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From the seminal work of Chafe and Nichols (1986), to the recent Aikhenvald (ed. 2018), many aspects have been debated with respect to evidentiality. To begin with, there is still no consensus on the definition of the term. From a restricted point of view, evidentiality is understood as a linguistic category that expresses the ‘source of information’ (internal-speaker or external-other) or the ‘type of evidence’/ ‘mode of access to information’ (direct or indirect) that the speaker possesses for their assertion (Aikhenvald 2004, 2018; Albelda 2015, Diewald & Smirnova 2010, a.o). From a different perspective, the notion of evidentiality is understood as overlapping with others like epistemic modality (Dendale & Tasmowski 2001; McCready & Ogata 2007; González Ruiz et al. 2016, a.o.), or even integrated into broader categories such as epistemicity (Boyé 2010), perspectivization (McCready 2015) or stance (Bermúdez 2005, among others). The boundary between evidentiality and mirativity has also been discussed in the literature (DeLancey 2001 among others).

On the other hand, although for many authors evidentiality is a grammatical category limited to languages with specific morphological paradigms encoding information source or mode of access to information (Diewald & Smirnova 2010, Aikhenvald 2018), others defend that the full understanding of this linguistic domain requires the study of languages that express evidentiality by other linguistic means: the so-called languages with evidential strategies (cf. to illustrate, from different theoretical frameworks, Cornillie 2007; Squartini, in all his works).

Languages with evidential strategies—most European—express the mode of access or source of the information on which the speaker bases the content of their assertions in three ways:
1- by means of lexical-conceptual resources, such as discourse markers or sentential adverbs, or by way of compositional means, combining lexically expressed concepts (verbs of speech and perception, verbs of belief or the verb *parecer* ‘seem’ for Spanish; lexical-conceptual resources will not be the focus of this workshop).


The general goal of this panel is to host talks that bring up problems related to when, and under what conditions, languages that lack grammaticalized evidential paradigms use grammatical mechanisms (i.e., non-lexical means, characterized by non-cancellability and by not being context-dependent) to systematically convey evidential meaning.

This panel aims to bring together talks that revolve around four general research questions

1) In what form is evidentiality represented in grammar? Or, in other words, what is the place of evidentiality in the grammars of languages that lack evidential paradigms? Syntax, compositional semantics (propositional or non-propositional meaning), pragmatics? Is evidentiality an interface phenomenon between linguistic components?
2) To what extent is evidentiality a specific and uniform category in languages without grammaticalized evidentials? What are the limits with other notions such as modality or mirativity? Is it a semantic primitive, or is it the result of the interaction of other more basic features (like, for example, learning time)? What primitive theoretical notions are needed to account for the observed phenomena? Is it necessary to refer to more specific sub-classes of evidentiality using concepts such as perspectivization or subjectivization?

3) What relationships exist between evidential and non-evidential interpretations associated with a single linguistic unit or mechanism? Could there be a single basic and undetermined meaning that is further specified in a compositional way? And, if so, what are the conditions and requirements necessary to obtain the evidential interpretations?

4) In consideration of cross-linguistic contrasts in the means for encoding evidential meaning, what can data on the native and non-native speaker’s understanding and production of evidential meaning contribute to the understanding of the previous questions?
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