INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EVIDENTIALITY AND MODALITY ICEM'18

Madrid 19-22 September 2018
Department of English Studies
Facultad de Filología
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Organising Committee

Marta CARRETERO (Chair)
Elena DOMÍNGUEZ ROMERO (Secretary)
M. Victoria MARTÍN DE LA ROSA (Treasurer)
Jorge ARÚS HITA
Yolanda BERDASCO GANCEDO
Karlos CID ABASOLO
Anita HANEY
Laura HIDALGO DOWNING
Julia LAVID
Carmen MAÍZ ARÉVALO
Juana I. MARÍN ARRESE
M. Ángeles MARTÍNEZ
Alfonso SÁNCHEZ MOYA
Sarah SCHLEMMER
Juan Rafael ZAMORANO MANSILLA

Scientific Committee

Karin Aijmer
(University of Göteborg)

Laura Alba Juez
(UNED)

Francisco Alonso Almeida
(Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canarias)

Marta Albelda
(Universitat de València)

Marisa Blanco
(Universidad Rey Juan Carlos)

Jill Bowie
(University College London)

Frank Brisard
(University of Antwerp)

Piotr Cap
(University of Lodz)

María Luisa Carrió Pastor
(Universidad Politécnica de Valencia)

Peter Collins
(University of New South Wales)

Nicole Delbecque
(Katholieke Universiteit Leuven)

Patrick Dendale
(Universiteit Antwerpen)

Ilse Depraetere
(Lille III University)

Angela Downing
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Laura Filardo-Llamas
(Universidad de Valladolid)

Ad Foolen
(Radboud University Nijmegen)

Gaëtanelle Gilquin
(Université Catholique de Louvain)

Sonia Gómez-Jordana
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Montserrat González
(Universitat Pompeu Fabra)

Mercedes González Vázquez
(Universidade de Vigo)

Laura Hidalgo Downing
(Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)

Dámaso Izquierdo Alegría
(Universidad de Navarra)

Dorota Kotwica
(Universitat de València)

Julia Lavid
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

María José López Couso
(Universidad de Santiago de Compostela)

Lucía Loureiro-Porto
(Universitat de les Illes Balears)

Juana I. Marín Arrese
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Javier Martín Arista
(Universidad de La Rioja)

Elena Martínez Caro
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

María Ángeles Martínez Martínez
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Belén Méndez Naya
(Universidad de Santiago de Compostela)

Tanja Mortelmans

(Antwerp University)

Nicole Nau
(Uniwersytet im.
Adama Mickiewicza)

Dirk Noël
(The University of
Hong Kong)

Begoña Núñez
Perucha
(Universidad
Complutense de
Madrid)

Ignacio Palacios
(Universidad de
Santiago de
Compostela)

María Pérez Blanco
(Universidad de León)

Paola Pietrandrea
(Université François
Rabelais de Tours &
CNRS LLL)

Vladimir Plungian
(Institute of
Linguistics, Russian
Academy of Sciences)

Rosa Rabadán
(Universidad de León)

Amalia Rodríguez
Somolinos
(Universidad
Complutense de
Madrid)

Jesús Romero Trillo
(Universidad
Autónoma de Madrid)

Anna Ruskan
(Vilnius University)

Louis de Saussure
(Université de
Neuchâtel)

Andreu Sentí
(Universitat de
València)

Anne-Marie Simon-
Vandenbergen
(University of Ghent)

Jolanta Šinkūnienė
(Vilnius University)

Augusto Soares da
Silva
(Universidad Católica
Portuguesa)

Anna Socka
(University of Gdansk)

Audronė Šolienė

(Vilnius University)
Katerina Stathi
(University of
Hanover)

Miriam Thegel
(University of
Uppsala)

Anastasios Tsangalidis
(Aristotle University of
Thessaloniki)

Aurelija Usoniene
(Vilnius University)

Johan van der Auwera
(University of
Antwerp)

An Van linden
(University of Leuven)

Björn Wiemer
(Universität Mainz)

Christopher Williams
(University of Foggia -
ESP)

Astrid De Wit
(University of
Antwerp)

Debra Ziegeler
(Université Sorbonne-
Nouvelle Paris 3)

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

4

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EVIDENTIALITY AND MODALITY ICEM'18

ICEM'18

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EVIDENTIALITY AND MODALITY 2018

19-22 SEPTEMBER 2018
FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA
UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID

Book of abstracts

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

5

Index

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

6

Plenary speakers

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

7

Kasper BOYE
University of Copenhagen
boye@hum.ku.dk

Criteria of evidentiality – abstract – longer

Anderson (1986: 274-275) defined archetypical evidentials as expressions that ...

a. show the kind of justification for a factual claim which is available to the person making that claim [...].

b. are not themselves the main predication of the clause, but are rather a specification added to a factual claim about something else.

c. have the indication of evidence [...] as their primary meaning, not only as a pragmatic inference.

d. are inflections, clitics, or other free syntactic elements (not compounds or derivational forms).

Several aspects of Anderson's definition have been challenged in the literature, and the ones that haven't been challenged can be challenged. However, whether Anderson's definition was spot on or not, it is a good point of departure because it covers central issues of what it means to be evidential, and what it means to be a category or a member of one.

In my talk I will discuss the five (not only four) issues referred to in Anderson's definition: 1) the conceptual domain covered by evidential expressions, 2) the scope of evidential expressions, 3) how evidentiality is expressed, 4) the discourse prominence of evidential expressions, and 5) the conventionalization of evidential expressions. I will outline different positions on each of these issues, and discuss whether one position is preferable, and to which extend it makes sense to address it in a definition of evidentiality.

Reference

Anderson, Lloyd B. 1986. 'Evidentials, paths of change, and mental maps: Typologically regular asymmetries', pp. 273-312 of *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, edited by Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols. Norwood: Ablex.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

8

Gabriele DIEWALD
University of Hannover
gabriele.diewald@germanistik.uni-hannover.de

Exploring the borderlands between subjective and objective modality and inferential evidentiality

The discussion on the delimitations of the domains of epistemic modality and inferential evidentiality are not just of a terminological nature, but pertain to fundamental conceptual considerations as to the structure and interrelations of those domains. The presentation aims at "drawing the lines", i.e. sketching the distinction between (i) epistemicity and evidentiality, (ii) subjective and objective modality, and (iii) objective modality and inferential evidentiality, on the one hand, and "dissolving the boundaries", i.e. identifying their connections on the other hand. It is assumed that the relevant features are found in the respective combinations of relational structures expressed and, in particular, in the configuration of the modal/evidential source.

Selected References

Diewald, Gabriele. 1999. Die Modalverben im Deutschen. Grammatikalisierung und Polyfunktionalität. Tübingen: Niemeyer (Reihe Germanistische Linguistik 208).

Diewald, Gabriele und Elena Smirnova. 2010. Evidentiality in German. Linguistic Realization and Regularities in Grammaticalization. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 228).

Hundt, Markus. 2003. "Zum Verhältnis von epistemischer und nicht-epistemischer Modalität im Deutschen." In: ZGL 31, 343-381.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. 2 vol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Mortelmans, Tanja. 2000. "On the evidential nature of the epistemic use of the German modals *müssen* and *sollen*." In: *Modal verbs in Germanic and Romance languages.* Johan Van der Auwera and Patrick Dendale (eds.). Amsterdam: Benjamins, 131-148.

Palmer, Frank Robert. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plungian, Vladimir A. 2001. The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 3: 349-357.

Willet, Thomas. 1988. "A Cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality." *Studies in Language* 12, 51-97.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

9

Nicolas TOURNADRE
University of Aix-Marseille
nicolas.tournadre@univ-amu.fr

Specific features of complex Evidential-Epistemic systems and 'Situational grammars'

The aim of this talk is to show some specific features of complex Evidential-Epistemic systems which are usually not found in binary systems or more simple systems. In particular, complex E-E systems may exhibit the following properties: astonishing flexibility, empathy and related anticipation strategies, strong interactions between epistemic modalities and evidentials, double E-E marking within one sentence and sensitivity to discourse genres. These properties are either absent or less salient in simple E-E systems. In the case of complex E-E systems, the notion of 'situational grammar' could be relevant and useful. This talk will be illustrated with categories and examples from two language families, the Tibetic and Iranic languages, which are genetically and typologically diverse.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

10

General session papers
(in alphabetical order)

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

11

Francisco José ÁLVAREZ GIL
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

francisco.alvarez@ulpgc.es

An analysis of adverbial devices in English History Texts

In the present paper the evidential adverbs certainly, evidently and obviously as stancetaking devices are analysed. For this, I have selected a corpus of history texts from the Modern English period (1700-1900), as compiled in The Corpus of History English Texts, a subcorpus within the Coruña Corpus of English Scientific Writing. Although manual inspection has been employed to analyse the pragmatic functions of these evidential adverbs, they have previously examined using computerised corpus tools. The adverbial devices explored in this paper are said to express authorial stance and to communicate the author's commitment or detachment towards the information presented, and so they are classified as epistemic adverbs. I have decided to choose adverbials as the target linguistic devices of my analysis because they are usually considered as one of the grammatical categories that most clearly contribute to the expression of interpersonal meanings (Biber and Finegan 1988).

From a diachronic perspective even if much research is still to be done in academic texts, there exist some relevant studies on stance devices carried out within the arena of historical pragmatics (cf. Gray et al. 2011). Following this tradition, I focus on the adverbs certainly, evidently and obviously as examples of a stancetaking feature to evaluate how this form signals authorial position. The findings suggest that, in the scientific articles from the historical discipline, those adverbs are used with differing pragmatic functions, e.g. strengthening a claim. In my assessment of instances, I also consider the context in which these forms appear. This means especially the syntactic context, since it has some important effects on the pragmatics of these and other adverbs, as I have shown elsewhere (Álvarez-Gil 2017).

References

Aijmer, Karin. 1980. Evidence and the declarative sentence. Stockholm: AlmquistWiksell. Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. Evidentiality. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alonso-Almeida, Francisco. 2015. Introduction to stance language. Research in Corpus Linguistics 3: 1-5.

Álvarez-Gil, F. J. Apparently, fairly and possibly in The Corpus of Modern English History Texts (1700-1900). In F. Alonso-Almeida (ed.). In Stancetaking in Late Modern English Scientific Writing. Evidence from the Coruña Corpus. Collección Scientia [Applied Linguistics]. Valencia: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad Politécnica de Valencia. 93-109.

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1988. Adverbial stance types in English. Discourse Processes 11.1, 1-34.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan. 1999. Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Essex: Longman.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

12

Chafe, Wallace 1986. Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In Evidentiality and the linguistic coding of epistemology, eds. W. L. Chafe and J. Nichols, 261–272. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Carretero, Marta. 2002. The influence of genre on epistemic modality. Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense 10, 11-41.

Conrad, Susan and Douglas Biber. 1999. Adverbial stance marking in speech and writing. In Susan Hunston and Geoff Thompson (ed.). Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 56-73.

Cornillie, Bert. 2009. Evidentiality and epistemic modality. On the close relationship between two different categories. Functions of Language 16.1, 44-62.

Crespo, B. and I. Moskowich. 2015. "A Corpus of History Texts (CHET) as part of the Coruña Corpus Project" in Proceedings of the international scientific conference. St. Petersburgh State University, 14-23.

Dendale, Patrick and Liliane Tasmowski. 2001. Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions. Journal of Pragmatics 33, 339-348.

Diewald, G., M. Kresic and E. Smirnova. 2009. "The grammaticalization channels of evidentials and modal particles in German: Integration in textual structures as a common feature" in Hansen, M.M. and Visconti J. (eds.) Current Trends in Diachronic Semantics and Pragmatics. UK: Emerald, 189-209.

Gray, B., Douglas, B. and T. Hiltunen. 2011. The expression of stance (1665-1712) in early publications of the Philosophical Transactions and other contemporary medical prose: Innovations in a pioneering discourse. In Irma Taavitsainen and Päivi Pahta (eds.). Medical writing in Early Modern English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 221-247.

