

DGfS AG 4: The linguistic realization of evidentiality in European Languages

Vladimir A. Plungian

Institute of Linguistics, Moscow

Types of verbal evidentiality marking: towards a general typology

Recent typological studies provide several working classifications of evidential meanings which try to cover the world's languages as broadly as possible. The publications in the field which are referred to most frequently seem to be Aikhenvald (2004) and de Haan (2005); earlier influential papers include Givón (1982), Willett (1988), Lazard (1999) and Friedman (2000), among many others. Some points, however, remain at issue. The most important among them are: (i) the interaction of evidentiality and modality (widely discussed in a number of conflicting approaches), and (ii) possible semantic extensions of evidential markers, primarily, the so-called mirative values.

So far, the classification of evidential *values* is much more elaborated (and agreed upon) than the classification of evidential *systems*. The paper proposes an overview of possible evidential systems and argues that one of the most important division within them is that between “modalized” and “non-modalized” evidential systems (the term was first proposed in Plungian (2001)). The role and status of modal values differ according to the type of evidential system, and, most probably, there is no unified answer to the question about how modality and evidentiality are related (if at all). The same is true for the analysis of mirative values: their status depends on the type of the evidentiality system, and modalized systems tend to integrate mirativity in a more consistent way than non-modalized ones.

References

- Aikhenvald, A. (2004), *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford U. Press.
- de Haan, F. (2005), Encoding speaker perspective: evidentials. In: Z. Frajzyngier et al. (eds.), *Linguistic diversity and language theories*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 379-397.
- Friedman, V. (2000), Confirmative / nonconfirmative in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, and Albanian with additional observations on Turkish, Romani, Georgian and Lak. In: L. Johanson & B. Utas (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 329-366.
- Givón, T. (1982), Evidentiality and epistemic space. *Studies in language*, 6.1, 23-49.
- Lazard, G. (1999), Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other? *Linguistic typology*, 3.1, 91-109.
- Plungian, V. (2001), The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33.3, 349-357.
- Willett, Th. (1988), A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. *Studies in language*, 12.1, 51-97.

Katerina Stathi
Freie Universität Berlin
The rise of evidential markers in Modern Greek

Like most European languages, Modern Greek does not have a grammatical system of evidentiality. Moreover, for a language spoken in the Balkans Modern Greek is unusual in that it lacks grammatical coding of evidentiality (cf. Joseph 2003).

Nevertheless, tendencies of grammaticalization of evidential markers in the verbal domain can be observed both in earlier stages of the language and in real-time. The case of the verb of speech *léi* '(one) says' which grammaticalizes to a reported speech marker meaning 'allegedly, reportedly' in the 3. person singular, is already mentioned in Aikhenvald (2004: 150-151, 272).

Additionally, there is synchronic evidence for the grammaticalization of the verbs *apiló* 'threaten', *ipósxome* 'promise' and *fénome* 'appear/seem' to evidential markers, as in languages like German and English.

Furthermore, the particle *tha*, which is used for the expression of tense (future) as well as epistemic modality, has also developed to a marker of inferred evidentiality in a construction with the imperfect.

In this paper we will discuss the grammaticalization tendencies that lead to the emergence of evidential markers in Modern Greek, focusing of verbal constructions. We will thereby address two issues. Firstly, we will discuss the processes that lead to the grammaticalization of particular verbs and constructions to evidential markers in the light of similar processes that are well-attested for other European languages. Secondly, we will discuss which interrelations between evidentiality and other categories (for example tense and mood) can be particularly observed in the case of Greek. Our findings are based on corpus-based analyses using both synchronic data (from the Hellenic National Corpus) as well as diachronic data.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Joseph, Brian (2003). 'Evidentials. Summation, questions, prospects', in Aikhenvald, A. Y. and Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 307-327.

Nóra Kugler
Loránd Eötvös University (ELTE), Budapest
The modalized evidential system in Hungarian

Epistemic modality and inferential evidentiality are widely recognized to be overlapping domains rather than separate categories (van der Auwera–Plungian 1998: 86, Plungian 2001: 354). This treatment receives substantial empirical support from the analysis of Hungarian, in which both functions are expressed by the same markers (Kugler 2003, 2003–2005: 59). In my presentation, I interpret the results of my corpus-based study within the framework of functional linguistics.

