš-gap'íl-aʔ-š gewe  
 lizard 3-run-forward-away-DUR-here.and.there-DEP-SR coyote

galóʔpamduwéweʔaʔ  
 ge-loʔop-am-duweweʔ-aʔ  
 3.OBJ-catch-away-try.RED-DEP

‘While Lizard ran away, Coyote chased after him.’ (SJ: 5)

I also counted an *-aʔ*-marked clause as a temporal adjunct clause if the action or state named in the clause was plausibly occurring simultaneously with the action or state named in a neighbouring clause, even if the translation did not contain one of those aforementioned lexical items.

<sup>7</sup> As explained below, the presence of switch reference *-š* in this clause also indicates that it is a subordinate clause.

This means that at least some cases were somewhat up to interpretation.<sup>8</sup> In (4), I counted the first clause marked with *-a?* as a temporal adjunct clause: Coyote being pleased with himself very plausibly occurs simultaneous to his thinking that he has burned Lizard (the latter being the likely reason that he is pleased with himself).

- (4) Context: Lizard runs under a rock to hide from Coyote. Coyote stuffs sagebrush under the rock and sets it on fire in order to burn Lizard.

ʔudi	géwe	gumgaʔlá:ma?	gik
ʔ-ud-i	gewe	∅-gum-gaʔla:m-a?	gik
THEME-SEQ-IND	coyote	3-REFL-like-DEP	3.PRO
dót'ikhaya?	hámuya?	ʔi:yewe?i	
∅-dot'ig-ha-a?	∅-hamu-a?	ʔ-i:ye?-uwe?-i	
3-burn-CAUS-DEP	3-think-DEP	3-go-hence-IND	

‘Then Coyote left, thinking that he had burnt [Lizard] and was pleased with himself.’ (JW: 17)

In fact, I argue that every mood marker in (4) is predicted by the generalizations in Table 2. In addition to the dependent mood marking on *gumgaʔlá:ma?* ‘he was pleased with himself’ as indicating a temporal adjunct clause, I argue that the *-a?* marking on the *hámuya?* ‘he thought’ is also a temporal adjunct use of the dependent mood: Coyote being pleased with himself and his thinking occur simultaneously with the action of the matrix clause, his going away. The verb form *dót'ikhaya?* containing *-a?* ‘he burnt him’ is a complement clause of the verb *hámuya?* ‘he thought’ (i.e., ‘he thought that he had burnt him’). Finally, the independent mood *-i* on the final clause is the default for matrix clauses.

An *-a?*-marked clause containing overt switch reference morphology also counted as a subordinate clause, since switch reference marking in Wá·šiw is a property of subordinate clauses only (Arregi and Hanink 2022). Switch reference marks disjoint reference of the subjects in the matrix and subordinate clauses. (5) is such an example.<sup>9</sup> The first clause is marked with switch reference since the third person subject of the first clause (Coyote) is disjoint with the third person subject of the second clause (Lizard). In this particular example, it is plausible that the first

<sup>8</sup> Since I tagged the clauses myself, future studies would ideally have at least one more annotator so that inter-annotator agreement could be checked.

<sup>9</sup> Switch reference marking can also occur on subordinate clauses marked with independent *-i*.

clause is interpreted as a temporal adjunct clause (i.e., “When Coyote walked away from there, Lizard came out from there.”). In any case, the switch reference marking on the first clause unambiguously signals that this is a subordinate clause. I also counted the second clause in this sentence as a temporal adjunct clause, because the event it described plausibly occurs simultaneously with the event of the following clause, namely that Lizard taunts Coyote.

- (5) Context: Lizard crawls under a rock, and Coyote tries to burn him. After a while, Coyote gives up and walks away.

yá: p'íʔšuweʔuŋilaš	píteliʔ dášiʔ
ya: Ø-p'-iʔiš-uweʔ-uŋil-aʔ-š	piteliʔ da:-šiʔ
then 3-crawl-forward-hence-PAST-DEP-SR	lizard there-from
pímiʔaʔ	
Ø-p'-imiʔ-aʔ	
3-crawl-out.from-DEP	

‘He [Coyote] walked away from there. Lizard came out from there [under the rock].’ (BH: 26–27)

I counted any other *-aʔ*-marked clause found in a text as a matrix use of *-aʔ* and thus not predicted by previous analyses. In (6), this clause appears to simply describe the event of Coyote jabbing in the sagebrush with a stick in isolation; it is not clear that it is connected temporally or contrastively with any of the clauses surrounding it. In fact, the following clause in the text starts with *ʔudi* ‘and then’, indicating that the event in the following clause takes place after the event in this clause.