Hoye, Leo. 1997. Adverbs and modality in English. London: Longman.

Hyland, Ken. 2005. Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. Discourse Studies 7(2): 173–192.

Marín-Arrese, J.I.; Carretero, M., Arús Hita, J. & van der Auwera, J. 2013. English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie and Karin Aijmer. 2007. The semantic field of modal certainty. A corpus-based study of English adverbs. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Taavitsainen, I. and Pahta, P. 1997. "Corpus of early English medical writing 1375-1550" in ICAME Journal 21, 71-78.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

13

José AMENÓS PONS
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
jamenos@ucm.es

Evidentiality in the romance future: L1/L2 Spanish and French

In this talk, we will focus on the L2 acquisition of the Spanish morphological future (M-FUT) by adult speakers of L1 French, and on the consequences of our results for the description of the divergent cross-linguistic properties of the M-FUT.

Current analyses of Romance tenses claim that evidentiality has become the main feature of the Spanish M-FUT (Escandell 2010, 2014), which marks the propositional content as information obtained inferentially by the speaker, even in seemingly neutral contexts such as (4); while the periphrastic future (P-FUT) is increasingly used to express chronology (3) (Squartini 2001; Cartagena 2017; Azzopardi 2017). Yet this evolution has not taken place in other Romance varieties, such as French (Barceló, 2007; Abouda and Skrovec 2006, 2015). The French M-FUT can have epistemic readings, but they are more restricted than in Spanish, and are derived by means of pragmatic enrichment processes (Saussure, 2013): conjectural readings like (1) below are possible, but concessive constructions in M-FUT, equivalent to (2), are ungrammatical.

We offer data on the acquisition of the Spanish M-FUT by L1 French speakers (at two different proficiency levels, from intermediate to advanced, N = 30 per level), and a control group of L1 European Spanish speakers (N = 30), from three online interpretation tasks of M-FUT and P-FUT under conditions inducing chronological or evidential readings. Additionally, we examine the results of a follow-up, L1 Spanish speaker oral production task (N = 20), intended to elicit spontaneous future tense uses.

If evidentiality is at the core of the Spanish M-FUT, no interface-related properties are systematically involved in the evidential interpretation of the tense by L1 speakers. Contrarily (and assuming transfer), interpreting evidential content will require grammar-pragmatics interface integration processes for L1 French speakers. Thus, based on the predictions of the Feature re-assembly hypothesis (Lardiere 2008, 2009), a significant degree of inconsistency is expected in the L2 data, while variability is less likely to appear in L1 Spanish.

The online (written) interpretation tasks did not show statistically significant differences ($p > .05$) between L1 Spanish and L2 French speakers, with items expressing future time reference. Only hypothetical and concessive environments showed differing patterns: the L1 Spanish speakers almost systematically chose M-FUT; L1 French speakers often choose lexico-syntactic devices to express hypothetical and concessive content in the L2.

Feature re-assembly was concluded to be a potential source of optionality in L2 acquisition, even at intermediate and advanced levels. However, more research was needed to empirically ascertain the claims of the evidential future hypothesis (Escandell 2010, 2014).

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

14

To shed light on this issue, we interviewed and tape-recorded twenty speakers of European Spanish, responding to open questions priming the description of future plans and events (5), and hypotheses on causes and developments of forthcoming and past events ((6) and (7)). If the answers spontaneously given by speakers displayed a significant preference of P-FUT in the former case, and of M-FUT in the latter, this would clearly favour the evidential future hypothesis.

EXAMPLES

(1) María no ha venido. Estará enferma…

María hasn't come. She must be ill (M-FUT)

(2) A: Jorge es muy listo.

B: Será muy listo, pero no lo parece.
A: Jorge is very clever.
B: He may be (M-FUT) very clever, but he doesn't seem like it.

(3) Creo que no va a venir.

I think s/he is not going to come. (P-FUT).

(4) Se lo traerá.

S/he will bring (M-FUT) it to him/her.

(5) Estás en tu último año de estudios. ¿Qué proyectos tienes para el año que viene?

You're in the final year of your studies. What are your plans for next year?

(6) Parece que más de la mitad de europeos siguen pensando que el sitio de la mujer es el hogar. ¿Crees que esa idea puede cambiar pronto? ¿Qué evolución prevés tú para esta situación?

It seems that more than half of European citizens still think that a woman's place is in the home. Do you think this idea will change soon? How do you think this situation will evolve?

(7) En los últimos años, en diferentes países, están surgiendo partidos alternativos, que no están de acuerdo con el sistema político. ¿A qué crees que se debe esta tendencia?

In recent years and different countries, alternative political parties are appearing, who don't agree with the political system. What do you think is causing this tendency?

References

Abouda, L. & Skrovec, M. (2006). 'Le futur des langues romanes et la modalité : monosémie et dialogisme', *Cahiers de Praxématique* 47, 177-190.

Abouda, L. & Skrovec, M. (2015). Du rapport entre formes synthétique et analytique du futur. Étude de la variable modale dans un corpus oral micro-diachronique, *Révue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* 38, 35-57.

Azzopardi, S. (2017). 'Le futur est-il un marqueur modal ? Analyse du fonctionnement du futur à effet de sens « conjectural » en français et en espagnol', in Baranzini, L. (ed.). *Le futur dans les langues romaines.* Berna : Peter Lang, 79-104.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

15

Barceló, G.J. (2007). 'Le(s) futur(s) dans les langues romanes : evolution linéaire ou cyclique?', *Cahiers Chronos* 16, 47-62.

Cartagena, N. (2017). 'Grammaire, sémantique et pragmatique des temps du futur en espagnol', in Baranzini, L. (ed.). *Le futur dans les langues romaines.* Berna : Peter Lang, 105-132

Escandell-Vidal, V. (2010). 'Futuro y evidencialidad', *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica,* XXVI: 9-34.

Escandell-Vidal, V., Leonetti, M. & Ahern, A. (eds.) (2011). *Procedural Meaning. Problems and Perspectives.* Bingley: Emerald.

Escandell-Vidal, V. (2014). 'Evidential futures: The case of Spanish', in P. De Brabanter, M. Kissine & S. Sharifzadeh (eds.). *Future times, future tenses.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 219-246.

Moeschler, J. (1994). 'Anaphore et déixis temporelles. Sémantique et pragmatique de la référence temporelle', in J. Moeschler et al.: *Langage et pertinence. Référence temporelle, anaphore, connecteurs et métaphore*. Nancy, Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 39-105.

Saussure, L. de (2003). *Temps et pertinence. Éléments de pragmatique cognitive du temps.* Bruxelles: De Boeck / Duculot.

Squartini, M. (2001). 'The internal structure of evidentiality in Romance', *Studies in Language* 25(2): 297-334.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

16

Anne-Laure BESNARD
Université Rennes 2
anne-laure.besnard@univ-rennes2.fr

BE set to **and modality: A corpus-based study**

The goal of this paper is to question the limits of modality as a semantic category in present-day British English via a case study of the uses of *BE set to* which are illustrated below:

(1) *Other polls suggest that the Greens **are set to** double their 6 per cent of last time round.* (In2009)

(2) *A Government guarantee for bonds backed by mortgages and other types of loan **is set to** be announced by Alistair Darling, the Chancellor.* (In2009)

(3) *Ofcom announced in June that it **was set to** force Sky to offer its premium broadcasting — including sports and Hollywood movies — to rivals including Virgin and BT at cheaper wholesale prices.* (In2009)

These examples, which were taken from a 620-million-word newspaper corpus[1], are representative of the different values generally attributed to *BE set to* by dictionaries: likely future event in (1); planned future event in (2); subject determination in (3).

In light of these possible interpretations and of the formal properties of the construction, which resembles structures like *BE likely to* or *BE bound to*, *BE set to* might be characterized as a 'quasi-modal', that is as belonging to 'a somewhat loosely-defined grouping formally distinguishable from, but semantically similar to, the modal auxiliaries' (Collins 2009). Yet the term 'quasi-modal' remains rather elusive as the semantics of such periphrastic expressions have been the object of very little research. I will thus contribute to the clarification of the modal degree of 'quasi-modals' by providing a mostly qualitative analysis of *BE set to* within the framework of the Theory of Predicative and Enunciative Operations (Culioli 1990).

With about 40 occurrences per million words in *The Independent* 2009, this structure is definitely not the most frequent BE X TO quasi-modal but still deserves attention considering how its uses have spread (+ 150 % between 1992 and 2009). Moreover, just like *BE likely to* or *BE expected to* (Besnard 2017), it is much more frequent in newspaper discourse than in other registers (Biber et al. 1999). Consequently, clarifying the relationship between the meaning of *BE set to* and epistemic modality in particular should help us better understand the function fulfilled by such expressions and explain their preferential use in news texts.

Taking into account the syntax, semantics and pragmatics of *BE set to*, I will highlight the respective contribution of *BE*, *set* and *to* to the operating mode of the construction as a whole. I will show that it shares notional properties with causation markers and that, as such, it expresses a form of necessity. However, I will conclude that being anchored in the propositional content of the utterance, *BE set to* — as other BE X TO structures — is intrinsically factual, and indeed not really modal.

---

[1] Digital edition of *The Independent* (1992-2009) collected by Catherine Collin, University of Nantes.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

17

References

Besnard, Anne-Laure. 2017. '*BE likely to* and *BE expected to*, epistemic modality or evidentiality? Markers of (non)commitment in newspaper discourse'. In *Evidentiality Revisited: Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse-Pragmatic Perspectives*, edited by Juana I. Marín-Arrese, Gerda Haßler, and Marta Carretero, 249–69. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. New York: Longman.

Collins, Peter. 2009. *Modals and Quasi-Modals in English*. Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi.

Culioli, Antoine. 1990. *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation (Tome 1) : Opérations et représentations*. Gap: Ophrys.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

18

Katherine BOLANOS
The University of Texas at Austin & Instituto Caro y Cuervo

kbolanos@austin.utexas.edu , katherine.bolanos@caroycuervo.gov.co

Contact induced categories. A case study of evidentiality in Kakua (ISO code: cbv)

In this presentation I shall examine the strategic development of a complex evidentiality system in Kakua, a Kakua-Nukak language (see Epps & Bolanos 2017) spoken in the multilingual area of the Vaupés, in Northwest Amazonia, Eastern Colombia.

The data shown in this presentation comes from my own notes of field work among the Kakua people. With this data I will show that Kakua has two diachronic stages of the development of its evidential categories: an older stage which distinguishes between the visual unmarked category and the morphological marking of firsthand and secondhand information. In a more recent stage, the simpler three-way evidentiality distinction evolved into a more complex one adding distinctions between reported, inferred and assumed categories.

I will argue that Kakua's development of a three-way evidentiality distinction into a much more complex six-way distinction responds to a contact driven expansion of the evidentiality categories present in most of Kakua's neighboring languages, motivating the fitting of Kakua into the Vaupés linguistic profile.

The evidence for this argument comes primarily from the morphophonological complexity and the grammatical behavior of the older versus the newer evidential markers.

Kakua's neighbors, speakers of Eastern Tucanoan (ET) languages, have been described as being mostly suffixing languages, marking their complex evidentiality distinctions as verbal suffixes (cf. Barnes 1999). Kakua, like its neighboring ET languages, also has means of marking evidentiality by post-stem elements (enclitics). I will argue that because of the syntactic position and the morphemic realization of the encliticized evidential markers in Kakua (and the etymological transparency for one of these), they correspond to a set of newly developed grammatical categories of evidentials, driven primarily by Kakua's contact with ET languages.

Compare Kakua's newly developed evidential markers in (1) below, to one from an ET language in (2):

(1)   Kakua: 'reported' evidential suffix marking
kun-dé=di?   wi?-kan=ka   nih=na=wɨt=hi
        hɨw?-ɲi?

