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Evidentiality (Willet, 1988; Aikhenvald, 2004)

Grammatical marking of information source
Evidentiality (Willet, 1988; Aikhenvald, 2004)

Grammatical marking of information source

Evidentials: a motley crew

From deictic operators: Northern Ostyak (Nikolaeva, 1999), Cuzco Quechua (Faller, 2004), Korean (Chung, 2007; Lee, 2008, 2011), Bulgarian (Koev, 2011)

to epistemic modals: Bulgarian (Izvorski, 1997), Tibetan (Garrett, 2001), St'át'imcets (Matthewson et al., 2008; Matthewson, 2011), Turkish (Şener, 2011)

to illocutionary modifiers: Cuzco Quechua (Faller, 2002), Cheyenne (Murray, 2010)
mass regional feature: present perfect morphology as a frequent make-up of evidentiality
mass regional feature: present perfect morphology as a frequent make-up of evidentiality

traditional descriptions of Georgian: perfect with an occasional evidential flavour (Boeder, 2000; Giacalone Ramat and Topadze, 2007; Topadze, 2011):

(1) urfxul-s gandz-i daumalia
dragon-DAT treasure-NOM hide.3SG.S.3SG.O.PERF
p: ‘The dragon hid the treasure’
EV: I was told / infer that p.
Georgian evidential perfect

• mass regional feature: present perfect morphology as a frequent make-up of evidentiality

• traditional descriptions of Georgian: perfect with an occasional evidential flavour (Boeder, 2000; Giacalone Ramat and Topadze, 2007; Topadze, 2011):

(1) Ṽrxul-s  gündʒ-i  daumalia
dragon-DAT treasure-NOM hide.3SG.S.3SG.0.PERF
p: ‘The dragon hid the treasure’
EV: I was told / infer that p.

• this is the only evidential in the language
**Georgian evidential perfect**

- mass regional feature: present perfect morphology as a frequent make-up of evidentiality
- traditional descriptions of Georgian: perfect with an occasional evidential flavour (Boeder, 2000; Giacalone Ramat and Topadze, 2007; Topadze, 2011):

  (1) .ContextCompat

      urf)،xul-s  gand-$i  daumalia
      dragon-DAT treasure-NOM hide.3SG.S.3SG.O.PERF

      $p$: ‘The dragon hid the treasure’
      EV: I was told / infer that $p$.

- this is the only evidential in the language
- other tenses are evidentially-neutral
Core data: briefly
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Core data: briefly

- **Evidential past**: the evidential describes past eventualities
- **Extra truth-conditionality**: the evidential meaning does not contribute to the main assertion
- **Disjunctive evidential requirement**: two interpretations are rather two different markers
- **Time of evidence acquisition**: the evidential constrains time of evidence acquisition
- **Lack of shifting**: the evidential remains speaker-oriented in any context
- **Lack of speaker’s commitment**: the scope proposition can be known to the speaker to be false
- **Evidential subordination**: effects similar to modal subordination but not completely
How to approach evidential perfects and the like
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Perfect of Evidentiality (PE)

Homophonous forms with different semantics and distribution: a perfect perfect and an indirect evidential underspecified between inference and hearsay
Izvorski (1997)

Perfect of Evidentiality (PE)

Homophones forms with different semantics and distribution: a perfect perfect and an indirect evidential underspecified between inference and hearsay

Evidential as an epistemic modal

Evidentiality is part of modality (Bybee, 1985; Palmer, 1986; van der Auwera and Plungian, 1998)


Modal base contains evidentially-possible worlds
Accessible worlds are ranked wrt attitude towards evidence
The evidential universally quantifies over the closest evidentially-possible worlds
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Deictic approaches to evidentiality

Faller (2004) and Koev (2011)

Evidentials are deictic operators that describe facts of the actual world and how the speaker learnt them
Cuzco Quechua non-experienced past -sqa

Spatio-temporal propositional operator similar to tense and aspect

Past eventualities outside of speaker’s perceptual field: spatially, temporally or mentally
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Faller (2004) and Georgian evidentiality

- Evidential past  
- Extra truth-conditionality
- Disjunctive evidential requirement ← easy to incorporate
- Temporal reference of evidence acquisition ← easy to incorporate
- Lack of shifting  
- Lack of speaker’s commitment
- Evidential subordination
Faller (2004) and Georgian evidentiality

- Evidential past  YAY
- Extra truth-conditionality  🇯🇦
- Disjunctive evidential requirement ← easy to incorporate
- Temporal reference of evidence acquisition ← easy to incorporate
- Lack of shifting  YAY
- Lack of speaker’s commitment  🇯🇦
- Evidential subordination  🇯🇦
Bulgarian direct and reportative evidentials