The linguistic coding of epistemic modality and evidentiality can be regarded as the manifestation of natural epistemology (Chafe–Nichols 1986: vii). The inferential process and interpretation in general can be affected by relevance and (Givón’s) implicit communicative contract (Givón 1982: 24). The marking of epistemic attitude and indirect evidence is generally highly relevant in verbal interaction, and has a strong metapragmatic function (Verschuren 1999).

I interpret evidentiality in Hungarian as a ‘modalized evidential system’ (Plungian 2001: 354) with a bias for the distinction between reliable (direct) and unreliable (indirect or inferred) evidence.

Also significant in Hungarian is the quotative type of evidence, subtly related to epistemic modality. For example, the stance adverb *állítólag* ‘allegedly’ indicates that the speaker commits herself to some extent to the truth of the statement, but adds a degree of uncertainty by locating the source of evidence externally. Combining elements of perspectivization and subjectification (Sanders–Spooren 1997: 96), this adverb is also a clear example of how the systems of evidentiality and modality can be closely intertwined.

In Hungarian, there is no coherent morphological system of evidential affixes or clitics. Evidential functions appear to be less than straightforwardly grammaticalized, and are generally linked to lexical rather than grammatical devices. Although the mood suffixes *-nA* (quotative / inferential evidence) and *-hAt* (inferential evidence) seem to be associated with some of these functions, they compare poorly to what lexical items can express, cf. *állítólag* ‘allegedly’, *valóban, tényleg* ‘indeed’ (degree of commitment to the proposition), *feltehetőleg* ‘presumably’, *valószínűleg* ‘probably’ (epistemic modality), and so on.

References

- Chafe, Wallace–Nichols, Johanna (eds.) (1986). *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Givón, Talmy (1982). Evidentiality and epistemic space. *Studies in Language* 6, 23–49.
- Kugler, Nóra (2003). A módosítószók funkciói. (The functions of stance adverbs) *Nyelvtudományi Értekezések* 152. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kugler, Nóra (2003–2005). Marking of speaker’s uncertainty (epistemic possibility) in Hungarian. In I. Szathmári (ed.) *Annales Univ. Scientiarum Budapestinensis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae. Sectio Linguistica Tomus XXVI*. Budapest, 45–64.
- Plungian, Vladimir A. (2001). The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 349–57.
- Sanders, José–Spooren, Wilbert (1997). Perspective, subjectivity, and modality from a cognitive linguistic point of view. In Liebert, Wolf–Andreas–Redeker, Gisele–Waugh, Linda (eds.): *Discourse and perspective in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 85–112.
- Van der Auwera, Johan–Plungian, Vladimir A. (1998). Modality’s semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2, 79–124.
- Verschuren, Jef (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Björn Wiemer

Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz

Hearsay and epistemic values cross-classified in an integrative approach to evidentiality marking in European Languages

I will start from the assumption that markers of evidentiality can be ordered along a cline stretching from grammatical toward lexical means (cf. Squartini, to appear; Wiemer 2006: 18-20). Under typical grammatical means we may subsume inflections (e.g. Turk. *-mİş*) and functional extensions of TMA-paradigms (like the perfect on the Balkans, the Caucasus and in Baltic, or the conditional in French and Italian), whereas as lexical markers we may consider particles (like Cz. *prý*, Russ. *mol*), adverbials (like Eng. *allegedly*), parentheticals (e.g. Fr. *paraît-il*, Russ. *kažetsja*), conjunctions (e.g., Russ. *budto*) and some prepositions (like Germ. *gemäß*, *zufolge*). Somewhere in-between we can locate auxiliaries (e.g., Germ. *sollen*, Ital. *dovere*), perception verbs both with raising (as in Eng. *This workshop is supposed to become a good one*) and without (e.g., Span. *parece que*) as well as petrified copular participles (in Baltic: Lith. *esą*, Latv. *esôt*) and predicatives (like Pol. *stychać*).