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

19

there-relative=OBJ   come-stop   not.exist-NEG-ASS
     say=DECL=REP.EVID=REM.PST

'(they) arrived and stood somewhere like there and said "they are not here"' (lit. like there they came and stopped and said no one is here)

(2)   Tucano: reported (Ramirez 1997) yɨ'ɨ utî-a-pa'do
1SGcry-REC.PAST-REPORT_other_people

'(they say) that I cried' (I don't remember because I was drunk)

Silverwood-Cope (1972) documents a strong history of an unbalanced contact relationship between Kakua and its ET neighbors. The nature of such contact history, together with evidence from languages of the area that have also been described as having developed new evidentiality distinctions (c.f. Aikhenvald 2002:117-129, on the diffusion of evidentiality categories in Tariana) can serve as an argument for proposing that some of the evidentiality distinctions in Kakua have been developed through contact with languages in the area.

In addition to the parallels between evidential categories in Tukanoan languages and Kakua, my argument for diffusion of such evidential categories into Kakua is supported by the lack of such categories in Kakua's sister language Nukak, spoken outside of the Vaupes area. I will show comparative data of Kakua and Nukak.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2002. *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford University Press.

Barnes, Janet. 1999. "Tucano" In *The Amazonian Languages*, R. M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Aikhenvald (eds.), 207-226. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Epps, Patience & Katherine Bolanos. 2017. *Reconsidering the Maku language family of Northwest Amazonia*. International Journal of American Linguistics. vol. 83, no. 3. Pp 467-507.

Silverwood-Cope, Peter. 1972. *A Contribution to the Ethnography of the Colombian Maku*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Cambridge.

Stenzel, Kristine. 2004. *A reference grammar of Wanano*. Ph. D. dissertation. University of Colorado

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

20

María Luisa CARRIÓ PASTOR

Universitat Politècnica de València
lcarrio@idm.upv.es

Direct vs. indirect evidentiality in academic English: a contrastive study of engineering and linguistics research papers

Academic papers published in journals reflect the social self-image of writers and their own perceptions of reality. As an example, evidential lexical items show the encoding of an utterance by the indication of the source of the information contained in the proposition (Aikhenvald 2004: 3), i.e. "the kind of evidence a person has for making factual claims" (Anderson 1982: 273). It should be taken into account, on the one hand, that direct evidentials are used when academic writers have some sort of direct evidence for the action they describe. On the other hand, indirect evidentials indicate that the writer was not a witness to the event and they are divided into the categories of inference and reportative (Marín-Arrese 2011, 2015). Thus, the hypothesis of this paper was that writers who belong to different specific fields of knowledge use dissimilar evidential markers in English when they communicate their findings in research papers. In this sense, the general objective of this paper was to determine the differences in the use of direct evidentiality and indirect evidentiality in academic discourse when written by researchers with different specific fields of knowledge. The first specific objective was to identify the specific lexical items used in engineering and linguistics research papers and the second specific objective was to identify the phraseological patterns associated to both categories of evidential devices. The method was based on a corpus-approach and thus, thirty English academic papers belonging to the field of engineering and thirty from the domain of linguistics were compiled. The evidential devices were identified and classified into direct and indirect. The devices were contrasted to determine the quantitative difference in the use of evidential lexical units. Their phraseological patterns were also identified and examples were discussed to determine if writers adapted to the specific field of knowledge and to the expected readers. The corpus was processed with the tool METOOL developed as part of the research project FFI2016-77941-P (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Spain). The results showed that there are differences in the evidential devices and in the phraseological units used in engineering and linguistics research papers. The conclusions of this study focus on the phraseological patterns and in the most outstanding differences identified in the use of direct and indirect evidential devices in academic English.

References

Aikhenwald, Alexandra (2004). *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

21

Anderson, Lloyd B. (1982). Evidentials, Paths of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically regular Asymmetries. In: Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.). *Evidentiality: The linguistic encoding of epistemology*. Norwood: Ablex, 273-312.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (2011). Epistemic legitimizing strategies, commitment and accountability in discourse. *Discourse Studies* 13, 789–797.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. (2015). Epistemic stance: A cross-linguistic study of epistemic stance strategies in journalistic discourse in English and Spanish. *Discourse Studies* 17.2, 210-225.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

22

Agnès CELLE
Université Paris Diderot
Marie Curie fellow at Colorado University
agnes.celle@univ-paris-diderot.fr

On conjectural questions

This paper focuses on conjectural questions in conditional sentences in French. The so-called "conjectural conditional" (Dendale 2010, Haillet 2001, Tasmowski 2001) appears in polar questions that are marked by subject-verb inversion although they are reported to have the force of an assertion. The conditional conveys a positive bias that disallows a *yes*- or *no*-answer.

(1) Elle était profondément étonnée. **Aurais-je** de l'amour pour Julien ? se dit-elle enfin. […] (Stendhal, *Le Rouge et le Noir*)

She was deeply amazed. Can it be that I'm in love with Julien? she said to herself at last.

In (1), a conjecture is put forward. As argued by Diller 1977, a presupposition based on perceptual evidence is superimposed on the interrogative. As a result, the speaker knows the answer and the force of the interrogative clause is reduced. Perceptual evidence allows the speaker to infer that p is true, although p runs counter to her expectations. As unexpected as it may be, this evidence supports the truth of p ("being in love"). While acknowledging that this presupposition of evidence reduces the interrogative force, I argue that this does not allow equating conjectural questions with assertions. Conjectural questions are shown to be a sub-type of rhetorical questions (see Caponigro and Sprouse 2007) as both speaker and addressee know the answer. Like any other rhetorical questions, they seek a commitment update.

The presupposition has to be related to perceptual evidence and the inferential meaning arises from the interrogative structure. This can be described by the following paraphrases: "Can I conclude on the basis of perceptual evidence that p is true? Can I conclude that p (*being in love*) is the cause of q (*my state of agitation*)?" By contrast, the conditional used in an intonation question with a declarative structure is reported not to be inferential (Dendale 2010: 305), but to be related to reportative evidence. I claim that unexpected linguistic information is taken as a premise in an inferential process of a different nature:

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

23

(2)   Quoi! Vous **iriez dire** à la vieille Emilie qu'à son âge il sied mal de faire la jolie
[…] ?
(Molière, *Le Misanthrope*)
What ? Would you go and tell old Emilia that it ill becomes her to set up for a beauty
at her age?

The aim of the declarative question is not to determine the putative *cause* of
unexpected evidence, which explains why intonation questions are generally not
taken as conjectural. However, in such a declarative question, the speaker seeks
confirmation of their inference about the (possibly absurd) prospective *consequences* of
the addressee's preceding discourse. In (2) the addressee has just argued that one
should always speak one's mind and be upfront. The inference can be paraphrased
as follows: "So p entails q. Do you confirm q?" By showing how absurd the
consequence of p is, the speaker is in fact attempting to undermine the legitimacy of
p (always being upfront).

Word-order in these two types of conjectural questions reflects two different types of
inference. This demonstration has important theoretical implications. Contra
Dendale (2010), I argue that (possibly surprising) reportative evidence is used as a
premise with the conditional. This allows unifying conjectural uses of the
conditional, including in declarative clauses as in the following example:

(3)   Quoi, **j'aimerais**, se disait-elle, **j'aurais** de l'amour! Moi, femme mariée, je
serais amoureuse ! (Stendhal, *Le Rouge et le Noir*)
What ! she said to herself. Can I love him, feel love for him? Can I, a married woman,
have fallen in love?

(4)   Nous nous sommes mariés pour donner un foyer à Dylan, mais à t'entendre,
je **serais** encore épris de Dana. Ce qui n'est pas le cas, je te l'assure !
We married to give Dylan a home, but according to you, I am still in love with Dana.
Which is not the case, I can assure you!

I argue that the conditional is inferential in nature, including in its reportative use
((2), (4)). In sum, by uncovering the link between evidentiality, mirativity and
interrogativity, this paper proposes a definition of conjectural questions. This also
allows for a unified account of the conjectural conditional: whenever a conjectural
conditional is used, the speaker draws a conclusion as to the truth of a proposition
on the basis of evidence (whether perceptual ((1), (3)) or reportative ((2), (4)), but
suspends commitment as to its factuality.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

24

References

Caponigro, I., & Sprouse, J. (2007) Rhetorical questions as questions. In E. Puig-Waldmüller (Ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 11 (pp. 121-133). Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

Dendale, P. (2010) *Il serait à Paris en ce moment. Serait-il à Paris ?* À propos de deux emplois épistémiques du conditionnel. Grammaire, syntaxe, sémantique, *in* Castro, C. A., Bango de la Campa, Fl. & Donaire, M.L. 2010, *Liens linguistiques. Études sur la combinatoire et la hiérarchie des composants*, Bern, Peter Lang, p. 291-317.

Diller, A.-M. (1977) Le conditionnel, marqueur de dérivation illocutoire, *Semantikos* 2, 1-17.

Haillet, P. (2001) À propos de l'interrogation totale directe au conditionnel, in DENDALE, P. & L. TASMOWSKI (éds.) *Le conditionnel en français*, Paris: Klincksieck, Recherches linguistiques 25, 295-330.

Tasmowski, L. (2001) Questions au conditionnel, in DENDALE, P. & L. TASMOWSKI (éds), *Le conditionnel en français*, Paris: Klincksieck, Recherches linguistiques 25, 331-343.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

25

Patrick DENDALE
University of Antwerp
patrick.dendale@uantwerpen.be

Philippe KREUTZ
Université Libre de Bruxelles
Philippe.Kreutz@ulb.ac.be

Disentangling expressions of evidentiality and epistemic modality in French : The case of seemingly modal adverbs *certainement, sans doute, peut-être (que)*

There is, at present, no generally accepted, standard set of criteria to identify evidential markers and to set them apart from epistemico-modal ones, despite many efforts made to define the notion of evidentiality in contrast with that of epistemic modality. One reason is probably the fact that the identification problem of *expressions* as evidentials *or* modals is much more complex than the definition and delineation problem of the *notions* of evidentiality and epistemic modality. Identification criteria (or tests) for evidential *versus* modal expressions are crucial however in order to establish reliable (i.e. complete and coherent) lists or databases of "evidential markers" (cfr. Wiemer/Stathi 2010) or in order simply to check if expression *x* or *y* can be considered an evidential marker (e.g. *s'avérer/turn out, promettre/to promise,* or *menacer/to threathen*, etc.).

Our talk is meant to give preliminary elements of answer to the question: "What criteria are needed to identify an expression (in our case lexical ones) as an evidential or a modal marker, in addition to the well-known notional criteria of evidentiality ("the expression of the way in which the speaker acquired the information in the sentence") and epistemic modality ("the evaluation of the likelihood of a state of affairs" or "the certainty of a speaker that a state of affairs is true"?) (Aikhenvald 2004, Nuyts 2001)

We will treat this question through a distributional analysis and analysis of the sentence function of three French adverbs, for which there are good reasons to be considered *epistemico-modal* rather than *evidential* markers (e.g. their morphological constituents and traditions of linguistic analytic tradition), *certainement, sans doute* and *peut-être (que)* in authentic sentences, like:

1. O'Brien le connaissait **certainement/sans doute**, car il avait un léger battement de paupières ('O'Brien **certainly** knew him (**for sure**), because he had a slight eyelid flutter').
2. Pourquoi n'est-il pas là? **Peut-être qu'il** a oublié notre rendez-vous… ('Why isn't he here? Maybe he has forgotten our appointment…')

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

26

We will examine the following elements towards a unified procedure for the identification of epistemic (i.e. evidential and modal) expressions:

(1°) a plea in favour of an analysis in which a marker does not necessarily have to be either modal of evidential (cf. the analysis of parenthetical expressions (Urmson 1952)).