Evidential contribution is extra truth-conditional (projective and backgrounded)

The scope proposition is entailed

Secondary tenses that encode temporal distance between time of the described eventuality and time of evidence acquisition

Enriched Neo-Reichenbachian temporal ontology (Kamp and Reyle, 1993; Klein, 1994): addition of a learning event

No concept of ‘evidence’: it comes for free by virtue of temporal relations, cf. Speas (2010, 2012)
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Koev (2011) and Georgian evidentiality

- Evidential past  **YAY**
- Extra truth-conditionality  **YAY**
- Disjunctive evidential requirement ← easy to incorporate
- Temporal reference of evidence acquisition  **YAY**
- Lack of shifting  **YAY**
- Lack of speaker’s commitment
- Evidential subordination
Koev (2011) and Georgian evidentiality

- Evidential past  YAY
- Extra truth-conditionality  YAY
- Disjunctive evidential requirement ← easy to incorporate
- Temporal reference of evidence acquisition  YAY
- Lack of shifting  YAY
- Lack of speaker’s commitment ✹✹
- Evidential subordination ✹✹
The Georgian form lacks properties typically associated with perfects across languages (McCawley, 1971; Comrie, 1976; Kiparsky, 2002; Pancheva, 2003; Alexiadou et al., 2003; Ritz, 2012):

- no present resulting state of a past situation
- intepretation does not depend on the aspectual class
- compatibility with adverbials restricted by the aspectual class and not by the form itself, i.e. no present perfect puzzle
- lack of “Einstein has visited Princeton” effects
- use in narratives
Indirect evidence requirement

The eventuality described by the scope proposition can never be witnessed by the speaker directly.
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Indirect evidence requirement
The eventuality described by the scope proposition can never be witnessed by the speaker directly

Past tense requirement
The eventuality described by the scope proposition always takes place prior to the moment of speech
Evidential past

Indirect evidence requirement

The eventuality described by the scope proposition can never be witnessed by the speaker directly.

Past tense requirement

The eventuality described by the scope proposition always takes place prior to the moment of speech.

(2) (*axla) **ucvimia**
now rain.3sg.s.PERF
‘I was told that / I infer that it rained (*now)*.'
The evidential contribution projects

- never in the scope of negation

(3) sup’-i ar gauk’etebia
   soup-NOM NEG make.3SG.S.3SG.O.PERF
   ‘I was told / infer that she did not cook the soup.’
≠ It is not the case that I was told / infer that she cooked
   the soup’.

- never affected by other propositional operators, e.g. modals or
  temporal adverbials
The evidential contribution does not bear on the main point of the utterance

- cannot serve as a reply
  #Context 1: How do you know they built a new metro line in LA?
  Context 2: Any news on public transportation in LA?

(4) los-anželes-ji metro-s axal-i haz-i
    LA-in metro-GEN new-NOM line-NOM
    gauxavniat
    construct.3PLS.PERF

‘I was told / infer that they constructed a new metro line in Los Angeles’.
The evidential contribution does not bear on the main point of the utterance

- cannot serve as a reply
  - #Context 1: How do you know they built a new metro line in LA?
  - Context 2: Any news on public transportation in LA?
    
    (4) los-angelo-si metro-s axal-i haz-i
    LA-in metro-GEN new-NOM line-NOM
    gauxavniat
    construct.3PLS.PERF
    ‘I was told / infer that they constructed a new metro line in Los Angeles’.

- cannot be denied
In some languages the evidence holder may shift from the speaker:

- to the addressee in questions (interrogative flip: Cheyenne, Cuzco Quechua, German, Stát’imcets)
- to the attitude subject under attitude reports (Tibetan, Turskish)
In some languages the evidence holder may shift from the speaker:

- to the addressee in questions (interrogative flip: Cheyenne, Cuzco Quechua, German, Stát’ímcets)
- to the attitude subject under attitude reports (Tibetan, Turskish)

Georgian evidential past cannot be used in questions but can be syntactically embedded.
Speaker-orientedness II

#Context 1: The speaker has direct evidence for the proposition.
Context 2: The priest is speaker’s only source of information.

(5) moxudel-ma mitxra rom ber-eb-s
priest-ERG tell.3SG.S.3SG.0.1SG.IO.AOR that monk-PL-DAT
biblia tanamedrove kartul-ad
Bible.NOM modern Georgian-ADV
gadautargmniat
translate.3PL.S.3SG.O.PERF
‘The priest told me that monks translated the Bible into Modern Georgian.’