On the basis of this rough classification the aim of the talk will be to show the areal distribution of hearsay marking in European languages. Special attention is paid to an assessment of Slavic and Baltic languages in the context of larger linguistic areas. The following criteria will be relevant:

1. The proportion between (more) lexical and (more) grammatical means in the languages. In particular, I will ask whether the distribution of markers along the cline in a language is guided by a complementarity principle (more grammatical means, less lexical one, and vice versa). Preliminary observations make us believe that this is not the case.
2. The proportion between epistemically neutral markers (e.g., Germ. *sollen*, Pol. *podobno*, Ital. conditional) and markers with conventionalized epistemic overtones (e.g., Russ. *jakoby*, Rum. *chipurile*).
3. Irrespective of the interaction with epistemic modality, the proportion between markers restricted to hearsay (e.g. Germ. *angeblich*, Lith. *girdi*) and markers with an indifferent meaning of indirect evidence (e.g., Bulg. 'preizkazni formi', Eng. *apparently*, Russ. *kažetsja*, Georgian *titkos*).

These three criteria belong to three independent dimensions, so that we may ask whether their combinations render a random pattern of areal distribution or rather some clustering can be observed. A preliminary answer to this question will be supplied. The cross-classification of evidential markers along these parameters raises methodological issues which will be discussed, too.

References

- Squartini, M. (to appear): Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian. *Linguistics*.
- Wiemer, B. (2006): Particles, parentheticals, conjunctions and prepositions as evidentiality markers in contemporary Polish (A first exploratory study). *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 3, 5-67.

Gerda Haßler
Universität Potsdam

Epistemic modality and evidentiality and their determination on a deictic basis

In the Romance languages, modal adverbials, specific sentence constructions and prosodic means are included along with the modal verbs in the inventory of the ways to express modality. Used in this sense, modality is the expression of the speaker's attitude as evaluation of a fact or circumstance in positive-negative terms (evaluative attitude) or as evaluation of the probability of a fact or circumstance (validative attitude). A further linguistic dimension is added with the coding of the source from which the speaker has gained the information contained in his utterance (from direct visual observation/perception, through linguistic media, conclusion etc.). Specifying (or consciously concealing) the source of information conveyed in an utterance represents a basic communicative strategy which has been studied in linguistics in recent years under the term evidentiality. The linguistic means corresponding to this category, such as adverbials, certain usages of the French *conditionnel* or the Spanish *imperfecto* are termed "evidentials".

Deixis will be utilised in this paper to identify evidential means. The deictic character of evidentiality has already been pointed out in earlier works (e.g. Jakobson 1957, Schlichter 1986, Frawley 1992, Volkmann 2005). Deixis is defined as a specific mechanism of referentialisation, which refers to the context of the utterance and establishes a relationship to ego-hic-nunc. Evidentiality can be understood as a deictic phenomenon in so far as its markers refer to extra-linguistic elements such as the source of knowledge and the participant in the communication process who has access thereto. If the categories of deictic classification of the epistemic field which were suggested by Frawley (1992) are applied (deictic centre: ego or alter, directionality: going away from X or going toward X), four sub-categories will result: (1) going away from ego (inference), (2) going toward ego (scale of visual perception, auditive, other senses), (3) going away from alter (quote, message, rumour), (4) going toward alter (one to all possible conversation partners). Thus, deixis implies a perspectivation from the standpoint of the text producer, which the recipient must reinterpret from his own discursive position. While epistemic modality adds the attitude of the text producer, evidentiality presumes the establishment of a relationship to the source of knowledge by the recipient and thus a judgment of the credibility.

This paper will begin from the premise that there is no clear correlation of linguistic means to (epistemic) modality and to evidentiality in the Romance languages. However, both categories refer to semantic and pragmatic necessities which are manifested in the significance of the corresponding means. This will be demonstrated using examples from French, Spanish, Italian and Portuguese corpora.

Adriënne Heijnen/ Alexandra Kratschmer
Aarhus University

Revelative evidentiality in European Languages: linguistic coding and its anthropological background

This collaboration between an anthropologist (Heijnen) and a linguist (Kratschmer) seeks to establish a first inventory of linguistic markers used in European languages for revelative evidentiality and proposes a typology of these markers (lexical vs. grammatical markers; independent vs. combinatorial markers; diachronic and synchronic semantic aspects; relation to epistemic modality, cfr. Kratschmer 2005, 2006; discourse related conditions of usage).