(2°) examination of the acceptability of different "semiotic" statuses for the element of the notional definition of evidentiality in the analysis of expressions: (inherent) *meaning*, *meaning component, sentence function, implicature*?

(3°) examination of the effects of the "direction" of analysis: from lexical categorization to sentence function, or *vice versa*?

(4°) influence of the underlying semantic theory on the characterization of such expressions.

References

Aikhenvald, A., 2004, *Evidentiality*, Oxford UYP

Nuyts, J. 2001, *Epistemic Modality, Language and Conceptualization*, Benjamins.

Urmson, J.O, 1952, "Parenthetical verbs"? *Mind*, 61.

Wiemer, B. & Stathi, K. (2010): "The database of evidential markers in European languages", STUF-Language Typology and Universals, 63/4.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

27

Elisabeth ENGBERG - PEDERSEN
University of Copenhagen

eep@hum.ku.dk

Cognitive and communicative motivations for epistemic expressions in two unrelated sign languages

The term *epistemic modality* is here taken to cover all linguistic expressions that speakers may use to convey their certainty or, more often, uncertainty about the truth value of what they are saying (Boye 2012). Data for this study are video-recordings of signers' discussions of what objects will best guarantee one's survival in a decrepit lifeboat in the middle of the Pacific. Two sign languages are included, Japanese Sign Language and Danish Sign Language. They are unrelated, and they are minority languages in societies with two unrelated majority languages, Japanese and Danish.

Both sign languages are influenced by the majority languages surrounding them. Like the majority languages, they use cognition verbs with first person cognizers and complement clauses about what the signers are (un)certain about. The most frequent order in each sign language reflects the order of verb and complement clause found in the majority spoken language, in Japanese Sign Language complement clause + cognition verb, in Danish Sign Language cognition verb + complement clause. But both sign languages also use the opposite order and the order cognition verb + complement clause + cognition verb, a structural type with final repetition found in many sign languages as the verb sandwich construction (Fischer & Janis 1990) and constructions with pronoun copies (Padden 1988). Moreover, they both use constructions with a first person pronoun either before or after the "complement" clause, i.e. a construction without any verb, a construction type that is also used for quotations and constructed action ("quoted" action).

Independently of the majority languages and of each other, the two sign languages have developed expressions of epistemic modality from response words. Japanese Sign Language uses words (YES (from SAME) and SENSE, cf. Matsuoka, Yano, Akahori & Oka 2016) as response words, tags, and as sentence final particles of epistemic modality integrated into the sentence. Danish Sign Language uses a gesture of metaphorically presenting or showing the contents of the discourse to the addressee (X 2002; cf. Müller 2004) as a response word, a tag, and as a cognitive verb of epistemic uncertainty. Both types of markers of epistemic modality thus have discourse organizing functions besides their functions as epistemic markers. As epistemic markers, they occur in different structural positions in the two sign languages in accordance with the languages' dominant structural type. The discourse-organizing functions of the markers in the two sign languages show how expressions of uncertainty may originate in how interlocutors negotiate agreement besides expressing their uncertainty, and the markers of epistemic modality illuminate how sign languages are both influenced by the majority languages and develop independent means of expressing communicatively relevant meaning based on cognitive and communicative function.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

28

References

Boye, K. (2012). *Epistemic meaning: a crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study*. Berlin, Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fischer, S., & Janis, W. (1990). Verb sandwiches in American Sign Language. In S. Prillwitz & T. Vollhaber (Eds.), *Proceedings of the fourth international symposium on sign language research* (pp. 75-85). Hamburg, Germany: Signum Verlag.

Matsuoka, K., Yano, U., Akahori, H., & Oka, N. (2016). Notes on modals and negation in Japanese Sign Language. *Studies in Language Sciences: Journal of the Japanese Society for Language Sciences, 15*, 1-20.

Müller, C. (2004). Forms and uses of the palm up open hand: a case of a gesture family? In C. Müller & R. Posner (Eds.), *The semantics and pragmatics of everyday gesture: proceedings of the Berlin conference, April 1998* (pp. 233-256). Berlin, Germany: Weidler Buchverlag.

Padden, C. (1988). *Interaction of morphology and syntax in American Sign Language*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing, Inc.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

29

John Fredy GIL BONILLA
Complutense University of Madrid
jhongil@ucm.es

The use of epistemic and deontic modality in Spanish students of English in Tertiary Education

Over the last decades, relationships among language, culture and identity have become a favourite topic in social science, due to this fact, some scholars have lately begun to pay systematic attention to many areas in the field of pragmatic failure (Dunworth 2002), however, little research has been devoted to both the pragmatic failure considering the deontic and epistemic illocutionary force in the answers provided by Spanish tertiary students and the way these students answer in terms of politeness. This has become an important aspect of analysis as it is in its infancy. As Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987:216) explain that the *pragmatic force* of an utterance is normally contradictory or uncertain, even in context, and often deliberately. For reasons of politeness, the speaker and hearer should intentionally exploit this contrariness. Along this line, this paper aims at answering the following research questions:

(1) With what frequency do deontic modals cause pragmatic failure in students' responses in contrast to epistemic modals?

(2) Does "language transfer"cause a major limitation when interpreting the illocutionary forces of epistemic and deonticmodals? Could language transfer break down communication?

(3) Can deontic and epistemic pragmatic failure be interpreted as impolite?

Data for this research were gathered from 30 Spanish tertiary students in English linguistics who ranged in age from 22 to 24 having just graduated from college (BA) and finding themselves at a postgraduate level of studies. This study used a questionnaire which was developed by considering two variables. The first variable included participant's native language, cultural background and place of residence, age and foreign language knowledge. The second variable referred to the intention purported in the questionnaire, that is, the participants had limited options in the answers they could provide, two options were given regarding epistemic modality (could and may) and two referring to deontic modality (can and must); students were expected to answer using one of these options only, but in those cases in which the students considered that any of the possibilities were suitable, they were allowed to provide an optional free answer. The dialogue-type focused on different scenarios ranging from formal to colloquial situations.

The findings reveal that Spanish tertiary students do often commit more errors when interpreting the illocutionary force of epistemic modals in contrast to the use of deontic modals. The deontic modals cause less problems in its interpretation due to language transfer and similarity across cultures and languages. However, when using epistemic modal verbs

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

30

students showed less capacity of cross-cultural pragmatics, being unable to identify the illocutionary force of the question and claims and therefore setting up a linguistic cultural barrier in communication.

References

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Dunworth, K. (2002). Creating an environment for collaborative language learning. Curtin University. HERDSA 2002. Retrieved from http://www.aare.edu.au/02pap:/sav02622.htm

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics* . London: Longman

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

31

Sonia GÓMEZ-JORDANA
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
sgjordana@filol.ucm.es

Evidential markers in French and Spanish: is it visibly the same? The case of *visiblement / visiblemente*

Visiblement is nowadays an evidential type adverb, concerned with the source of information. It has undergone semantic and positional evolution. The question that will concern us here, is to establish how the adverbs *visiblement* in French and *visiblemente* in Spanish have evolved, causing them to have different meanings nowadays. We will establish the most accurate translations of contemporary French *visiblement* in Spanish. Dictionaries tend to give literal translations, whereby *visiblement* is translated as *visiblemente,* in the same way that *justement* is translated as *justamente* and *décidément* as *decididamente*. A diachronic analysis of these adverbs will enable us to see whether they are indeed false-friends. We will make use of corpora compiled mainly from Frantext databases, as well as databases from oral corpora such as Clapi (French), and the Spanish language databases CORDE and CREA (RAE).

According to contextual and dictionary uses, in Old French and Middle French, as well as in Pre-classical French, throughout the 16th century, the adverb *visiblement* is used as a clause element adverb with the meaning *in a visible way.*

(1) N'onques ne fu, c'est chose voire,
A veoir plus bel edefice,
Car, tant fu par grant artefice
Fondé et fait si soubtilment
Qu'il sembloit *tout visiblement*
A toutes gens grans et menues
Que le sommet touchiast les nues
(Christine de Pizan, Le livre de la Mutation de Fortune, 1400, p.109)

From the 17th century onwards, in Classical French, the adverb appears more and more frequently, still as a clause element adverb, and with the meaning of *manifestement, clairement* as in:

(2) On sçait **visiblement** qu'il veut faire donner à ses gens de guerre, on nous asseure neantmoins de la paix.
LUCINGE René de, *Les Occurrences de la paix de Lyon*, 1601, p.35
We will find more and more instances, especially from the 18th century onwards.:
(3) Ainsi lorsque nous lui disons : ne nous induisez pas en tentation : *visiblement* il faut entendre : en permettez pas que nous y entrions.
BOSSUET Jacques-Bénigne, *Méditations sur l'Évangile*, 1704, p.96

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

32

From the mid 19th century onwards, we find the adverb standing alone (in absolute position):
(4) << Maintentant it était trop tard. Visiblement.
  – Vous avez toujours pu résister à vos désirs, dit-elle>>
VIAN Boris, *L'Herbe rouge*, 1950, p. 153

We also find the adverb accompanying *oui*.

(5) Être gaulliste, aimer de Gaulle comme nous l'aimons c'est visiblement pour lui le comble de l'inacceptable. *Visiblement oui,* puisque ses traits sont altérés.
MAURAC Claude, *L'Oncle Marcel*, 1988, p273

We will propose a diachronic analysis of the Spanish marker *visiblemente* to show that the evolution is not the same as in French. We have access to a vast corpus with which to reference *visiblemente,* from medieval times starting from 1300, up until the present day, where the term only appears as a clause element adverb.

Regarding translation from French into Spanish, we establishe that a modern translation of *visiblement* would not be *visiblemente* when the word is used as a disjunct adverb.

References

ANSCOMBRE Jean-Claude, (2005) : « Le ON-locuteur : une entité aux multiples visages », in BRES Jacques, HAILLET Pierre-Patrick, MELLET Sylvie, NØLKE Henning et ROSIER Laurence (éds), *Dialogisme et polyphonie : approches linguistiques,* Bruxelles, De Boeck-Duculot, pp. 75-94.

ANSCOMBRE Jean-Claude *et alii*, 2009, « Apparences, indices et attitude du locuteur : le cas de *apparemment* », *Langue française* 161, pp. 39-58.

DENDALE Patrick et TASMOWSKI Liliane (éds), (1994) : *Les sources du savoir et leurs marques linguistiques, Langue française* 102.

DENDALE Patrick et VAN BOGAERT Julie, (2007): « A semantic description of French lexical evidential markers and the classification of evidentials », *Rivista di Linguistica* 19, pp.65-90.

DUCROT O., (1975b), «Je trouve que», *Semantikos,* Volume 1, pp. 63-88

DUCROT O., (1995), «Les modificateurs déréalisants», *Journal of pragmatics* 24, pp.145-165.

GUENTCHÉVA Zlatka, (1996) : *L'énonciation médiatisée,* Louvain, Paris, Peeters.

HASSLER, Gerda (2014) : « Adverbes épistémiques dans le français parlé et écrit: *apparemment, évidemment, visiblement, éventuellement, probablement* », in W. Weidenbusch (éd.), *Diskursmarker, Konnektoren, Modalwörter,* Tübingen, Narr, p. 161-174.

KRONNING, Hans, (2003) : « Modalité et évidentialité », *in* BIRKELUND, M., BOYSEN, G. & KJAERSGAARD, P. S. (eds), *Aspects de la Modalité,* Tübingen, Max Niemeyer, Linguistische Arbeiten 469, p. 131-151.

MOLINIER, Ch. (2009), "Les adverbes d'énonciation: comment les définir et les sous-classifier", *Langue française* 161, pp.9-22.