- (6) Context: Coyote is using sagebrush to build a fire under the rock where Lizard is hiding.

máʔaklu dá:bala	t'ót'omuwaʔaʔ
maʔag-lu da:bal-a	Ø-t'ot'om-uweʔ-aʔ
stick-INS	sagebrush-LOC 3-jab-hence-DEP

‘He [Coyote] jabbed around in the sagebrush with a stick.’

(JW: 20)

Another example is in (7). Both clauses in this sentence contain an instance of *-aʔ*, but it is not clear that either of them uses *-aʔ* in a way that is predicted by Table 2. The first clause might plausibly be considered a temporal adjunct clause (e.g., ‘As the Coyote got kind of tired, he ran



away’), but it is not obvious that the second clause is connected temporally or contrastively with the following clause, which also starts with *ʔudi* ‘and then’. I counted both of these cases as matrix uses of *-aʔ*.<sup>10</sup>

- (7) Context: Coyote is chasing Lizard, but is not able to catch him.

ʔudi                    géwe    gumyóʔlahé:šaʔ  
 ʔ-ud-i                gewe    Ø-gum-yoʔla-he:š-aʔ  
 THEME-SEQ-IND coyote 3-REFL-tired-Q-DEP

Múʔšuwáʔaʔ  
 Ø-Mu-iʔiš-uweʔ-aʔ  
 3-run-forward-hence-DEP

‘And then Coyote got kind of tired and ran away.’ (SJ: 15)

In sum, although there are some cases of dependent-marked clauses that are somewhat open to interpretation, there do appear to be uses of *-aʔ* in these texts that do not fit with the predictions of Table 2, and specifically where a dependent-marked clause seems to be used as a matrix clause.

#### 4 Results

In the table below, I present for each text the number of matrix clauses with independent *-i* and dependent *-aʔ*, as a percentage of total main clauses. These numbers are instructive because matrix clauses are the only environment where a speaker in principle has a choice between using *-i* or *-aʔ*. As shown in Table 4, *-aʔ* is used more frequently than *-i* in main clauses in all the texts, i.e., across all speakers.<sup>11</sup>

**Table 4:** Percentage of matrix clauses using *-i* and *-aʔ*

Text	Matrix clauses with <i>-i</i>	Matrix clauses with <i>-aʔ</i>
JW	9/29 = <b>31.0%</b>	15/29 = <b>51.7%</b>
BH	14/47 = <b>29.8%</b>	30/47 = <b>63.8%</b>
SA	2/22 = <b>9.1%</b>	15/22 = <b>68.2%</b>
SJ	1/12 = <b>8.3%</b>	7/12 = <b>58.3%</b>

<sup>10</sup> The question morpheme *hé:š* seems to be used here as a hedge (‘kind of’), as the clause it appears in is not interpreted as a question.

<sup>11</sup> The percentages do not add up to 100% because some clauses contain a mood other than *-i* or *-aʔ*.

Since Bochnak and Hanink (2022) predict the percentage of matrix clauses with  $-a?$  to be zero, non-zero values in the third column of Table 4 are problematic for their analysis. As it turns out, dependent-marked clauses are used in matrix clauses more than half the time by all speakers. This finding corroborates Jacobsen’s (1964) comments that  $-a?$  in texts is used as a “narrative tense” of sorts.