The term “revelative evidentiality” goes back to R. Jakobson (1957, quoted following Aikhenvald 2004: 345) where it covers the meaning “see in a dream”. We want to use the term “revelative evidentiality” for all information created inside the mind of a subject without direct input from the outside world (as seen from a positivistic view which is not necessarily the one of the experiencing subject, as we will show): besides dreams this also refers to visions/revelations, hallucinations, inspiration/ideas. Our present contribution focuses though uniquely on the linguistic marking of information revealed in dreams. Looking at linguistic markers of this subclass of revelative evidentiality in biblical (Aramaic, Ancient Greek, Latin), Romance (Italian, French, Spanish) and Germanic (Icelandic, Faroese, Dutch, German, Danish) languages, we will show to what extent the linguistic realization of revelative information source marking depends on cultural traditions of conceptualizing dream experiences and on their social function. We will especially focus on the Greek dream conception that has widely influenced European dream conception and linguistic marking of dream telling in general (cfr. Heijnen 2005) and which seems unique among the cultures of the world judging from the linguistic treatment of dream evidentiality as inventorized so far by Aikhenvald (2004: 344-347).

We want to emphasize that we use the concept of “evidentiality” – against Aikhenvald – for all linguistic manifestations of information source marking (lexical markers, grammatical markers vehiculating additional evidential nuances as well as genuine grammaticalized information source markers, amongst which only the latter are given the label “evidentiality” by Aikhenvald 2004: 3ff.).

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press.
- Heijnen, Adriënne (2005). *Dream Sharing in Iceland*. PhD thesis submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, Århus.
- Kratschmer, Alexandra (2005). “Raising- og Small Clause-konstruktioner med italiensk *sembrare/parere*: polyfoni og evidentialitet”. In: *Arbejdsrapporter 3, Sprogligt Polyfoninetwork*. RUC. 101-137.
- Kratschmer, Alexandra (2006). “Che te ne sembra? Semantica e pragmatica delle costruzioni italiane con *sembrare/parere*”. In: *Atti del XVI Congresso dei Romanisti Scandivani, Copenhagen und Roskilde, 24-27 agosto 2005*, <http://www.ruc.dk/isok/skriftserier/XVI-SRK-Pub/MMH/>

Bert Cornillie
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

An interactional approach to evidential and epistemic adverbs in Spanish conversation

In many accounts epistemic and evidential meanings are lumped together as commitment expressions with similar functions. It is said that they show up and, hence, can be interchanged, in the same context. This may be true, but it does not mean that they all have the same discourse function. A closer look at the conversational context indicates that Spanish epistemic and evidential adverbs, though sometimes indeed interchangeable, often serve specific interactional purposes in the process of turn-taking and sequential order. It is my assumption that the meaning of these (and other) expressions is formed through talk-in-interaction.

My analysis is based on a sample of *aparentemente* ‘apparently’, *evidentemente* ‘obviously’, *obviamente* ‘obviously’, *claro* ‘of course’, *supuestamente* ‘supposedly’, *a lo mejor* ‘perhaps’, *igual* ‘perhaps’, *quizá* ‘maybe’. The data come from the *Corpus de conversaciones coloquiales* (100.000 words, Val.es.Co. Valencia) and the conversational section of the *Corpus oral del castellano* (269.500 words, UAM. Madrid).

Looking for alignment is an important element of the discourse organization in which the speaker and the interlocutor(s) are involved. I show that *claro* ‘of course’, *evidentemente* ‘obviously’, *obviamente* ‘obviously’, *a lo mejor* ‘perhaps’ and *igual* ‘perhaps’ tend to be used as “alignment seekers” more often than *aparentemente* ‘apparently’, *supuestamente* ‘supposedly’ and *quizá* ‘maybe’. The former adverbs play a more important role in the discourse organization than the latter ones: they can either appear at the beginning or at the end of a turn. This position allows for handing the turn over to the other participants to evaluate or validate. The other adverbs, by contrast, do not show up at the end of a turn.

From a semantic point of view, the evidential content of the first series of adverbs is little or at least quite vague, which allows for “doing some very routinized interactional work” (Kärkkäinen 2003:183). The other ones are less advanced in the process toward becoming interactional markers, i.e. they are more attached to their original meaning of *aparecer* ‘showing up’, *suponer* ‘suppose’ and *saber* ‘know’ (*quizá* ~ *quien sabe* ‘who knows’).