RODRÍGUEZ SOMOLINOS Amalia, 2010, "L'évolution de *apparemment* en français: la formation d'un marqueur d'attitude énonciative", in B. Combettes, C. Guillot, S. Prévost, E. Oppermann-Marsaux, A. Rodríguez Somolinos (éds.) *Le changement en français. Etudes de linguistique diachronique.* Berna, Peter Lang, 345-361.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

33

Karolina Grzech
SOAS, University of London
kg7@soas.ac.uk

Epistemic authority and access marking in Amazonian Kichwa discourse

This talk describes the paradigm of epistemic enclitics attested in Amazonian Kichwa, a Quechuan language spoken in Ecuador. The language has a paradigm of 8 enclitics which can attach to any phrasal category and tend to occur on focal constituents. They are not obligatory from a syntactic point of view; The markers occur in between 2 and 6% of turns, and their occurrence is motivated by discourse-related factors. This optionality and communicative, rather than syntactic motivation behind their use underpins their analysis as discourse markers.

Two of the enclitics found in the Amazonian Kichwa epistemic paradigm, =mi and =cha, are cognates of evidential markers attested in other Quechuan varieties (e.g. Floyd 1997; Faller 2002). Previous studies associate the enclitic =mi with direct evidence (e.g. Weber 1986; Floyd 1999) or marking of Best Possible Ground (Faller 2002). The enclitic =cha, on the other hand, has been analysed as a marker of inference and conjecture (e.g. Floyd 1999; Faller 2002) and an epistemic modal (Faller 2002). In this talk, I will demonstrate that the evidential analysis of these two markers cannot be upheld for Amazonian Kichwa. I will show that both =*mi* and =*cha*, as well as the remaining six markers found in the paradigm, encode a range of complex epistemic values related to the distribution of epistemic authority and epistemic access among the participants of discourse.

I use the term 'epistemicity' in a broader sense that the one adopted by Boye (2012), who defines it as encompassing evidentiality and epistemic modality. Rather, my analysis follows Bergqvist (2017) in understanding epistemicity as a range of meanings related to the expression of attitudes to knowledge in interaction. Over the course of the talk, I will discuss the distributional and functional properties of the Amazonian Kichwa epistemic discourse markers, focusing on =*mi* and =*cha*. I will show that =*mi* is used when the speaker wishes to assert their exclusive authority over knowledge, and mark it as inaccessible to the addressee. I will also demonstrate that the marker =*cha* is used to defer epistemic authority to the addressee, while indicating that epistemic access is to some extent shared by both interlocutors.

My analysis of Amazonian Kichwa markers is based on a corpus of 11 hours of monolingual discourse and 2 hours of interactive experiments, which I collected during collaborative fieldwork in Ecuador. The data was analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively, with a mix of methods stemming from segmented Discourse Representation Theory (Asher & Lascarides 2003) and Conversation Analysis (e.g. Schegloff 2007). The resulting analysis is placed in the context of epistemic marking systems found in Quechuan languages (Hintz & Hintz 2017), and marking of epistemic authority and/or access found cross-linguistically (Evans et al. 2017).

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

34

References

Asher, Nicholas & Alex Lascarides. 2003. *Logics of Conversation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boye, Kasper. 2012. *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bergqvist, Henrik. 2017. The roke of perspective in epistemic marking. *Lingua* 186–187. 5-20. DOI*: 10.1016/j.lingua.2015.02.008

Evans, Nicholas, Henrik Bergvsit & Lila San Roque. 2017. The grammar of engagement II: typology and diachrony. *Language and Cognition* 10 (1). 141-70. DOI: 10.1017/langcog.2017.22

Faller, Martina. 2002. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. PhD Thesis. Stanford University.

Floyd, Rick. 1999. *The structure of Wanka Quechua evidential categories*. Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington Publications in Linguistics. Dallas.

Hintz, Daniel J. & Diane M. Hintz. 2017. The evidential category of mutual knowledge in Quechua. *Lingua* 186-7. 88-109

Weber, David J. 1986. Information perspective , profile, and patterns in Quechua. In W. Chafe & J. Nichols (eds.) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing

Schegloff, Emanuel A. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction: A Primer in Conversation Analysis, Volume 1*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

35

Yasra HANAWI MUADEN
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid
yasra59@hotmail.com

A comparison of appraisal choices, represented in engagement category, in two of Bush's speeches to and about the Arabic world in two different contexts (international vs. National)

Martin and White "locate appraisal as an interpersonal system at the level of discourse semantics". (2005: 33) They argue that "appraisal is one of three major discourse semantic resources construing interpersonal meaning (alongside involvement and negotiation)" (34-35). Also, they describe appraisal theory as "a model evolved within the general theoretical framework of SFL" (2005:7) whose main concern is the analysis of the interpersonal dimension of meaning. Relating appraisal to SFL is also proposed by other linguists, such as Thompson who defines appraisal as "a central part of the meaning of any text and that any analysis of the interpersonal meanings of a text must take it into account". (2004: 75).

Bearing this in mind, this paper, following Martin and White(2005) Biber et al.1999,Chilton(2004)and Hunston & Thompson(1999), is concerned with the linguistic resources of engagement in two speeches delivered by the American president George W. Bush. Both Speeches talk of Arabic issues, but in two different contexts. The first speech addressed the Arab World from Abu Dhabi in 2008 (international context), whereas the other one was about the Arab World addressing the Saban Forum, Washington 2008 (national context). Therefore, this paper investigates the differences and similarities in choices of engagement under the effect of contextual situation variation (speech addressed to Arab World vs. speech addressed to the Department of State).

More specifically, it aims to answer the following questions:
1.   How does Bush position himself linguistically in these speeches, as a president of the USA, with respect to each of his different addressees? And what does that reflect about him as a president?

2.   What do the different choices of engagement made by Bush reveal about his positioning towards these two different audiences?

  The methodology followed in this paper consists of a combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis. A manual analysis of the selected items has been carried out, followed by a computer assisted analysis, UAM CorpusTool, in order to be sure of the identification. The contextual features of the uses of the explored linguistic sources have been taken in account during the manual analysis. Significant higher frequency of differences than similarities are expected in the choices of engagement category between these two international and national speeches to and about the Arab world.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

36

References

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, Edward Finegan. 1999. The Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London: Longman.

Chilton, Paul. 2004. Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice. London: Routledge.

Downing, A. & P. Lock. (2006). A university Course in English Grammar. London: Routledge (second revised edition)

Eggins, S.(1999). An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics. London: Pinter.

Eggins, S.(2004). An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.2nd edition, London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Facchinetti, R. Palmer,F. (2004). English Modality in Perspective. Genre Analysis and Contrastive Studies. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Fairclough, N. (2003). Analysing discourse textual analysis for social research. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power. London: Longman.

Greenbaum, S. y R. Quirk. (1990). A Student's Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). Explorations in the Functions of Language. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1989). Language, Context and Text: a social semiotic perspective, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Mattiessen, C.M.I.M (2004). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. 3rd ed. London: Edward Arnold(Third revised edition)

Hidalgo Downing, Laura and Hanawi, Yasra, (2011) The pragmatics of modality, negation and personal pronouns: Stance and intersubjective positioning in Bush and Obama's speeches to the Arab world. Presentation delivered at the 44th SLE Conference, Universidad de la Rioja.

Hidalgo-Downing, Laura. (2004). "Non-verbal markers of modality and evidentiality and the expression of writer stance in a comparable corpus of English and Spanish editorials and news articles". Perspectives on Evidentiality and Modality, Juana Marín Arrese (ed.), (205-228). Madrid: Editorial Complutense.

Hunston, Susan and Thompson, Geoff (eds.) (2000). Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourses. Oxford University Press

Hunston, Susan and Geoff Thompson (eds.). 1999. Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourses. Oxford University Press.

Lock, Graham (1996) Functional English Grammar. An Introduction for Second Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marín-Arrese, Juana. (2004). "Evidential and epistemic qualifications in the discourse of fact and opinion: A comparable corpus study". In Perspectives on Evidentiality and Modality, Juana Marín-Arrese (ed.), (153-184). Madrid:Editorial Complutense.

Marín-Arrese, Juana. (2004). "Non-verbal markers of modality and evidentiality and the expression of writer stance in a comparable corpus of English and Spanish editorials and news articles ". In Perspectives on Evidentiality and Modality, Juana Marín-Arrese (ed.), (205-228). Madrid: Editorial Complutense

Marín-Arrese, Juana. (2007) Stance and Subjectivity/ intersubjectivity in political discourse. A contrastive case study. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Marín-Arrese, Juana and Núñez-Perucha, Begoña. (2006b). "Evaluation and Engagement in Journalistic Commentary and News Reportage". Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses 19 (2006):225-248.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

37

Marín-Arrese, Juana I.(ed) (2002) Conceptualization of Events in Newspaper Discourse: Mystification of agency and degree of Implication in News reports. Madrid publicaciones de la Universidad Complutense. Introduction and Chapter 2.

Martin, James and White, Peter. 2005. The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. New York: Palgrave.

Martin, James and White, Peter. (2005). The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. New York: Palgrave

Martin, J.R. & D. Rose (2003) Working with Discourse. Meaning beyond the clause. London: Continuum. Chapter 3: Ideation: Representing experience.

Martin, J.R. (1992). English text: System and Structure. Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins

Thompson, Geoff and Laura Alba-Juez (2014) Evaluation in Context. Ámsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thompson, Geoff. (2004). Introducing Functional Grammar. London: Arnold.

White, Peter. (2004). The Appraisal website. www.grammatics.com/appraisal /Discourse Studies

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

38

Virginia HILL
University of New Brunswick - Saint John

mota@unb.ca

Evidentiality with perception verbs

Bi-clausal constructions with perception verbs yield two types of readings in Romanian: either direct or indirect evidence, the latter having a cognitive dimension. This may amount to ambiguity out of context, as in (1).

> (1) *Am   văzut   că animalele   vor fi sacrificate.*
> have.1 saw   that animals-the   will.3PL=be=sacrificed
> 'I saw (with my eyes) or I (somehow) understood that the animals will be sacrificed.'

Lexical approaches to such ambiguity argue that there are two lexical entries for the same verb in the lexicon, one with a direct evidence feature, the other with a cognitive feature in addition to the evidential one (e.g., Jędrzejowski et al, 2018). In this paper we argue for the opposite **hypothesis**: there is one lexical entry for the verb, but the derivational pattern it generates is different for the direct versus the indirect evidence reading.

The main **proposal** is that the two readings in (1) arise from two underlying structures: (i) when the verb merges in the derivation with its lexical evidential feature, the reading is that of direct evidentiality; (ii) when the evidential feature of the verb is grammaticalized, and mapped as a functional feature [evid] in the verbal projection, the reading is that of indirect evidence/cognition.

The **analysis** provides syntactic tests to support this proposal. The main argument is that the indirect evidence reading may alternatively allow for the specification of the source of evidence when subject-to-object raising (SOR) takes place – see (2), where the clues for the cognition reading arises from Mircea's behavior, as opposed to (1), where the source of information is undisclosed.

> (2) *L-am văzut   pe Mircea   că nu are intenții bune.*
> him=have.1 seen   DOM Mircea   that not has intentions good
> 'I saw that Mircea does not have good intentions.'

SOR in (2) (versus base generation in the matrix clause through argument structure or prolepsis) is demonstrated through constituency tests, plus tests showing that this structure blocks long and short wh-movement from the embedded clause, and restricts the class of nouns compatible with SOR to those with an animate feature. All these properties can be derived from the mapping of [evid] on the little v (=functional verb projection) of the matrix clause. SOR does not arise in the presence of a direct evidence reading (the test results are opposite), which means that there is no [evid] on matrix little v to interfere with movement from the embedded clause.

The **conclusion** is that certain evidential values are read off the syntactic configuration instead of being lexically specified. This result is in line with language economy hypotheses, since it takes some load off the memory and passes it to the computational system.

References

Jędrzejowski,   ukasz; Malika Reetz; Przemys aw Staniewski (eds.). 2018. *Olfactivity in language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. (to appear).

