

## Evidential strategies. Description and explanation

Isabel Pérez Jiménez (Universidad de Alcalá)  
Silvia Gumiol Molina (Universidad de Alcalá) &  
Aoife Ahern (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Keywords: evidentiality; evidential strategies; verb tenses; syntax/semantics-pragmatics interface, first/second language acquisition

The organization and part of the research for this panel is financially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación, EPSILone project, ref. PID2019-104405GB-I00.

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* (Boye 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).

2- by means of non-lexical resources in which content related to the “speaker’s trace” also emerges, for example, by syntactic means: copular structures (evidencial-*estar* in Spanish, Escandell-Vidal & Leonetti 2002, 2015; Escandell-Vidal 2018a,b, Pérez-Jiménez et al. 2018, Gumié et al. 2019, Sánchez Alonso et al. 2016); insubordination structures (Demonte & Fernández Soriano 2005, 2009; de la Mora & Maldonado 2015, Corr 2018); impersonal structures expressing general knowledge evidentiality (Fernández 2008, Hugo 2011, Vilinbakhova 2018), clitic/subject raising structures (Rooryck 2001; Bermúdez 2006). Also, evidentiality is expressed by prosodic means (Escandell-Vidal 1998, 2002, 2017; Estellés-Arguedas 2015; Roseano et al. 2016; Vanrell et al. 2017; among others)

3- by means of the extension of temporal and aspectual categories: conjectural future and conditional (Squartini 2001, 2008; Dendale 2001, Bermúdez 2005; Escandell-Vidal 2010, 2014; among others), evidential-oriented inferential meaning of past tenses (cf. indirect evidence, reportative) (Saussure 2003, 2013; Squartini 2001; Escandell-Vidal & Leonetti 2003; Amenós 2010, 2015; Saussure 2013; Azpiazu 2016), or mirative readings of the pluperfect in some Spanish contact varieties in Latin America (Alcázar 2018).

**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?

### **References:**

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. 2004. Evidentiality. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, A. Y., ed. 2018. The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality. Oxford: OUP.
- Albelda, M. 2015. “Evidentiality in Non-evidential Languages: Are There Evidentials in Spanish?”, *Journal of Pragmatics* 85: 135–137.
- Alcázar, A. 2018. “Dizque and other Emergent Evidential forms in Romance Languages”, in Aikhenvald 2018.
- Amenós Pons, J. 2010. Los tiempos verbales del español y el francés: semántica, pragmática y aprendizaje de E/LE, Doctoral Dissertation. Madrid: UNED.
- Azpiazu, S. 2016. “Evidencialidad en el pretérito perfecto compuesto del español: revisión y propuesta”, in González Ruiz et al., eds., 2016, 303-328.
- Bermúdez, F. W. 2006. “La “subida de clíticos”: modalidad, prominencia y evidencialidad”. *Lexis*, 30:1, 83-115.
- Bermúdez, F. W. 2005. Evidencialidad. La codificación lingüística del punto de vista, Doctoral Dissertation. Department of Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Studies: Stockholm University.
- Boye, K. 2010. “Semantic maps and the identification of cross-linguistic generic categories: Evidentiality and its relation to epistemic modality”, *Linguistic Discovery* 8, 4–22.
- Chafe, W y J. Nichols. 1986. Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology, Hillsdale, N.J: Ablex Publishers.
- Cornillie, B. 2007. Epistemic Modality and Evidentiality in Spanish semi- auxiliaries. A cognitive-functional Approach. Berlin-New-York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Corr, A. 2018. “‘Exclamative’ and ‘quotative’ illocutionary complementisers in Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish”, *Languages in Contrast. International Journal for Contrastive Linguistics*, 181, 69–98.
- de la Mora, J. & R. Maldonado. 2015. “Dizque: Epistemics blurring evidentials in Mexican Spanish”, *J. of Pragmatics* 85, 168–80.