The analysis crosscuts the traditionally established epistemic and evidential functional categories. It separates the more frequent adverbs from the less frequent ones on the basis of recurrent interactional patterns. By doing so, this paper goes beyond the common focus on what a modal qualification does to the propositional content of an utterance.

Dirk Noël
University of Hong Kong
The English Evidential Nominative and Infinitive Construction

The English nominative and infinitive pattern (or NCI, short for Latin ‘nominativus cum infinitivo’), which consists of a passive utterance, cognition or perception verb followed by a *to*-infinitive, can realize various form-meaning pairings (or ‘constructions’). The pattern can simply be an instantiation of the passive construction, as in (1), where the utterance verb of *are said to* refers to a specific statement made in a text. In (2), on the other hand, there is no explicit reference to a communicative exchange. Here the *is said to* pattern functions as an evidentiality marker, on a par with *reportedly*, used in the second sentence in the example.

- (1) Above Dr. Ravnskov’s findings are dismissed as being out of step with mainstream medicine. Yet here they *are said to* be true. Which is it?
- (2) Amy Winehouse Gets Rap Makeover From Jay-Z
Rapper Shawn ‘Jay-Z’ Carter has reportedly given Amy Winehouse’s song Rehab a hip-hop makeover to help the British soul star break into the mainstream American market. The Def Jam president *is said to* be a big fan of Winehouse’s sultry vocals, and has remixed her single Rehab to make it appeal to a wider audience.

This NCI pattern was mentioned by Chafe (1986) in his comparison of evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. Noël (2001) has argued that from a synchronic point of view the evidential NCI can be construed as a grammaticalization of the passive NCI. Historically, however, the situation in which there was only a passive NCI and no evidential one, which is implicit in the grammaticalization scenario, seems never to have existed, since it is very likely that the evidential NCI was borrowed from Latin. (3) contains an example of the Latin NCI construction it was probably modelled on.

- (3) Nullam caedem Otho maiore laetitia excepisse, nullum caput tam insatiabilibus oculis perlustrasse *dicitur*, ... (Tacitus, *Historiae Liber* 1, 44)
‘Otho is said to have extracted no greater joy from any other murder, and to have scrutinized no (severed) head which such insatiable eyes, ...’

The paper’s conclusions about the genre-specificity of the (evidential) NCI and its entrenchment as a schematic construction will be based on a comparison of quantitative data from the Corpus of Late Modern English Texts and the British National Corpus.

References

- Chafe, Wallace. 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols, eds., *Evidentiality: the linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 261-272.
- Noël, Dirk. 2001. The passive matrices of English infinitival complement clauses: Evidentials on the road to auxiliarihood? *Studies in Language* 25 (2): 255-296.

Mathias Schenner/ Hatice Coskun
ZAS Berlin & Universität Frankfurt am Main
Evidentials in complement clauses: Evidence from Turkish

It has often been argued that evidentials do not contribute to the proposition expressed, but operate on the speech act level: For example, they cannot scope under negation and often fail truth-conditionality tests. However, Ifantidou (2001) demonstrated that evidential adverbials in English do contribute to truth-conditions, using embeddability in the antecedent of conditionals as a test (cf. (1a)). Similar facts hold for German reportative *sollen* ('shall') (cf. (1b)).

- (1) a. If the cook has *allegedly* poisoned the soup, the police should make an inquiry
b. Wenn der Koch die Suppe vergiftet haben *soll*, sollte die Polizei in der Sache ermitteln

If evidentials in at least some languages can have truth-conditional effects, we expect them to be licensed in embedded contexts as well. Surprisingly little research has focused on evidentials in embedded clauses so far.

It has been claimed (cf. e.g. Aikhenvald 2003, 17), that evidentials cannot occur in embedded contexts. We will show that this does not hold in general. For example, the Turkish indirective marker *-miş* often occurs in complements of utterance predicates (e.g. *de-* 'say' in (2a)) or mental state predicates as well as in subject clauses (e.g. of the predicate *iyi* 'good' in (2b)).