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

39

Elvan Eda IŞIK-TAŞ
Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus
edaisik@metu.edu.tr

Çiğdem SAĞIN-ŞIMŞEK
Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey
sagin@metu.edu.tr

A Study on evidentiality in Cypriot Turkish and Turkey Turkish with a cross-linguistic perspective

A number of studies have thus far compared grammatical features of Turkey Turkish and Cypriot Turkish and have identified the realization of evidentiality as one of the distinguishing features of these two varieties. According to these studies, in Turkey Turkish while the morpheme -DI is used to report witnessed events (direct experience), the morpheme –mIş is used to express hearsay, reported or inferred information (indirect experience) (e.g., Aksu-Koç, 1995). In Cypriot Turkish, on the other hand, hearsay, reported or inferred information (indirect experience) is expressed mainly with the morpheme –DI, as –mIş does not possess any indirect or inferential meaning and is mainly used to describe dubitative function (Demir, 2002). This study aims to explore, first, whether variation exists regarding the functions of evidentials used in the oral productions of Turkey Turkish and Cypriot Turkish speakers. If yes, the study also aims to explore whether the difference between the two varieties can be explained due to language contact phenomenon.

Evidentiality in Turkey Turkish and Cypriot Turkish has not been extensively researched and the few existing studies (Brendemoen, 1996; Demir, 2002; Demir & Johanson, 2006; Abdurrazzak, 2012) are based on the observations of the language use of the Cypriot Turkish participants or the linguistic analysis of the early literary works and are thus descriptive. In this sense, we believe that by utilizing an exploratory methodology, the present study will contribute to the linguistic and cross-linguistic analysis of the evidentials in the Cypriot Turkish. The data were collected from four groups of participants. The first group consisted of native speaker Cypriot Turkish university students aged between 18-22. We assumed that the participants in this group would be more sensitive to the perception and production of evidentials in Turkey Turkish since they interacted with their Turkey Turkish speaking peers. The second group were native Cypriot Turkish speakers of ages 50 and above, who lived in historical Cypriot Turkish villages. We assumed that the participants in this group had more experience with the Greek language but less contact with Turkey Turkish compared to the participants of the first group. Accordingly, their production preferences and perception abilities of evidentials would be different than the participants in the first group. The third and the fourth groups comprised native Turkey Turkish speakers of comparable ages to the first and the second groups of speakers respectively. The first task, in the form of an interview, aimed to reveal how evidentials were expressed by the participants and required the participants to answer questions about their direct and indirect past experiences. The second

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

40

task aimed to examine how the evidentials used by the native Turkish and Cypriot Turkish speakers were perceived by one another. The task was developed utilizing the data obtained in the first task and required the participants to read the experiences/anecdotes and response to the questions asking whether they reported direct or indirect experiences.

The data analysis so far highlighted significant variation in the grammatical and lexical expression of evidentiality across the two varieties. Regardless of their ages, Turkey Turkish speakers used –DI to express their direct experiences and –mIş to express indirect experiences. The Cypriot Turkish speakers, on the other hand, behaved differently. While the older group used –DI as the main evidential marker indicating both direct and indirect experiences together with some lexical elements, the younger group used both –DI and –mIş to express indirect experiences. Another important finding so far seems to be that Turkey Turkish speakers interpreted all instances of -DI in the perception task as "witnessed events" and misinterpreted the instances in which Cypriot Turkish speakers used this morpheme to report hearsay of indirect evidence. These results are likely related to the language contact of Cypriot Turkish with the Greek and Turkish languages. Presumably due to the influence from Greek, Cypriot Turkish lacked indirect evidential marker -mIş but included more of lexical elements indicating indirect experience. However, the increasing contact with the Turkey Turkish language seemed to result in the use of –mIş as an indicator of indirect experience but still supported by lexical elements.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

41

Andra KALNAČA
Ilze LOKMANE
University of Latvia, Riga
kalnaca@latnet.lv, ilokmane@latnet.lv

Evidentiality and the latvian oblique forms

This paper focuses on the Latvian oblique forms that are used to indicate that the author of a text is not the source of the information contained in that text (e.g., Plungian 2001, 2010; Aikhenvald 2004; Holvoet 2007), i.e., to express reportative evidentiality:

(1) *Šogad* **būšot**   *ļoti* *silta*   *vasara,*
     this_year **be.OBL.FUT** very warm.NOM   summer.NOM

     prognozē   *sinoptiķi.*
     forecast.PRS.3   meteorologist.NOM.PL

     'This year a very warm summer is to be expected, the meteorologists
     say.' (Kas Jauns)

In Latvian, reportative is marked by means of the suffix *-ot*, the resulting forms expressing either present or future tense meanings depending on the kind of verbal stem they are added to (Mathiassen 1997).

Tense	Synthetic form	Analytical (periphrastic) form
PRS	*las-ot* 'I, you, he/she, etc. reportedly read'	*es-ot lasījis,-usi, -uši, -ušas* 'I, you, he, she etc. reportedly had read'
FUT	*lasīš-ot* 'I, you, he/she, etc. reportedly will read'	*būš-ot lasījis,-usi, -uši, -ušas* 'I, you, he, she, etc. reportedly will have read'

The fact that information has been obtained from an extraneous source in Latvian is usually signalled by *verbum dicendi*, which points on the reported information in the first part of a composite sentence (among others, Nītiņa, Grigorjevs 2013; Chojnicka 2008, 2016).

However, *verbum dicendi* is not compulsory. Such instances undoubtedly express evidentiality and this is achieved by means of the oblique form alone.

(2) *Viens*   *no* *kandidātiem*   *premjera*
     one.NOM   of   candidate.DAT.PL   prime_minister.GEN

     biroja   *vadītājapostenim*
     office.GEN   head.GEN   position.DAT

     esot   *bijušais veselības*   *ministrs.*
     be.OBL.PRS   former.NOM   health.GEN   minister.NOM

     'Reportedly, one of the candidates for the position of the head of the prime
     minister's office is the ex-minister for health.' (www.korpuss.lv)

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

42

The oblique forms may be used without any doubt about the veracity of the contents:

(3) *Reiz uz ielas satiku rakstnieku, kurš teica,*

  ka   *Latvijas Enciklopēdijā* ***vajagot***   *redaktorus.*

  that   Latvia.GEN Encyclopedia.LOC **need.OBL.PRS** editor.ACC.PL

  'Once I bumped into a writer on the street who told me that the Latvian Encyclopedia needed editors.' (Ieva)

The oblique forms are also used to express suppositions or guesses:

(4) *Meitas viņai par Jāni sāka stāstīt.*

  Cik   *viņš*   ***esot***   *labs!*

  how   he.NOM **be.COP.OBL.PRS** good.NOM

  Kā   *viņš*   *savu*   *māti*   ***apkopjot!***

  how   he.NOM his   mother.ACC **take_care.obl.prs**

  'The daughters started telling her about Jānis. How good he was! How well he took care of his mother!' (www.korpuss.lv)

The oblique narration can thus vary from a relatively precise citation to a more loose one, even taking the form of a commentary on the text from external sources. That is why the oblique form can acquire epistemic overtones such as doubt, critical examination and irony. Thus, one utterance can syncretically express both evidential as well as epistemic meanings (among others, Cornillie 2009; Boye 2012). The author of a text (utterance) can add an epistemic overtone to an evidential main clause (the information contained in it) by reference to shared knowledge (Mushin 2001). Usually it is doubt as to whether something exists or disbelief of a fact or version (example (1)).

Analysis of the semantics of the oblique forms contributes to the understanding of evidential and modal meanings in the structure of Latvian.

References

Aikhenvald, Aleksandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boye, Kasper.2012. *Epistemic Meaning. A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study.* De Gruyter Mouton.

Chojnicka, Joanna. 2012. Reportive evidentiality and reported speech: is there a boundary? In Aurelija Usonienė, Nicole Nau & Ineta Dabašinskienė (eds.), *Multiple perspectives in linguistic research on Baltic languages.* Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 170–192.

Cornillie, Bert. 2009. Evidentiality and epistemic modality: on the close relationship of two different categories. *Functions of Language, 16* (1), 44–62.

Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and Modality in Baltic.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo universitetu Jagiellońskiego.

Mathiassen, Terje. 1997. *A Short Grammar of Latvian.* Slavica Publishers, INC.

Mushin, Ilana. 2001. *Evidentiality and Epistemological Stance: Narrative Retelling.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nītiņa, Daina & Juris Grigorjevs. 2013. *Latviešu valodas gramatika.* Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.

Plungian, Vladimir A. 2001. The Place of Evidentiality within the Universal Grammatical Space. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33 (3), 349–357.

Plungian, Vladimir. 2010. *Types of verbal evidentiality marking: An overview.* In Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova (eds.), *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*, 15–58. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

43

Lois KEMP
ACLC, University of Amsterdam
lois.kemp@uva.nl

-*ly* evidential adverbs in British newspapers: limitations on use in verbal subclauses

Texts from recent British newspapers are examined for the distribution of evidential *–ly* adverbs in subclauses of complement taking predicates (CTPs). In contrast to evidential *–ly* adverbs in main clauses, it is expected that a CTP will limit the choice of the evidential *–ly* adverb appearing in its complement clause.

As seen in Table 1, patterns of usage will be represented in FDG hierarchical Layers. The interaction between the four categories of *-ly* evidential adverbs and four categories of CTPs is represented here with plus signs. It can be seen that a CTP will admit evidential adverbs of
its own category and also adverbs of lower categories.

Table 1: *Layers present in the underlying representation of the complements of verbs*

Evidential adverbs in FDG	reportative	inferential	deduction	event perception
Example of evidential -ly adv.	*purportedly*	*seemingly*	*perceivably*	*visibly*
CTP: *say* (indirect speech)	+	+	+	+
CTP: *believe, think*	-	+	+	+
CTP: *regret*	-	-	+	+
CTP: *see* (direct perception)	-	-	-	+

Example (1) shows a complement clause of CTP *think* with the inferential evidential adverb *seemingly*, which is an expected combination as seen in Table 1.

(1)   *Mr Campbell-Bell said he thinks the car had been dismantled for repair by a local soldier, but was then **seemingly** abandoned* (Classic care unearthed by archaeologists on Salisbury Plain, 14 Sept 2017, www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-wiltshire-41265294)

It turns out that in the present British newspaper data set, the categorization in Table 1 is only found when the evidential adverb has as its anchor[2] the subject of the matrix clause.

---

[2] anchor: mediator to the knowledge base

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

44

When the anchor of the evidential adverb is not the subject of the matrix clause, the instance will fall outside the strict categorization described above and will allow reportatives in subclauses of CTPs with an underlying representation other than that of *say*.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hengeveld, Kees & Marize Dall'Aglio Hattnher. 2015. Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil. *Linguistics* 53/3: 479-524.

Hengeveld, Kees & J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keizer, Evelien. 2015. *A Functional Discourse Grammar for English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

45

Mohsen KHEDRI
Sohar University
MKhedri@soharuni.edu.om

Evidentiality in academic writing: Linking discourse features to disciplinary practices

By taking a mixed-methods research design and in a comparative corpus, this study explored the use of evidentials in research writings in the disciplines of Applied Linguistics, Psychology, Environmental Engineering and Chemistry. To be specific, the study aimed to investigate how writers belonging to different communities vary in their strategic use of evidence markers in written academic discourse. To this end, a representative sample of 80 research articles written in the selected disciplines comprised the corpus of the study. The functional-contextual analysis reported significant cross-disciplinary variations as regards the writers' rhetorical behaviour of using evidentials in their writings. Notable variations were found in the writers' discursive functions of evidentials mapped onto their discourse. The variations could be attributed to the amount of rhetorical sensitivity to and awareness of purpose, disciplinary propensities and the tendencies of the disciplinary genre. The present findings can be helpful in the teaching and learning of academic writing and may give some insights to rhetorical practices of members in the disciplinary communities studied.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

46

Seppo KITTILÄ
University of Helsinki, Finland
seppo.kittila@helsinki.fi

Folklore as an evidential category

Our statements are typically based on concrete evidence, which may be our own (e.g., visual evidence), or we may rely on other people's evidence (reported evidence). We may also have less concrete evidence, for whose truthfulness we cannot take any responsibility. One manifestation of this is presented by folklore, traditional stories and myths, the information source type focused on in this paper (henceforth folklore). Folklore is here defined as traditional knowledge that is passed on from generation to generation, and that no (living) speaker has actually witnessed, which makes the information very indirect in nature. This paper proposes a formal-functional typology of folklore coding, and discusses its rationale.

