This paper examines the evidential system of Yauyos (ISO 639-3: [qux]), a hitherto undocumented, extremely endangered Quechuan language of Peru. Yauyos, like other Quechuan languages, counts three evidential affixes: direct (-mI), reportative (-shI), and conjectural (-chrI), as in (1), (2), and (3).

Yauyos is unusual, however, in that each of its three evidentials counts three variants, formed by the affixation of the evidential modifiers ("EM's"), -Ø, -k, -ki, to the base form. Evidentials obligatorily take modifiers; modifiers attach exclusively to evidentials. With all three evidentials, the -k form is associated with some variety of increase over the -Ø form, and the -ki form with greater increase still.

In the default case, the EM's indicate an increase in strength of evidence. With DIRECT -ml-Ø/k/ki and REPORTATIVE -shI-Ø/k/ki, the EM's then generally affect the interpretation of strength of assertion, with -k and -ki indicating increasingly strong assertions, as in (1) and (6); with CONJECTURAL -chrI-Ø/k/ki, the EM's affect the interpretation of certainty of conjecture, with -k and -ki indicating increasingly certain conjectures, as in (4) and (5). In case the evidential takes scope over a modalized verb, the modifiers then generally affect the interpretation of the force of the modal: with universal-deontic and future-tense verbs, for example, -k and -ki generally indicate increasingly strong obligations or imminent futures, respectively, as in (7) and (8).

I argue that interpretation is pragmatic. (-Ø, -k, -ki) forms a Horn scale that gives rise to conversational (quantity) implicatures. That a speaker uses the a weaker EM entails that she couldn't have used a stronger form. I model this making use of Schulz and van Rooij's (2004, 2005, 2006) model-theoretic formalization of Grice's Principle.

Gricean interpretation is described by selecting minimal models, selection taking place among those possibilities where the speaker knows P and the order that determines minimality compares the strength of evidence of evidence type EV that the speaker has for P. The sentence \( K^{EV,EM}P \) ‘the speaker knows P by EV-EM’ (wrt W and R) is: defined in w if the speaker has evidence for P of type EV of and strength EM in w; is true in w if P=T in every world in R(w), w \( \in R(w) \). The order \( \preceq_{EM,S} \) ranks possibilities in terms of the extent of the speaker's evidence of type EV. \( \varphi \) is evidence for \( \psi \) if the conditional probability of \( \psi \) given \( \varphi = T \) exceeds the conditional probability of \( \psi \) \( \varphi = F \) (McCready(2010)).

**DEFINITION (Interpreting evidentially-marked sentences according to the Gricean Principle)**

Let EM be an evidential modifier and S be a pair of a predicate P and a pair of an evidential type EV and evidential modifier EM in context C = (W,R). Define the pragmatic interpretation \( grice^{C}_{SR}(EM,S) \) of EM wrt S and C

\[
grice^{C}_{SR}(EM,S) =_{def} \{ w \in [K^{EV,EM}P]^C | \forall w' \in [K^{EV,EM}P]^C : w \preceq_{EM,S} w' \} \]
1 Oka-ta qasa-mu-n-mi kay-paq
oca-ACC freeze-CIS-3-EVD-Ø DEM.P-LOC
'Oca freezes around here.' (LlankaTravel, 05:09-12)
-Ø DIRECT present: evidence from personal experience, utterance is a neutral assertion

2 Qari-n-ta-sh Ø wañu-ra-chi-n masha-n-ta-sh Ø wañu-ra-chi-n
man-3-ACC-EVR-Ø die-PRF-CAUS-3 son.in.law-3-ACC-EVR-Ø die-PRF-CAUS-3
'She killed her husband, they say; she killed her son-in-law, they say.' (ViñacGrandparents3, 37:28-35)
-Ø REPORTATIVE past: evidence is secondhand, utterance is a neutral assertion

3 Alma-yuq ka-ya-n-chri-Ø
soul-POSS be-PROG-3-EVC-Ø
'She must be with a soul [of a recently dead relative].' (YuracsayhuaSoul, 01:59-02:01)
-Ø CONJECTURAL present: evidence is either personal or secondhand, utterance is a neutral conjecture

4 Chay-chri-k mana chaski-rqa-chu
DEM.D-EVC-K no accept-PST-NEG
'That's why it wouldn't have received it.' (ViñacGossip, 2:18-21)
-k CONJECTURAL past: strong speaker certainty in conjecture

5 Anu-ya-n-ña-chri-ki
wean-PROG-3-DISC-EVC-KI
'She must be weaning [him], for sure.' (ViñacMilking, 00:55-57)
-ki CONJECTURAL present: strongest speaker certainty in conjecture

6 Prisiyu-n-pis ka-n-mi-ki chakiruptinqa
price-3-ADD be-3-EVD-KI dry-URGT-SUBDS-3-TOP
'They have their (high) price when you dry them.' (ViñacMilking, 16:08-10)
-ki DIRECT present: strongest assertion, increase in degree of the predicate, 'pricy'

7 Ri-shaq. Yaku-ta-chri-ki qawa-mu-shaq
go.1.FUT water-ACC-EVC-KI see-CIS-1.FUT
'I have to go. I have to take care of the water now.' (TanaOrchard, 30:39-43)
-ki CONJECTURAL universal deontic: strongest obligation, urgency

8 Kuka-cha-n-kuna-ta apa-ru-pty-qa tiya-pa-wa-nga-chri-k
coca-DIM-3-PL-ACC bring-URGT-SUBDS-1-TOP sit-BEN-1.OBJ-3.FUT-EVC-K
'If/when I bring them their coca, they will accompany me sitting.' (ViñacCure1, 0:27-32)
-k CONJECTURAL future: close/certain future