- (2) a. Ali de-d-I ki Maria dün iki tiyatro bilet-I satın al-mış
Ali say-PRET-3SG COMP Maria yesterday two theater tickets-3SG buy-INDIR-3SG
'Ali said that Maria (allegedly) bought two theater tickets yesterday'
b. İyi ki Maria dün iki tiyatro bilet-I satın al- mış
good COMP Maria yesterday two theater tickets-3SG buy-INDIR-3SG
'It is good that Maria (allegedly) bought two theater tickets yesterday'

However, the distribution of indirective marking is not completely free in embedded clauses. Two important factors that influence the acceptability of embedded evidentials in Turkish are the choice of the complementizer (*ki* vs. *diye*) and the type of the embedding predicate. For example, the mental state predicate *bil-* 'know, think' allows indirective marking in its complement only if it is headed by the complementizer *diye*, but not if the complementizer *ki* is used.

We will address the following questions in detail, using both corpus data and native speaker acceptability judgments: (a) Which factors influence the acceptability of embedded evidentials? For example, how can the contrast illustrated in (3) be explained? (b) What are the semantic effects of embedding evidentials? In particular, are embedded evidentials speaker-oriented or subject-oriented and are there truth-conditional effects? (c) What implications follow from the embeddability of evidentials for the general picture of evidentiality?

References

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2003), 'Evidentiality in typological perspective', in A. Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Studies in Evidentiality*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1–31.
Ifantidou, E. (2001), *Evidentials and Relevance*, Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Richard J. Whitt
University of California at Berkeley

Evidentiality, polysemy, and perception verbs: a corpus-based analysis of English and German

Both English and German perception verbs evince a broad array of evidential meaning, ranging from first-hand observation to hearsay to inference. Consider the following:

- (1) *Ich höre ihn singen.*
I hear him singing.
- (2) *Ich höre, dass er verrückt ist.*
I hear (that) he's crazy.
- (3) *Ich sehe sie laufen.*
I see her running.
- (4) *Ich sehe, dass sie mich töten will.*
I see (that) she wants to kill me.
- (5) *Ich rieche, dass es Knoblauch in der Suppe gibt.*
I smell (that) there's garlic in the soup.
- (6) *Es riecht nach Skandal.*
It smells like a scandal.

It has often been noted that perception verbs can give rise to evidential meaning (Anderson 1986; Chafe 1986; Willett 1988; Sweetser 1990; Palmer 2001; Aikhenvald 2004). However, an in-depth analysis of evidential meaning among perception verbs has not been carried out, nor has the polysemy that exists among perception verbs (see, for example, Sweetser 1990 or Harm 2000) been linked to the wide-range of evidential meaning that evidential verbs can signify.

My study is a corpus-based analysis of evidential meaning signified by English and German perception verbs from the Early Modern period to the present. I have two goals in mind: I wish to examine the wide range of evidential meaning one finds among perception verbs and link this to the polysemy that exists among non-evidential uses of perception verbs; in addition, I will examine the various types of syntactic environments in which evidential perception appear (e.g. PERCEP VERB + ACCUSATIVE + INFINITIVE, PERCEP VERB + THAT-CLAUSE, etc.), and see if and how this ties in with the broad range of evidential meanings attested by perception verbs. My study also touches on more foundational issues related to evidentiality, i.e. the role of subjectification, personal deixis, and the connection with epistemic modality.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Lloyd B. (1986). "Evidentials, Paths of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically Regular Asymmetries." *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Eds. Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 273-312.
- Chafe, Wallace (1986). "Evidentiality in English Conversation and Academic Writing." Chafe/ Nichols (eds.), 261-272.
- Harm, Volker (2000). *Regularitäten des semantischen Wandels bei Wahrnehmungsverben des Deutschen*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Sweetser, Eve E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willett, Thomas (1988). "A Cross-Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticalization of Evidentiality." *Studies in Language* 12-1, 51-97.

Virginia Hill
University of New Brunswick (SJ)
Adverb grammaticalization as source for evidential markers

On the basis of data from Romanian, this paper argues that adverbs receive an evidential reading only under grammaticalization. The grammaticalization entails a re-analysis of the adverb in the domain of *speech acts* which are syntactically computed to determine the set-up for the utterance.

The empirical data concern adverbs such as *sigur* ‘surely’, *firește* ‘naturally’, which take propositional scope in two configurations: as preverbal (1a) or as preceding a ‘that’ indicative clause (1b).