- de Saussure, L. 2003. Temps et pertinence. Eléments de pragmatique cognitive du temps, Bruselas: Duculot.
- de Saussure, L. 2013. “Perspectival interpretations of tenses” in L. de Saussure y K. Jaszczołt, eds. Time: Language, Cognition and Reality, 46-70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DeLancey, S. 1992. The historical status of the conjunct/disjunct pattern in Tibeto-Burman. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 25(1): 39-62.
- Demonte, V. & O. Fernández Soriano. 2005: “Features in comp and syntactic variation: the case of dequeísmo in Spanish”. *Lingua* 115, 1063-1082.
- Demonte, V. & O. Fernández Soriano. 2009. “Force and Finiteness in the Spanish Complementizer System”. *Probus* 211, 23-49.
- Dendale, P. & L. Tasmowski. 2001. “Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions”, *J. of Pragmatics*, 33, 339-348.
- Dendale, P. 2001. “Le futur conjectural versus devoir épistémique: différences de valeur et de restrictions d’emploi”, *Le français moderne* 69, 1–20.
- Diewald, G. & E. Smirnova. 2010. Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European Languages, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Escandell-Vidal, V. 1998. Intonation and procedural encoding: The case of Spanish interrogatives. En V.Rouchota & A. Jucker (Eds.), Current Issues in Relevance Theory (pp. 169–203). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. 2002. Echo-syntax and Metarepresentation. *Lingua*, 112, 871–900.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. 2010. “Futuro y evidencialidad”, *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica*, 26, 9-34.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. 2014. “Evidential Futures: the Case of Spanish”, in P. de Brabanter, M. Kissine y S. Sharifzadeh, Future Tense vs. Future Time: an Introduction, 219–246. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. 2017a. “Evidential commitment and feature mismatch in Spanish *estar* constructions”, *Journal of Pragmatics*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.004>
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. 2018a. “Ser y estar con adjetivos. Afinidad y desajuste de rasgos”, *RSEL*, 48, 57-114.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. 2018b. “Evidential commitment and feature mismatch in Spanish *estar* constructions”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 128, 102-115.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. & M. Leonetti. 2002. “Coercion and the Stage/Individual Distinction”, in J. Gutiérrez Rexach ed.: From Words to Discourse: Trends in Spanish Semantics and Pragmatics. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 159-179.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. & M. Leonetti. 2003. “On the Quotative Readings of Spanish imperfect”, *Cuadernos de Lingüística del Instituto Universitario Ortega y Gasset*, 10, 135-154.
- Escandell, M. V. & M. Leonetti. 2011. “On the rigidity of procedural meaning”, in Escandell, Ahern & Leonetti (eds.). *Procedural Meaning*. Bingley: Emerald. 81-102.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. & M. Leonetti. 2015. “Estar joven a los dos lados del Atlántico”, in I. Arroyo ed., *Homenaje al Prof. René Lenarduzz*, 1-14, Venice: Ca’ Foscari.
- Estellés-Arguedas, M. 2015, “Expressing evidentiality through prosody? Prosodic voicing in reported speech in Spanish colloquial conversations”, en *Journal of Pragmatics* 85, 138-154.
- Fernández, S. S. 2008. “Generalizaciones y evidencialidad en español”, *Revue Romane*, 43 2, 217-234.

- González Ruiz, R., D. Izquierdo Alegría, & Ó. Loureda eds. 2016. *La evidencialidad en español, teoría y descripción*, Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Hugo Rojas, E. 2011. “Las formas de segunda persona singular como estrategias evidenciales”. *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada*, 49(1), pp. 143-167.
- McCready, E. 2015. *Reliability in pragmatics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCready, E., N. Ogata. 2007. “Evidentiality, Modality and Probability”, *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 30 2, 147-206.
- Pérez-Jiménez, I., S. Gumié-Molina & N. Moreno-Quibén. 2018. “Ser y estar en las lenguas romances ibéricas: las oraciones copulativas con atributo adjetival”, *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* 48, 107-151.
- Rooryck, J. 2001. “Evidentiality, Part I”, *GLOT International* 5, 125–33.
- Roseano, P., González, M., Borràs-Comes, J., & Prieto, P. 2016. Communicating epistemic stance: How speech and gesture patterns reflect epistemicity and evidentiality. *Discourse Processes*, 53(3), 135-174.
- Sanchez-Alonso, S., Deo, A., & Piñango, M. 2016. Copula Distinction and Constrained Variability of Copula Use in Iberian and Mexican Spanish. U.Penn Working Papers in Linguistics, 23(1).
- Squartini, M. 2001. “The Internal Structure of Evidentiality in Romance”, *Studies in Language* 25, 297–334.
- Squartini, M. 2004 “La relazione semántica tra futuro e condizionale nelle lingue romanze”, *Revue Romane*, 39:1, 68-96.
- Squartini, M. 2005. “L’evidenzialita` in rumeno e nelle altre lingue romanze”, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 121, 246–268.
- Squartini, M. 2008. “Lexical vs. Grammatical Evidentiality in French and Italian”, *Linguistics* 46 5, 917–947.
- Squartini, M. 2018. “Exgrammatical Expression of Information Source”, in A. Aikhenvald, ed., 2018: cap 14.
- Vanrell, M.M., Armstrong, M., & Prieto, P. 2017. “Experimental evidence for the role of intonation in evidential marking”. *Language and Speech*, 60 (2): 242-259.
- Vilinbakhova, E. 2018. Chto budet, to (i) budet: On one pattern of tautologies in Russian. *Komp’juternaja Lingvistika i Intellektual’nye Tehnologii* 17, 775–790.