(cf. contexts in Sauerland and Schenner 2007)
### Evidential past vs. other tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject.Dir</th>
<th>Subject.Indir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker.Dir</strong></td>
<td>ev.past: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aorist: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker.Indir</strong></td>
<td>ev.past: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aorist: yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidential past is only felicitous in contexts where the speaker has indirect evidence. Other tenses are evidentially-neutral and can be used regardless of the information source the speaker or the attitude subject have.
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### Evidential past vs. other tenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject.Dir</th>
<th>Subject.Indir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker.Dir</strong></td>
<td>ev.past: no</td>
<td>ev.past: no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aorist: yes</td>
<td>aorist: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaker.Indir</strong></td>
<td>ev.past: yes</td>
<td>ev.past: yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aorist: yes</td>
<td>aorist: yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evidential past

Is only felicitous in contexts where the speaker has indirect evidence.

### Other tenses

Are evidentially-neutral and can be used regardless of the information source the speaker or the attitude subject have.
Hearsay vs. inference

Hearsay

Grammaticises any type of report (secondhand, thirdhand), reliable or not, rumours, newspapers, reports based on self-ascriptions etc

Hearsay vs. inference

Hearsay

Grammaticises any type of report (secondhand, thirdhand), reliable or not, rumours, newspapers, reports based on self-ascriptions etc

Inference

Visual evidence only

#Audible evidence

#Smelled evidence

#Mental reasoning as evidence

Context 1 (smelled): I come home and feel a tasty flavour right from the entrance.

Context 2 (mental): It is Fat Week and mom always makes pies.

OK Context 3 (visual): I come home and see dirty baking sheet.

(6) deda-s
mother-/d.sc/a.sc/t.sc
ghvezel-i
pie-/n.sc/o.sc/m.sc
dauc'xvia
bake./three.taboldstyle/s.sc/g.sc./s.sc./three.taboldstyle/s.sc/g.sc./o.sc./p.sc/e.sc/r.sc/f.sc

I infer that mom made pies'.
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## Hearsay vs. inference

**Hearsay**

Grammaticises any type of report (secondhand, thirdhand), reliable or not, rumours, newspapers, reports based on self-ascriptions etc.

**Inference**

Visual evidence only  
#Audible evidence  
#Smelled evidence  
#Mental reasoning as evidence

1. **#Context 1 (smelled):** I come home and feel a tasty flavour right from the entrance.
2. **#Context 2 (mental):** It is Fat Week and mom always makes pies.
3. **OK Context 3 (visual):** I come home and see dirty baking sheet.

(6) deda-s ghvezel-i dauc’xvia  
mother-DAT pie-NOM bake.3SG.S.3SG.O.PERF  
‘I infer that mom made pies’.
Hearsay vs. inference III

Traditional treatment: underspecification

Two interpretations of one marker, availability depends on context
**Traditional treatment: underspecification**

Two interpretations of one marker, availability depends on context

**Disjunctive evidential requirement: ambiguity?**

Hearsay and visual inference do not cover the entire range of non-firsthand meanings
Time of evidence acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of eventuality described vs. time of evidence acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>learning ≺ event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning ◦ event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event ≺ learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints on temporal relations:
Learning the scope proposition always happens after and cannot overlap with the situation described.
Time of evidence acquisition

Time of eventuality described vs. time of evidence acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning &lt; Event</th>
<th>Learning ∩ Now</th>
<th>Learning ∩ Now</th>
<th>Now &lt; Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning &lt; Event</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning ∩ Event</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event &lt; Learning</td>
<td>yes with hearsay</td>
<td>yes with both</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Constraints on temporal relations

Learning the scope proposition always happens after and cannot overlap with the situation described.
Time of evidence acquisition II

Context: Nana and I are on the different continents. She tells me over the phone that now it is raining in Moscow. Next day, I cannot say:

(7) #moskov-fi gufin ucvimia
Moscow-in yesterday rain.3SG.S.PERF
‘I was told that it was raining in Moscow yesterday’.
Constraints on time of inference

Past inferences are ruled out.
 Constraints on time of inference

Past inferences are ruled out.