## 5 Discussion

At this time, I see two possible ways to think about this data (there could also be others). First, we could still try to push the analysis of Bochnak and Hanink (2022) onto these apparently matrix uses of the dependent mood. Under such a view, the dependent-marked clauses that don’t seem to fit into the uses described in Table 2 would still be considered adjunct clauses, and are used in narratives as a general clause chaining strategy. An account along these lines is already suggested by Bochnak and Hanink (2022), and is compatible with their semantic analysis of  $-a?$ , whose only semantic content is conjunction as shown in (8). In (8), the dependent mood can conjoin properties of the same type ( $\alpha$  stands in for elements of type  $e$ ,  $i$  or  $s$ ; which one is chosen depends on the syntactic height of the adjunction site of the dependent-marked clause). But crucially, dependent  $-a?$  does not directly lexicalize the temporal or contrastive readings, so this semantics is in principle compatible with the use of  $-a?$  as a general clause chaining mechanism without any other semantic import.

$$(8) \quad \llbracket -a? \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle \alpha, t \rangle} \lambda Q_{\langle \alpha, t \rangle} \lambda x_{\alpha} [P(x) \ \& \ Q(x)]$$

A second possible avenue would be to take the suggestion by Jacobsen (1964) more seriously that there is something special about narratives, which is signalled by the widespread use of the dependent mood. On this kind of view, this special use of the dependent mood could be thought of as part of a wider phenomenon that TAM categories across languages can often have what appear to be “non-canonical” uses in narrative discourse. Some familiar examples include the narrative present in English and the reportative subjunctive in German.

In the so-called “narrative present” in English, the discourse is not anchored to the speech time but rather to the time that the narrative takes place (e.g., Anand and Toosarvandani 2018). An example of the English narrative present is given in (9).

- (9) Mr. Tulkinghorn takes out his papers, asks permission to place them on a golden talisman of a table at my Lady's elbow, puts on his spectacles, and begins to read by the light of a shaded lamp.

(Dickens, *Bleak House*, cited by Anand and Toosarvandani 2018)

It is not clear to me that the Wá·šiw dependent mood involves shifted temporal anchoring in the same way that the English narrative present shifts the anchoring of the present tense in narratives. For this reason, I will not consider this comparison any further here. Instead, I would like to suggest that the distribution of the Wá·šiw dependent mood bears some similarities with the German reportative subjunctive.

The reportative subjunctive (Konjunktiv I) in German often appears in the complement clause of a verb of saying. It can also appear in a matrix clause, and when it does, it leads to the interpretation that the content of that clause is being reported by the speaker as what someone else has said. For instance in (10), the Konjunktiv I is used in the first sentence in the complement clause of the verb *sagte* 'say'. The use of the Konjunktiv I in the following matrix clause leads to the inference that the content of this clause is also reporting what the subject of the first clause said. Although the second sentence is not syntactically subordinate to the verb of saying in the first sentence, there is a sense in which it is interpreted as if it were.

- (10) Er sagte, sie sei schön. Sie habe grüne  
 he say.PAST.INDIC she be.KONJI pretty she has.KONJI green  
 Augen.  
 eyes

'He said she is pretty. She has green eyes (he said).'

(adapted from Schlenker 2005)

Like the German Konjunktiv I, the dependent mood in Wá·šiw also appears in the complements of the verb *-i:d* 'say'. However, the distribution of the dependent mood is much wider than the Konjunktiv I; the former also appears in complements of other non-factive attitudes such as *-hamu* 'think', and also in temporal and concessive adjunct clauses. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which it may make sense to think of narratives such as the ones used in this study as being reportative, since *Coyote and Lizard* is a folklore tale passed down orally through generations. In fact, two of the four versions of the texts studied here (those from John Wiger and Sylvia Andrews) conclude with a verb of saying, where the story-

teller explains that they are recounting the story as it was told to them. The example from Sylvia Andrews is given in (11).<sup>12</sup>

(11) Context: Lizard is victorious over Coyote.