The following mechanisms are attested for folklore coding:

1. Specific folklore marking (Ladakhi, Qiang)
2. Evidentiality-neutral coding (Nganasan)
3. Direct evidential (Wanka Quechua)
4. Indirect evidentials; non-firsthand, assumptive, inferential (Avar, Matses, Meithei)
5. Reported evidential (Ingush, Dena'ina, Kashaya)
6. Varying type (Tariana)

The first type is divided into two based on whether a given language has a dedicated folklore marker, or whether the language uses a combination of markers for this. Ladakhi illustrates the first type (Koshal 1979: 205), while in Qiang, folklore is coded by a combination of hearsay and inferential evidentials (LaPolla 2003: 205). The second type is attested in Nganasan, where evidentiality marking is dropped in folklore (Gusev 2007, cited in Aikhenvald 2004: 311). The use of direct evidentials for folklore coding is rare, but a potential example is found in Wanka Quechua (Floyd 1993: 102). Indirect evidentials comprise here all information sources labeled as +personal and –direct by Plungian (2010: 37). For example, in Avar, a general non-firsthand evidential is used for coding folklore (Forker: forthcoming), while inferential evidential is used for this in Matses (Fleck 2003: 604). The use of reported evidentials for folklore coding is very common, and examples are attested, e.g., in Dena'ina (Holton & Lovick 2008) and Kashaya (Oswalt 1986). Finally, there are languages where the coding of folklore varies, e.g., according to its nature (see, e.g., Aikhenvald 2004: 310ff for Tariana, where at least three evidentials may be used for this purpose).

The secondhand nature of folkore is directly manifested in the frequent use of indirect evidentials for its coding. However, as a part of one's cultural heritage, folklore can also be regarded as reliable information, which explains the (albeit rare) use of direct evidentials for this purpose. Finally, folklore can also be viewed as an information source type of its own. Most prominently, folklore differs from all other information sources in the lack of concrete evidence. Folklore resembles facts in that our evidence is internal in nature (Author,

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

47

submitted). However, facts are originally based on some kind of witnessed evidence, while this is lacking for folklore. From this it also follows that it is impossible to (dis)confirm the truthfulness of folklore, while we can have (dis)confirming evidence for (most) facts. The semantically specific nature of folklore is manifested in Types 1 and 2.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP.

Author, submitted. And that's a fact: remarks on facts as an evidential category. *Linguistics*.

Fleck, David William 2003. A Grammar of Matses. Doctoral dissertation, Rice University.

Floyd, Rick 1993. The Structure of Wanka Quechua Evidential Categories. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

Forker, Diana. Forthcoming. The semantics of evidentiality and epistemic modality in Avar. To appear in: Diana Forker and Timur Maisak (eds.) *The semantics of verbal categories in Nakh-Daghestanian l anguages: Tense, aspect, evidentiality, mood/modality*. Leiden: Brill.

Gusev, Valentin J. 2007. 'Evidencialjnostj v nganasanskom jazyke' (Evidentiality in Nganasan). In Viktor S. Xrakovskij (ed.), *Èvidencial'nost' v jazykax Evropy i Azii. Sb. statej pamjati N.A. Kozincevoj*, 415-444. Saint Petersburg: Nauka.

Holton, Gary & Lovick, Olga, 2008. Evidentiality in Dena'ina Athabaskan. *Antropological Linguistics* 50: 292-323.

Koshal, Sanyukta 1979. *Ladakhi grammar*. Delhi, Varanasi & Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

LaPolla, Randy. 2003. *A grammar of Qiang*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Oswalt, Robert L. 1986. The Evidential System of Kashaya. In Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, 29-45. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Plungian, Vladimir. 2010. Types of verbal evidentiality marking: an overview. In Gabriele Diewald & Elena Smirnova (eds.), *The Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*, 15-58. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

48

Rebeka KUBITSCH
University of Szeged
kubitsch.rebeka@gmail.com

The interaction of first person and evidentiality in Udmurt

The aim of the presentation is to introduce the interaction of first person and indirect evidential forms in the Udmurt language focusing on the semantic domains covered by their constellation.

Udmurt is a Uralic language, part of the Permic subgroup, spoken by 339 800 speakers, of which most live in the Udmurt Republic in the Russian Federation (Ethnologue). The speakers are Udmurt-Russian bilinguals and the strong domination of Russian in cities and the administrational life is typical (Winkler 2001: 5).

Udmurt distinguishes evidentiality only in the past tenses. The evidential system is binary, firsthand (a.k.a. 1st past) and non-firsthand (a.k.a. 2nd past) evidentials are distinguished (Skribnik & Kehayov 2018: 539). Non-firsthand evidential forms cover several semantic parameters in relation to the information source (reportative, inferential, assumption), which also has other functions that are not related to the source of information ('token' of genre, mirativity, non-volitionality, politeness) (Winkler 2001, Siegl 2004, Kubitsch 2017).

The data for the research of first person evidential forms in Udmurt was taken from the subcorpus of blogs of the online Udmurt Corpus. This subcorpus is selected as its language is closer to the spoken varieties of Udmurt. Altogether 65 first person second past forms have been analyzed.

If a language has restrictions on the use of evidential that usually involves first person forms (Aikhenvald 2004: 219). Furthermore, in Komi, the closest related language to Udmurt, such forms occur sporadically as a dialectical feature (Kozmács 2008: 171; Leinonen 2000: 429). Typologically, if first person evidential forms are allowed, their core function is expressing lack of consciousness and unintentional actions (Aikhenvald 2014: 30, Curnow 2003: 39). Udmurt first person effect shows this meaning as well (Skribnik & Kehayov 2018: 542).

(1) pushdun.blogspot.ru

Olokiz̦i̦   mon n̦ulesk-e șur -ișkem.
somehow   I   forest ILL get 2Pst.1Sg
'Somehow I got into a forest.' (after waking up from a nightmare)

I propose that most of the first person evidential forms show strong correlations to deferred realization which is part of the mirative semantic parameter of Udmurt second past (Kubitsch 2017: 29).

(2) marjamoll.blogspot.ru
Kemalaș liz̦z̦   -ișkem   n̦i   val.
long.ago read   2PST.1SG yet   to.be.1PST.3SG

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

49

'I read a long time ago.' (realizing)

In rare occasions first person second past forms might have express the more usual, reportative semantic parameter of evidentiality.

(3) udmurto4ka.blogspot.ru

Sobere   pe, srazu   jöna   -śkem.
then   PTC suddenly   recover   2PST.1SG
'Then I suddenly recovered.' (telling a story about herself as a small child)

Based on the results Udmurt first person evidential forms seem to be semantically remarkably loaded. They primarily express uncontrolled and unintentional actions. In same cases however, the semantic feature of mirativity is dominant as well. In addition, first person evidential forms can refer to a more conventional usage of Udmurt second past.

Analyzing first person evidential forms of a small evidential system is important from a typological point of view describing forms and meanings similar to Udmurt instances.

References

AIKHENVALD, Alexandra Yurievna. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press. Oxford.

CURNOW, Timothy Jowan. 2003. Nonvolitionality expressed through evidentials. *Studies in Language* **27**. 39–60.

Ethnologue. https://www.ethnologue.com/language/udm (2018. 01.29.)

KOZMÁCS, István. 2008. *Az -śk- képző az udmurt (votják) igeképzés rendszerében.* (*The -śk-derivational suffix in the verbal derivation system of Udmurt*) Nyitra.

KUBITSCH, Rebeka. 2017. *Evidencialitás a mai udmurt nyelvben.* (*Evidentiality in present-day Udmurt*) M.A. Thesis. Szeged.

LEINONEN, Marja. 2000. Evidentiality in Komi Zyrian. In: Johanson, Lars–Utas, Bo (szerk.) *Evidentials*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin. New York. 419–440.

The Grammar of Knowledge: *A Cross-linguistic Typology*. 2014. Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna. & Dixon, Robert. M. W. (szerk.). Oxford University Press.

SIEGL, Florian. 2004. *The 2nd past in the Permic languages*. M.A. Thesis. Tartu

SKRIBNIK, Elena – KEHAYOV, Petar. 2018. Evidentials in Uralic Languages. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. 525–555.

Udmurt corpus. http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus/search/

WINKLER, Eberhard. 2001. Udmurt. *Languages of the World/Materials* **212**. Lincom Europa. München.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

50

Ramaz KURDADZE
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
ramaz.kurdadze@tsu.ge

Maia LOMIA
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
maia.lomia@tsu.ge

Ketevan MARGIANI
Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
ketevan.margiani@tsu.ge

On the Relation between Verbal Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in the Kartvelian Languages[3]

As is widely known, evidentiality implies that the speaker points to the source of information, whereas epistemic modality implies that the speaker evaluates the reliability of information. The group of Kartvelian languages embraces four languages: literary Georgian and non-written Megrelian, Laz and Svan. The non-written languages frequently reveal certain morphological nuances that are only descriptive in the literary language. In all the Kartvelian languages evidentiality is a verbal category. There are two evidential tenses in the conjugation paradigm that are common to all the Kartvelian languages -*Evidential Pertfect I* and *Evidential Perfect II.* Apart from these, the non-written languages have developed both perfect and imperfect evidential tenses.

    Evidential Perfect I
Georgian: *u eria;* Megrelian: *u aru(n);* Laz: *u a(r)un;* Svan: *xoira* –'it has turned out that he/she has written it'.
    Evidential Perfect II
Georgian: *e era;* Megrelian: *u arudu;* Laz: *u a(r)uțu;* Svan: *xoiran* –'it had turned out that he/she had written it'.
    Evidential Perfect III
Laz: *aru-doren, ar-el-eren* –'it turned out that he/she has been writing it'.
    Evidential Perfect IV
Laz: *aru-dorțun, ar-el-erețu* –'it turned out that he/she had been writing it'.
    Evidential Imperfect I
Megrelian: *no arue(n)* – 'it has turned out that he/she is writing it';
Svan: *xäiruna* – 'it turned out that he/she was writing above something / it turned out that

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

51

he/she was writing it for him/her';
> *Evidential Imperfect II*

Megrelian: *no aruedu* – 'it turned out that he/she had been writing it'

Laz: *aru ṭu-doren, aru ṭ-eren* – 'it turned out that he/she had been writing it'
Svan: *Ɩəmijrün[li]* –'it turned out that he/she had been writing it to him/her'.

All the above verbs, without context and additional lexemes, point to the external source of information (verbality, inference). These evidential forms are non-modal and devoid of epistemic content. Without evaluation of reliability, they point to the source of information: in case of the verbal source, there is **quotative**, and in case of the inferential source – **inferentive, as the speaker draws a logical conclusion based on the direct trace.**

The non-written Kartvelian languages have modalized evidential tenses which express epistemic modality. The data of Svan and Megrelian languages are of special interest in this regard. There are five tenses of this kind in the Svan language and two in the Megrelian language. Below are given evidential-epistemic tenses with their arbitrary names and corresponding examples:

Svan:

Evidential-Epistemic Perfect I

xeiri – 'he/she has probably written it'.

Evidential-Epistemic Perfect II

xeirol – 'he/she had probably written it'.