- (1) a. *Sigur vine la ora cinci.*
Surely comes at hour five// “Of course s/he comes at five o’clock.”
b. *Sigur că vine la ora cinci.*
Surely that comes at hour five// “Of course s/he comes at five o’clock.”

Traditional accounts on (1) (e.g., *Grammatica Academiei* 1967) consider (1a) as a monoclausal structure, and (1b) as a biclausal structure, where the matrix contains a non-lexical copula ‘be’+ adverb predication. Empirically, the account on (1b) fails: the predicative association with ‘be’ works for adjectives but not for adverbs. *Sigur* happens to have identical forms as adjective and as adverb; however, other adverbs of the same class, which differ from their adjectival forms, rule out the ‘be’ predication.

This paper demonstrates that (1b) is also a monoclausal structure, and that the sentential adverb has the properties of a speech act marker as long as it has an evidential reading. Syntactically, the speech act status implies the properties of a non-projecting item that behaves as a functional (versus substantive) category.

The arguments towards the functional status of the evidential adverb in (1) come from syntactic tests showing that:

- *sigur* embeds (versus adjoins to) the ‘that’ clause in (1b) in the absence of a ‘be’;
- *sigur* cannot take modifiers in (1b), although it displays them elsewhere;
- *sigur* may take modifiers in (1a) (e.g., ‘more surely’) but it loses the evidential reading, although it maintains the propositional scope;
- *sigur* in (1b) cannot be replaced with an adverbial PP (e.g., ‘in way sure’), although it freely alternates with such PPs elsewhere;
- *sigur* in (1a) may alternate with an adverbial PP, but it loses its evidential reading.
- any adverb that allows for an evidential reading displays the same properties.

These results indicate that as long as *sigur* has a phrasal status (i.e., a substantive category projecting to AdvP) it cannot have an evidential reading. For the evidential reading to occur, *sigur* must be non-phrasal and it must be merged in a functional head that occurs outside the highest level of the core syntactic structure (i.e., above the complementizer ‘that’). Therefore, only grammaticalization leads to evidentiality.

In conclusion, evidential *sigur* in (1a, b) is the marker of a functional head that “oversees” the syntax, whereas the forms of *sigur* with non-evidential reading are substantive categories inserted in the regular core syntactic structure. The spell-out of ‘that’ in (1) is optional. Cinque (1999) argues that the “overseers” of core syntax are speech act heads which introduce pragmatic features into computation at the interface between discourse and syntax. In this framework, the properties of evidential *sigur* listed above qualify it as a speech act head.

Francis Grossmann/ Agnès Tutin
Université Stendhal, Grenoble III

Evidential markers in French scientific writing: the case of the lexicon of perception

The notion of evidentiality covers all marks signaling what testifies to the validity of the information stated by a speaker or writer. In scientific genres, in which the academic sources of knowledge have to be marked, perception lexicon can be used to express empirical evidence. Several markers (see Dendale 1994) are used in everyday language to express perception evidence (*apparemment, visiblement*), or inferences (*certainement, sûrement*). Some markers can express hearsay (*il paraît que*), but Nølke (1994) has shown that a more precise distributional and semantic analysis will be required to differentiate the uses of *il paraît que, il semble que* (as well as, in our case, *apparemment, visiblement*) which are, like *certainement* or *sûrement*, frequent inference markers.

Our goal is to apply this program to scientific genres, and to examine more complex syntactical and lexical systems expressing the differences between appearance and fact, or assumption and empirical evidence, for instance in concessive structures or sentences with adverbials such as *en fait*, which mark an opposition between appearances and reality (Blumenthal 1996; Grossmann & Wirth, 2007).

Our study will be based on a corpus of French scientific writings in linguistics and economics including theses, reports and scientific articles (about 1.3 million words). Lexico-syntactic patterns of evidentiality will be analysed with the help of the corpus processing tool Nooj built by Silberztein (2004). Evidentiality patterns will be annotated in texts in an interactive way and analyzed in a second step. Beside frequency and distribution of these markers among disciplines and genres, we will observe and compare the linguistic uses and the rhetorical functions of these markers.

