

Evidentials and attitudes: the big picture

Recent research on evidentiality, with some exceptions (Sauerland and Schenner 2007; Schenner 2010; Murray 2010; Lim 2010), focuses on evidentials in root declarative clauses. The now-common view is that evidentials fall into two classes (Faller 2006; Matthewson et al. 2008): those that operate at the propositional level (mostly treated as epistemics, Izvorski 1997; McCready and Ogata 2007; Matthewson et al. 2008) vs. those that operate at the speech act level. I argue that the big picture is more sophisticated. I explore interaction of evidentials and attitudes across languages by looking at three parameters of variation: (1) embeddability, (2) attitudes, (3) shifting. I show that the emerging typology of evidentials under attitude verbs cannot be nailed down to the propositional vs. illocutionary distinction and is not entirely predicted by the current theories.

Embeddability. Some languages do not allow evidentials under attitude predicates, e.g. Cheyenne (Murray 2010), Cuzco Quechua (Faller 2002), Korean (Lim 2010) (though see Lee (2013)). Some languages do, e.g. Bulgarian (Sauerland and Schenner 2007), Georgian (Korotkova 2012), German *sollen* (Schenner 2010), St'át'imcets (Matthewson et al. 2008), Standard Tibetan (Garrett 2001), Turkish (Şener 2011). According to Faller (2002), the ban on embedding stems from the illocutionary nature of respective evidentials. If illocutionary evidentials modify speech acts and if speech acts only correspond to root clauses, we expect such evidentials to be non-embeddable. Such theory predicts a one-to-one mapping between illocutionary evidentials and non-embeddable evidentials. However, there seem to be counter-examples to that in the world's languages: (1) Korean non-embeddable evidentials have been analysed as temporal (Chung 2007) or modal (Lee 2013) rather than illocutionary; (2) Tibetan evidentials, with a performative component, are embeddable (Garrett 2001). Moreover, it is not a given that speech acts always correspond to root clauses: Krifka (forth.) develops a theory of embedded speech acts. I propose to implement semantics for evidentials within this theory and to derive non-embeddability from independent syntactic constraints, e.g. lack of structural space for evidentiality in nominalisations.

Attitudes. There is a huge degree of variation in which attitude verbs allow evidentials in their complements. It is not clear how to explain these constraints intra- and cross-linguistically. Compare three predicates, 'say', 'think', and 'know': in Tibetan and Georgian, 'say' and 'think' are evidential-embedding, 'know' is not; in German and Bulgarian 'say' and 'know' are evidential-embedding, 'think' is not; in Turkish all three are. Within the theory I suggest above, embedding is a matter of selection: certain predicates are able to embed speech acts, and it correctly predicts where illocutionary evidentials occur in Tibetan. The rest is still a problem. As another example, some evidentials are analysed as epistemics. If so, we expect their distribution in embedded contexts to match that of epistemics (Anand and Hacquard 2013). But neither German *sollen* (Schenner 2010) nor the Bulgarian evidential (Sauerland and Schenner 2007), claimed to be modal, fulfil these expectations. So, the entire picture is more complex than the two-way illocutionary vs. propositional distinction suggests.

Shifting. In some languages, evidentials never change their perspective when embedded, e.g. Bulgarian (Sauerland and Schenner 2007) or Georgian (Korotkova 2012). In others, the perspective shift is obligatory, e.g. Tibetan (Garrett 2001). In yet others, the shift is optional, e.g. German *sollen* (Schenner 2010), St'át'imcets (Matthewson et al. 2008) or Turkish (Şener 2011). Current theories do not provide enough flexibility: modal theories predict that evidentials would always shift since modals do (Hacquard 2010); multi-dimensional accounts derive lack of shifting from projection (Koev 2011; Kierstead and Martin 2013) but see (Schlenker 2013). I argue that, if anything, the typology of the evidential shift resembles that of the indexical shift, which wouldn't be too surprising given (Murray 2012).

Embedding under attitudes serves as a good test for linguistic theories of context-sensitive elements (tenses (Ogihara and Sharvit 2012), modals (Hacquard 2010), indexicals (Schlenker 2003)), and evidentiality seems to be no exception. This paper offers a bird's eye view on the cross-linguistic behaviour of evidentials under attitudes and shows where current theories of evidentiality prove insufficient. I propose new theoretical explanations to fix some of the problems: an embedded-speech-act theory for illocutionary evidentials and an analysis of the evidential shift along the lines of the indexical shift.

References

- Anand, P. and V. Hacquard (2013). Epistemics and attitudes. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 6(8), 1–59.
- Chung, K.-S. (2007). Spatial deictic tense and evidentials in Korean. *Natural language semantics* 15(3), 187–219.
- Şener, N. (2011). *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Turkish*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Faller, M. (2002). *Semantics and Pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Ph. D. thesis, Stanford.
- Faller, M. (2006). Evidentiality above and below speech acts. In *Functions of Language*. John Benjamins.
- Garrett, E. J. (2001). *Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan*. Ph. D. thesis, UCLA.
- Hacquard, V. (2010). On the event relativity of modal auxiliaries. *Natural Language Semantics* 18(1), 79–114.
- Izvorski, R. (1997). The present perfect as an epistemic modal. In *Proceedings of SALT XII*, pp. 222–239.
- Kierstead, G. and S. Martin (2013). A multistratal account of the projective Tagalog evidential ‘daw. In *Proceedings of SALT 22*, pp. 326–246.
- Koev, T. (2011). Evidentiality and temporal distance learning. In *Proceedings of SALT XXI*, pp. 115–134.
- Korotkova, N. (2012). Evidentiality in the Georgian tense and aspect system. Unpublished manuscript, UCLA.
- Krifka, M. (Forthcoming). Embedding speech acts. In T. Roeper and M. Speas (Eds.), *Recursion in language and cognition*. http://amor.cms.hu-berlin.de/~h2816i3x/Publications/Krifka_EmbeddingSpeechActs.pdf.
- Lee, J. (2013). Temporal constraints on the meaning of evidentiality. *Natural Language Semantics* 21, 1–41.
- Lim, D. S. (2010). *Evidentials as interrogatives: a case study from Korean*. Ph. D. thesis, USC.
- Matthewson, L., H. Davis, and H. Rullman (2008). Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St’át’imcets. In J. van Craenenbroeck (Ed.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, Volume 7. John Benjamins.
- McCready, E. and N. Ogata (2007). Evidentiality, modality and probability. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30, 147–206.
- Murray, S. (2010). *Evidentiality and the Structure of Speech Acts*. Ph. D. thesis, Rutgers.
- Murray, S. (2012). The indexical component of evidentiality. At a workshop “Meaning as Use: Indexality and Expressives” during NASSLLI 2012 in Austin, <http://conf.ling.cornell.edu/sem/NASSLLI.pdf>.
- Ogihara, T. and Y. Sharvit (2012). Embedded tenses. In R. I. Binnick (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of tense and aspect*, Chapter 22, pp. 638–668. OUP.
- Sauerland, U. and M. Schenner (2007). Embedded evidentials in Bulgarian. In E. Puig-Waldmuller (Ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, pp. 495–509.
- Schenner, M. (2010). Evidentials in complex sentences: Foundational issues and data from German and Turkish. In T. Peterson and U. Sauerland (Eds.), *Evidence from evidentials*, pp. 183–220. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Schlenker, P. (2003). A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(1), 29–120.
- Schlenker, P. (2013). Supplements without bidimensionality. http://www.semanticsarchive.net/Archive/jgwMjNmM/Supplements_without_Bidimensionality.pdf.