Context: I see fresh bear traces and infer that a bear passed here. I cannot, however, report this inference the next day:

(8) #(gushin) ak datv-s **gauvlia**
yesterday here bear-DAT walk.3SG.S.PERF
‘I inferred that a bear passed here (yesterday)’.
**Time of evidence acquisition IV**

**Hearsay vs. inference**

Temporal constraints associated with inference and hearsay are different and cannot be reduced to context.
Commitment to the truth

Hearsay

The speaker is not committed to the truth of the scope proposition and may know that it is false.
Commitment to the truth

Hearsay

The speaker is not committed to the truth of the scope proposition and may know that it is false.

(9) a. kalifornia-s k’anonieri gauxdia marihuan-is California-DAT legal make.3SG.S.3SG.O.PERF marijuana-GEN gamoq’eneba usage.MSD.NOM ‘I was told that California legalised marijuana.’

b. da es ar aris martali and it-NOM NEG be.3SG.S.PRES true ‘But in fact that’s not true.’
Inference

The speaker believes the scope proposition
Inference

The speaker believes the scope proposition

Because of Maria’s red eyes you infer that she was crying. Then you realise that red eyes might be caused by allergy.

(10) #maria-s utiria magram es Maria-DAT cry.3SG.S.PERF but s/he allerg-is-gan akvs tval-eb-i c’itel-i allergy-GEN-BECUSE has eye-PL-NOM red-NOM

Intended: ‘I infer that Maria was crying but this is not so, she has red eyes because of allergy’.

Explanation: inference happens during the moment of speech and reflects current belief state.
If the antecedent is embedded under the evidential, anaphora is impossible unless the anaphor, too, is under the evidential.

(in English for the sake of simplicity)

(11) ‘I was told / infer that Natasha planted a tree’.

(12) a. #Squirrels inhabited it.
    b. ‘I was told / infer that squirrels inhabited it’.
    c. #Squirrels must have inhabited it’
Evidential subordination II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modal</th>
<th>Ev.past-hearsay</th>
<th>Ev.past-inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ev.past-hearsay</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ev.past-inference</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effects similar to modal subordination

Yet modals and evidentials behave differently; sometimes they pattern together, e.g. in German (Faller, 2012).
Core data

- Extra truth-conditionality
- Evidential past
- Disjunctive evidential requirement
- Temporal reference of evidence acquisition
- Lack of shifting
- Lack of speaker’s commitment
- Evidential subordination
Goals

- provide semantics for the two evidentials:
- maintain the spirit of deictic approaches:
- capture “nonveridical” properties:
Goals

- provide semantics for the two evidentials: via modifying Faller’s notion of perceptual field
- maintain the spirit of deictic approaches: via building upon Koev (2011)
- capture “nonveridical” properties: via adding belief worlds
At-issue vs. not-at-issue

DPL: AnderBois et al. (2010); Koev (2011), see also Murray (2010)

Assertions: proposals to update the common ground

Not-at-issue content: direct updates

$p^{cs}$—current context set
At-issue vs. not-at-issue

DPL: AnderBois et al. (2010); Koev (2011), see also Murray (2010)

Assertions: proposals to update the common ground

Not-at-issue content: direct updates

\( p^{cs} \) — current context set

(13) Byron, a syntactician, smiled.

a. new proposal: \( \exists p \land p \subseteq p^{cs} \land \)

b. at-issue: \( \exists x \land x = \text{BYRON} \land \)

c. appositive: \( \text{SYNTACTICIAN}_{p^{cs}}(x) \land \)

d. at-issue: \( \text{SMILE}_{p}(x) \land \)

e. proposal accepted: \( \exists p^{cs} \land p^{cs} = p \)
Evidential restriction

The speaker sees something and believes that what s/he sees entails the scope proposition (such notion of evidence is reminiscent of McCready (2011)’s)
Decomposing visual inference

Evidential restriction

The speaker sees something and believes that what s/he sees entails the scope proposition (such notion of evidence is reminiscent of McCready (2011)'s)

You see that Maria has red eyes.

(14) maria-s utiria
    Maria-DAT cry.3SG.S.PERF
    ‘I infer that Maria was crying’.

a. new proposal: \( \exists p \land p \subseteq p^{CS} \land \)
b. at-issue: \( \exists x \land x = \text{MARIA} \land \exists e \land \text{CRY}_{DOX}(w,sp,t_j)(e,x) \land e \subseteq t \land t < \text{now} \land \)
c. evidential: \( \exists e_i \land \text{RED.EYE}^{ps}_p(e_i,x) \land \)
    \( \exists \langle t',l \rangle \land \langle t_i,l \rangle \in \text{e-trace}(e_i) \land \langle t_i,l \rangle \in \text{vis-trace}(sp) \land t_i \circ \text{now} \land \)
    \( \text{RED.EYE}_{DOX}(w,sp,t_i)(e_i,x) \rightarrow \text{CRY}_{DOX}(w,sp,t_j)(e_j) \land e_i \subseteq t_i \land e_j \subseteq t_j \land t_j \preceq t_i \land \)
    \( \text{DOX}(w,sp,t_i) \cap p \)
d. acceptance: \( \exists p^{CS} \land p^{CS} \equiv p \)
Decomposing hearsay

**Evidential restriction**

The speaker was reported the scope proposition and its truth or falsity do not matter.
Decomposing hearsay

Evidential restriction

The speaker was reported the scope proposition and its truth or falsity do not matter.