In this paper, we will also focus on two questions that specifically relate to evidentiality: (a) What are the main functions of these perception markers in the genre under study, namely the scientific writing? Can we distinguish an attenuation function (since appearance is not reality) and an empirical function (since facts are matter of observation)? If yes, how are these two main functions made manifest (frequency? meaning and use of markers? existence of specific markers?) (b) What is the best theoretical frame for an analysis of these markers? Is the polyphonic approach in the line of ScaPoLine (Nølke) the most appropriate tool for such a study? We will also consider an additional question: (c) Is there a specific use of this sub-category of markers according to the discipline and/or the subgenre (paper or thesis).

References

- Blumenthal, P. (1996). "Le connecteur en fait." In Muller, C. (ed.) *Dépendance et intégration syntaxique. Subordination, coordination, connexion*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 257-269.
- Dendale, P. & Tasmowski, L. (eds) (1994). Les sources du savoir et leurs marques linguistiques, *Langue Française*, 102.
- Grossmann, F. & Wirth, F. (2007). "Marking Evidentiality in Scientific Papers: The Case of Expectation Markers". In K. Fløttum (Ed.), *Language and Discipline Perspectives on Academic Discourse*, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle, UK, 202-218.
- Nølke, H. (1994). La dilution linguistique des responsabilités. Essai de description polyphonique des marqueurs évidentiels *il semble que* et *il paraît que*, *Langue Française*, 102, 84-94.
- Silberztein, M. (2004). "NooJ : an oriented object approach". In Royauté, J. & Silberztein, M. (eds) *INTEX pour la Linguistique et le Traitement Automatique des Langues. Proceedings of the 4th and 5th INTEX workshop*, Bordeaux, mai 2001 et Marseille, mai 2002, Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté.

During the so-called complexation process, complex anaphors condense propositionally structured text segments and establish their referents (events, processes, states) as unified discourse objects (sometimes evaluating them, see (1b,c), cf. Consten/ Knees/ Schwarz-Friesel 2007).

- (1) *Ratzinger has been elected Pope.* (a) *This was just reported on tv.* (b) *This catastrophe was a bad setback for ecumenism.* (c) *This godsend will strengthen the bonds between papacy and theology.*

We investigate complex anaphors as evidential markers in a German newspaper corpus. The anaphoric complexation can be neutral with respect to evidential marking (as in (1a), (4)), confirm it (as in (2)) or change it (as in (3)).

- (2) *Die Sozialdemokraten führen eine Geisterschlacht um die moderne Wirtschaftspolitik. „Die Sozis verstehen nichts vom Geld.“ Dieses (Vor-)Urteil jedenfalls steht schon mal fest.* (TigerKorpus 18199-18201)

In (2), the antecedent is represented by direct speech so that the truth value of the proposition remains unspecified on the text-world level. Due to its lexical properties, the anaphor confirms the unspecified truth value. The antecedent in (3) is a proposition (indirect speech) which is marked as untrue by the lexical meaning of the complex anaphor.

- (3) *Der japanische Minister für Koordination, Takami Eto, ist zurückgetreten. Vor vier Wochen hatte er bei einem Hintergrundgespräch mit Journalisten gesagt, **Japan habe Korea während der Kolonialzeit (von 1910 bis 1945) „einiges Gute“ getan.** Die südkoreanische Zeitung Dong-A zitierte ihn mit der Bemerkung, **es habe in Korea kein Erziehungssystem gegeben, bevor die Japaner gekommen seien. Korea habe Japan zu verdanken, daß es heute so erfolgreich sei.** [...] Ein Sprecher des südkoreanischen Außenministeriums erklärte: „Wir sind geschockt und verärgert über dieses verzerrte Geschichtsbild eines japanischen Politikers.“* (TigerKorpus 22295-22303)

In cases like (4), one needs to differentiate between the intentions of quoted actants and the illocution intended by the author. In such cases, the epistemic status of the referent of the complex anaphor has to be derived from the cotext.

- (4) *Die Beweislage sei gar nicht so dünn, meint Wolfgang Langmack vom LKA. Der Anwalt eines 17jährigen Jungen, der als bisher einziger Verdächtiger von LKA-Beamten vernommen wurde, sieht das anders: „Die haben so gut wie nichts in der Hand.“* (TigerKorpus 203-205)

To sum up: Complex anaphors are means of evidentiality, namely by marking the epistemic status of its referent. In some cases, this marking is overridden by the cotext in the course of the complexation process.