

The argument structure of reportative evidentials

Vesela Simeonova

University of Ottawa

In this paper, I propose that reportative evidentials encode, in the syntax and semantics, the source of the report. The source is realized as a pronoun, following Stephenson (2007). The analysis captures cross-linguistic variation of non-shifting evidential languages.

Two types of evidential no-shift: independent and concord. Evidential shift, a type of indexical shift, occurs in the complements of attitude verbs (Garrett, 2001; Lim and Lee, 2012; Korotkova, 2016). What shifts is the ORIGO - an index representing the holder of the evidential information, from the speaker to the matrix subject. No-shift is understood as simply the case where the origo is the speaker even in embedded clauses, as in (1).

- (1) Maria-ma mitxra [rom bereb-s biblia kartul-ad gadautargmniat]
Maria-ERG tell.1SG.IO.AOR COMP monks-DAT Bible Georgian translate.3PL.S.REP
'Maria told me that - **and I was told that already** - the monks translated the
Bible into Georgian.' [Georgian] Korotkova (2016): (278)

I argue, however, that there are two subtypes of no-shift languages. I call (1) the INDEPENDENT type because the interpretation of the evidential morpheme is that the speaker has the information about the scope proposition from two independent report sources.

The second type of evidential no-shift is what Schenner (2010a) calls CONCORD because the reportative 'does not make any contribution on its own, but only harmonically supports the meaning of the utterance predicate' (Schenner, 2010b: 200). It is exemplified in (2).

- (2) Anna erzählte, dass Bernhard seinen Scheck zurückgeschickt haben *soll*.
Anna said that Bernhard his check send.back have REP
'Anna said that Bernhard sent back his check.' [German] Schenner (2010b): (52b)

While Schenner does not classify (2) in terms of shifting, I claim that concord is a type of no-shift because the origo is the speaker. The crucial difference between the two types of no-shift is whether there are two reports or one. Current proposals on evidential shift postulate a monster operator that triggers origo shift from the speaker to the matrix subject (Korotkova, 2016). But they cannot capture the variation within no-shift shown in (1)-(2).

Analysis. I propose that the source of the report is a syntactically represented pronoun, similar to PRO. It is bound in the concord case and free (arbitrary PRO) in independent no-shift. The analysis rests on three theories. First, I base the idea that the source is a pronoun on Stephenson's (2007) approach to taste predicates (the judge parameter is an argument in the derivation). A parallel between taste predicates and evidentials has already been drawn by (Korotkova, 2016) in that they are both self-ascriptions. Second, I adopt Moulton's 2009 view of the syntax of attitude complements, according to which the complement clause contains a projection that hosts the attitude. I claim that the pronoun is situated in the specifier in this projection. Finally, I propose that the pronoun is a logophor in the concord case, following recent developments on logophors by Pearson (2015). The analysis captures the cross-linguistic variation in (1)-(2) without adding any new machinery.

Consequences and extensions. The proposal contributes to the understanding of propositional attitudes and evidentiality. The source is different from the origo in that the origo exists in all evidentials, but the source only appears in reportatives. Thus, I provide evidence for a divide in the nature of evidentials advocated by Faller (2002) and opposed to by Matthewson et al. (2007), Matthewson (2010), AnderBois (2014), Déchaine et al. (2017).

References

- AnderBois, Scott. 2014. On the exceptional status of reportative evidentials. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 24: 234–254.
- Déchaine, Rose-Marie, Clare Cook, Jeffrey Muehlbauer, and Ryan Waldie. 2017. (De-)constructing evidentiality. *Lingua* 186-187: 21–54. doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2016.10.001.
- Faller, Martina. 2002. *Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Garrett, Edward John. 2001. *Evidentiality and assertion in Tibetan*. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Korotkova, Natalia. 2016. *Heterogeneity and uniformity in the evidential domain*. Ph.D. thesis, UCLA.
- Lim, Dongsik and Chungmin Lee. 2012. Perspective shifts of Korean evidentials and the effect of contexts. In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 22. 26–42.
- Matthewson, Lisa. 2010. On apparently non-modal evidentials. *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics* 8: 333–357.
- Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, and Hotze Rullmann. 2007. Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St’át’imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7.1: 201–254.
- Moulton, Keir. 2009. *Natural selection and the syntax of clausal complementation*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Pearson, Hazel. 2015. The interpretation of the logophoric pronoun in Ewe. *Natural Language Semantics* 23(2): 77–118. doi:10.1007/s11050-015-9112-1.
- Schenner, Mathias. 2010a. Embedded evidentials in German. In *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*, ed. Gabriele Diewald and Elena Smirnova, 157–185. Walter de Gruyter.
- Schenner, Mathias. 2010b. Evidentials in complex sentences: Foundational issues and data from Turkish and German. In *Evidence from Evidentials*, ed. Tyler Peterson and Uli Sauerland, vol. 28 of *The University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics*, 183–220. University of British Columbia.
- Stephenson, Tamina. 2007. Judge dependence, epistemic modals, and predicates of personal taste. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30(4): 487–525.