My little brother tells me that the dragon hid the treasure.

(15)  ḥ̱xul-s  ganξ-i  daumalia
dragon-DAT treasure-NOM hide.3SG.S.3SG.O.PERF
‘I was told that the dragon hid the treasure’.

a. new proposal:  ∃p ∧ p ⊆ p^{CS} ∧
b. at-issue:  ∃x ∧ x = DRAGON ∧ ∃y ∧ y = TREASURE ∧ ∃e ∧
HIDE_{DOX}(w, z, t_i)(e, x, y) ∧ e ⊆ t ∧ t < t_i ∧
c. evidential:  ∃z ∧ z = BROTHER ∧ ∃e_i ∧ REPORT_{p^{CS}}(e_i, z, sp, p) ∧
e_i ⊆ t_i ∧ t_i ≤ now ∧ DOX(w, z, t_i) ∩ p
d. acceptance:  ∃p^{CS} ∧ p^{CS} = p
Georgian evidential past can be analysed as two homophous markers:

- downside: accidental homophony instead of unified semantics
- upside: Georgian hearsay and inference pattern with the corresponding markers from other languages, e.g. Cuzco Quechua, Cheyenne, Japanese
- upside: other languages have been analysed like that, too, e.g. Turkish (Şener, 2011)
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A mixed evidential system: makes reference to the event level and to the proposition level
Conclusions

Georgian evidential past can be analysed as two homophonic markers
- downside: accidental homophony instead of unified semantics
- upside: Georgian hearsay and inference pattern with the corresponding markers from other languages, e.g. Cuzco Quechua, Cheyenne, Japanese
- upside: other languages have been analysed like that, too, e.g. Turkish (Şener, 2011)

A mixed evidential system: makes reference to the event level and to the proposition level

Cross-linguistic variation: how perfect is the perfect of evidentiality?
The phenomenon is very common and languages investigated so far (Turkish, Bulgarian) do not seem to pattern together.
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Appendix I: Faller (2004)

- two spatio-temporal functions
  
  **e-trace** maps an eventuality e onto its time-space coordinates

  \[(16)\]  
  \[\text{e-trace}(e) = \{\langle t, l \rangle \mid t \subseteq \tau(e) \land \text{AT}(e, t, l)\}\]
  
  \(\text{AT}(e, t, l)\) is true iff the eventuality e takes place at location l at time t

  **mP-trace** maps a person sp onto their perceptual field for each time of their lifespan

  \[(17)\]  
  \[\text{mP-trace}(sp) = \{\langle t, l \rangle \mid t \subseteq \tau(sp) \land \text{m-PERCEIVE}(sp, t, l)\}\]
  
  \(\text{m-PERCEIVE}(sp, t, l)\) is true iff sp perceived l at t and has a current memory of having perceived l at t

- the exact semantics for -sqa:

  \[(18)\]  
  \[\lambda t_R \lambda P \lambda e. P(e) \land t_R \prec \text{now} \land \neg \forall \langle t, l \rangle [t \subseteq t_R \land \langle t, l \rangle \in \text{e-trace}(e) \rightarrow \langle t, l \rangle \in \text{mP-trace}(sp)]\]
Appendix II: Koev (2011)

(19) Ivan celu-n-a-l Maria
Ivan kiss-PFV-3SG.PST-IND Maria
‘Ivan kissed Maria, as I learned later.’

a. proposal: \( \exists p \land p \subseteq p^{cs} \land \)
b. assertive content: \( \exists x \land x = ivan \land \exists y \land y = maria \land \exists e \land \text{kiss}_p(e, x, y) \land \)
e \( \subseteq t \land t < e_s \land \)
c. evidential import: \( \exists e_I \land \text{LEARN}_{p^{cs}}(e_I, \text{AGENT}(e_s), p) \land t < e_I \land e_I < e_s \land \)
d. acceptance: \( \exists p^{cs} \land p^{cs} = p \)