ʔudiš	t'ánu	píteliduŋ	lá:dugabaʔ
ʔ-ud-i-š	t'anu	píteliʔ-duŋ	le-a:duʔ-gab-aʔ
THEME-SEQ-IND-SR	person	lizard-like	1-hand-DIST.FUT-DEP
ʔítluliʔišgeduŋ		ʔéluliyaʔ	
ʔ- <b>i</b> d-luliʔ-i-š-ge-duŋ		ʔ-eʔ-luli-aʔ	
3- <b>say</b> -DIST.PAST-IND-SR-OBJ.REL-like	3-be-DIST.PAST-DEP		
ʔí:demelʔgi			
ʔ- <b>i</b> :d-emelʔ-i-gi			
3- <b>say</b> -TRAD-IND-SUBJ.REL			

‘Thus people were to have hands like Lizard’s, it was said and so it was long ago, the tradition says.’ (SA: 20)

In (11), we see the complements of the verb forms with *-i:d* ‘say’ contain the dependent *-aʔ*, as expected. Perhaps, then, we can understand the whole narrative as being implicitly interpreted as if it was subordinate to a verb of saying, and the near ubiquity of the dependent mood *-aʔ* as indicating just that. Note this (kernel of a) theory is not saying these uses of *-aʔ* are actually syntactically subordinate to a verb of saying in the narrative. Indeed, two out of the four texts considered here do not end with a verb of saying like (11). Rather, the idea is that the dependent mood in matrix clauses in Wá-šiw narratives is behaving like the Konjunktiv I in German — when it appears in a matrix clause, it is interpreted *as if* it is occurring subordinate to a verb of saying. I also do not wish to commit to saying that the dependent mood *conveys* reported speech, since it appears in many environments where reported speech is not implicated.

While I think the analysis sketched here has some plausibility, there are some challenges that would need to be worked out in more detail.

<sup>12</sup> This is actually the penultimate sentence of the text. The speaker ends the text with the sentence:

(i) Context: Immediately following (11).

díʔŋaŋ	ke	diYá:mle
díʔŋaŋ	ke	di-Yá:m-le
finish	TOP	1-tell-REDUND

‘That’s all I’ll say.’

(SA: 21)

The first is that, as observed in Table 4, there are still a minority of matrix clauses in the texts that contain the independent mood *-i*, which do not fall under the idea that the text as a whole is interpreted as reportative. A second issue is defining what counts as a narrative for the purposes of the matrix use of the dependent mood. Since not all versions of *Coyote and Lizard* end with a passage along the lines of (11), this kind of passage cannot be used as a signpost for delineating what counts as a narrative. Since these kinds of folklore narratives involve a monologue by a speaker, perhaps the monologue itself is enough to delineate the narrative and when we should expect to find these uses of the dependent mood. An examination of more texts may be useful in giving this question more traction.

For now, I hope to have made the case that the use of the dependent mood *-aʔ* in Wá·šiw narratives is a phenomenon that deserves further research to fully understand its use and meaning contribution. (Perhaps you have a clever idea, Hotze?)

## References

- Anand, Pranav, and Maziar Toosarvandani. 2018. No explanation for the historical present: Temporal sequencing and discourse. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 22*, ed. Uli Sauerland and Stephanie Solt, 73–90. Berlin: Leibniz-Zentrum für allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Emily Hanink. 2022. Switch reference as index agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 40:651–702.
- Bochnak, M. Ryan. 2016. Past time reference in a language with optional tense. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 39:247–294.
- Bochnak, M. Ryan. 2023. Some aspects of aspect in Wá·šiw. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 89:1–38.
- Bochnak, M. Ryan, and Emily Hanink. 2022. Clausal embedding in Washo: Complementation vs. modification. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 40:979–1022.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, ed. Irina Nicolaeva, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobsen, William H. 1964. A grammar of the Washo language. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley. Available online at <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/52c6q7hg>.

- Portner, Paul. 2018. *Mood*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reisinger, Daniel, Lisa Matthewson, and Hotze Rullmann. 2022. Using corpora to investigate modal-temporal interactions. In *Modality in under-described languages: Methods and insights*, ed. Jozina Vander Klok, Núbia Ferreira Rech, and Simone Guessier, 141–190. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rullmann, Hotze, and Lisa Matthewson. 2018. Towards a theory of modal-temporal interaction. *Language* 94:281–331.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2005. The lazy Frenchman’s approach to the subjunctive. In *Romance languages and linguistic theory 2003*, ed. Twan Geerts, Ivo van Ginneken, and Haike Jacobs, 269–309. Benjamins.