Evidential-Epistemic Present

Svan: *äjruni,* Megrelian: *arundas i'ii* - 'he is probably writing'

Evidential-Epistemic Complete

Svan: *adijrna* – 'he/she would probably write'

Evidential-Epistemic Incomplete

Svan: *äjrun l,* Megrelian: *arunduḳo i'uapudu* - 'he/she was probably writing'

The meaning of the above-mentioned verbs is **conclusive. The conclusion is based not on the direct trace, but on the logical assumption and background knowledge of the speaker; therefore, their meaning is far from „ideal knowledge".**

Thus, there are two types of verbal evidentiality in the Kartvelian languages: non-modalized – in all Kartvelian languages, and modalized, epistemic – only in the non-written Kartvelian languages.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

52

Fátima LÓPEZ
fatima.lopez@predoc.uam.es

Laura HIDALGO DOWNING
laura.hidalgo@uam.es

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Stance strategies and mind-style: The case of the police interview to Kipland Kinkel

The present paper explores the discourse-pragmatic functions of markers of epistemic and effective modality in combination with polarity as indexicals of speaker stance and mind-style in the two participants in a police interview. Stance markers are analysed in the responses made by an allegedly schizophrenic underage criminal in the police interview after his arrest, and in the questions made by the police officer interviewing him. We adopt a combination of Halliday and Matthiesen's (2004) classification of subjectivity markers into indirect explicit and indirect implicit stance, and Marín-Arrese's (2011) classification of effective and epistemic markers of stance, in addition to the role of negation in discourse. Results show that modality in Kinkel's discourse is of the indirect implicit type. It is expressed by means of effective modality, both in positive and negative polarity and by the use of mental verbs in negative polarity within epistemic modality. Other types of epistemic modality are absent in his turns, thus showing lack of epistemic commitment towards the information provided in the interview. The interviewer expresses modality by using both epistemic and effective stance, mostly with positive polarity. We argue that the analysis of the linguistic choices of stance in Kinkel's discourse may provide linguistic support to the claim made by two psychiatrists during his trial regarding his alleged schizophrenic profile.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

53

Mila LÜTJOHANN
University of Kiel
luetjohann@anglistik.uni-kiel.de

Beke HANSEN
University of Kiel
hansen@anglistik.uni-kiel.de

Robert FUCHS
University of Hamburg
robert.fuchs@uni-hamburg.de

People mustn't need it really – Negated *must* in spoken British English between 1994 and 2014

According to several grammatical descriptions of English, epistemic *mustn't/not* (as in the example in the title) does not exist. Instead, negated forms of *must* are thought to exclusively express deontic meaning, i.e. a prohibition (cf. Coates 1983: 19). As a suppletive form for epistemic *mustn't/not*, *can't* is thought be used (cf. Coates 1983: 20). However, a contrasting opinion in the debate holds that negated epistemic *mustn't/not* exists but is rare (cf. Collins 2009: 43; Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 181). Yet others have even claimed that negated epistemic *must* is on the increase, in particular for American English (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 225). A previous corpus-based analysis of negated tokens of *must* in British English (BrE), based on the original British National Corpus (1994), falsified the strong hypothesis of the non-existence of contracted epistemic *mustn't* in BrE in the late 1980s/early 1990s, with epistemic readings accounting for one third of all instances of negated *must* (cf. Anderwald 2002: 97). However, it is still unclear whether epistemic *mustn't/not* is in fact on the increase in BrE. The present study will address this question, and, in addition, asks more broadly what recent changes have occurred in the semantics of negated *must*. We analysed all instances of negated *must* in the demographic sample of the BNC1994 and the spoken BNC2014 (N=331). In line with our previous results on *must* in affirmative contexts (Author 2018), the normalised frequency of *must* in negative contexts also decreased substantially between 1994 and 2014 from 38 pmw to 14 pmw. The decrease affected deontic readings more strongly than epistemic readings, leading to a cross-over pattern. In 1994, deontic *mustn't/not* was more frequent than its epistemic counterpart (25 pmw and 12 pmw respectively). The reverse is true in 2014, with a frequency of negated deontic *must* of 6 pmw and a frequency of negated epistemic *must* of 8 pmw. Consequently, the proportion of epistemic uses increased from 33% in 1994 to 55% in 2014.

Further, a broad distinction between Northern and Southern dialects reveals an emerging regional divide. While in 1994 there are no significant regional differences, in 2014 the share of epistemic *mustn't/not* is substantially larger in the North. In terms of syntactic context, we find that epistemic *mustn't/not* occurs more often in tag questions than declarative sentences but is by no means restricted to the former (cf. Coates 1983: 44), even less so in 2014. Finally,

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

54

in a qualitative analysis we explore what conditions the choice between epistemic *mustn't/not* and *can't* (cf. also ZamoranoMansilla 2008; Palmer 1990: 61) and how use of epistemic *mustn't/not* relates to speaker class, age, and gender. To conclude, we provide further evidence that negated *must* exists with an epistemic reading and is not categorically substituted by *can't*. However, along with affirmative epistemic *must*, it is on the decrease in BrE. The hypothesis of the rise of epistemic *mustn't/not* (Quirk et al. 1985: 225) therefore appears to be inaccurate for BrE.

References

Anderwald, Lieselotte. 2002. *Negation in non-standard British English. Gaps, regularizations and asymmetries*. London: Routledge.

Coates, Jennifer. 1983. *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*. London: Croom Helm. Collins, Peter. 2009. *Modals and quasi-modals in English*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language.*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, Frank R. 1990. *Modality and the English modals*, 2nd edn. London: Longman. Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensivegrammar of the English language.* Harlow: Longman.

Zamorano-Mansilla, Juan Rafael. 2008. Epistemic "mustn't" in English. *Círculo de lingüística aplicada*
a la comunicación (clac) 36. 63-79.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

55

Lidia MAÑOSO PACHECO
Nebrija University
l.manoso@ucm.es

Elena MARTÍNEZ CARO
Complutense University of Madrid
e.martinezcaro@filol.ucm.es

Mixed reporting style in newspaper reports: a linguistic-conceptual approach

The choice of the reporting style in news reports is a powerful tool through which journalists can exhibit their position towards the information source, the state of affairs and/or the participants included in the quote. Despite the conventional distinction established in the literature between direct and indirect speech, recent research on journalistic discourse has blurred the line dividing these categories and revealed a high degree of mixed direct – indirect mode. Few studies on the subject have addressed the analysis of this hybrid style, a phenomenon which has been "rejected by grammarians but frequently used by journalists" (Calsamiglia and López 2003: 155). As Waugh maintains, the problem that arises from this sort of integrated citations is that "there is no one good source for the criteria by which direct and indirect speech are differentiated from each other" (1995: 167), thereby hampering the study of these forms and the intended purpose behind their use, as in this report published by *The Times*: Oscar Pistorius's social worker has told the court that the athlete was "barely coping" in the days after he killed his girlfriend, but not suicidal. Yvette van Schalkwyk became "upset" when Mr Pistorius was accused of faking emotion and vomiting at his murder trial in Pretoria and decided to testify in his defence (Maclean 2014).

This paper aims at exploring this mixed reporting style in order to discover interesting generalisations in terms of evidentiality, subjectivity, gender distinction and rhetorical purpose, among others. The news reports that will be discussed have been collected from a corpus of digital news published in British and Spanish quality newspapers, namely *The Times, The Guardian, El Mundo* and *El País*. Among the functions that have been typically associated with this reporting style the following can be identified: adding concision, distancing from the quoted information and qualification of the reported segment (Leech 1988; Obiedat 2006; Smirnova 2009). Thus, mixed style appears to be employed as a distancing device on the part of media writers, an issue that will be comprehensively assessed in this investigation.

References

Calsamiglia, H. and López, C. (2003). 'Role and position of scientific voices: reported speech in the media'. *Discourse Studies* 5 (2). 147–173.

Leech, G. (1988). *Meaning and the English Verb*. London: Longman.

Maclean, R. (2014). Pistorius was 'heartbroken man who cried 80 per cent of the time'. *The Times*. Retrieved from
http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/news/world/africa/article4084238.ece

Obiedat, N. (2006). 'The pragma-ideological implications of using reported speech: the case of reporting on the Al-Aqsa intifada'. *Pragmatics* 16 (2/3). 275–304.

Smirnova, A. (2009). 'Reported speech as an element of argumentative newspaper discourse'. *Discourse & Communication* 3. 79–103.

Waugh, L. (1995). 'Reported speech in journalistic discourse: the relation of function and text'. *Text* 15 (1). 129–173.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

56

Natalia MORA
Universidad Complutense de Madrid

nataliamora@ucm.es

Evidential expressions in Spanish accounts of religious miracles of the 17th century

Although there is some discussion about the limits of evidential expressions due to their overlapping with other meanings such as epistemicity (De Haan 1999; Cornillie 2009), the standard definition of evidentiality presents it as the linguistic realisation of the information source on which a statement is based (Aikhenvald 2004). As Comrie (2000:1) points out, this grammatical aspect started to be widely studied in the mid to late nineteen eighties (e.g., Givón 1982, Chafe and Chichols 1986, Willet 1988) but it has only recently been addressed in Spanish (Marín Arrese, Hidalgo and Molina 2002, 2004; Bermúdez Wachtmeister 2004; Cornillie 2007, 2008, 2015; Marín Arrese and Carretero 2014; Ahern, Amenós-Pons and Guijarro-Fuentes 2015; Carretero and Zamorano-Mansilla 2015; Cornillie and Gras Manzano 2015; Vatrican 2015).

As can be expected, evidential expressions are an important resource when dealing with the (intended) veracity of a text, since depending on the way it is related to evidence, the text may seem closer to or further from the truth. A special type of text where conveying veracity to the message may play a key role is that in which the narrated events may, at first, look unbelievable, unnatural or even supernatural. Such texts include accounts of religious miracles which, although rarely seen nowadays, were commonly reported and widely accepted some centuries ago, in the 16th and 17th centuries in Spain (García de Enterría 1994, 1996, 1998).

Thus, in order to enrich and widen the study of evidential expressions in Spanish, this paper examines the role of evidential markers in three Spanish accounts of religious miracles of the 17th century (Sánchez Iglesias 2017) and tries to shed some light on the way the author presents the information as true as possible by means of evidential strategies.

References

Ahern, A. K., Amenós-Pons, J., and Guijarro-Fuentes, P. (2015). Metarepresentation and evidentiality in Spanish tense and mood. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, *29*(1), 61-82.

Aikhenvald, A. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bermúdez Wachtmeister, F. 2004. La categoría evidencial del castellano: metonimia y elevación de sujeto. *Boletín de Lingüística* 22, 3-31.

Carretero, M. and Zamorano-Mansilla, J.R. (2015). Evidentiality as conversational implicature: Implications for corpus annotation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 212, 146-150.

Chafe, W. and Nichols, J. (eds.) (1986). *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Comrie, B. (2000). Evidentials: Semantics and history. In L. Johanson and B. Utas (eds.), *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1–14.

Cornillie, B. (2007). *Epistemic Modality and Evidentiality in Spanish (semi-) auxiliaries. A cognitive-functional Approach*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

57

Cornillie, B. (2008). On the grammaticalization and (inter)subjectivity of Spanish evidential (semi-)auxiliaries. In E. Seoane and M.J. López Couso (eds.), *Theoretical and Empirical Issues in Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 55-76.

Cornillie, B. (2009). Evidentiality and epistemic modality: on the close relationship of two different categories. *Functions of Language 16*(1), 44-62.

Cornillie, B. (2015). Más allá de la epistemicidad. Las funciones discursivas de los adverbios epistémicos y evidenciales en el español conversacional. *Spanish in Context 12*(1), 126-144.

Cornillie, B. and Gras Manzano, P. (2015). On the interactional dimension of evidentials. The case of the Spanish evidential discourse markers. *Discourse Studies 17*(2).

De Haan, F. (1999). Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality: Setting Boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18, 83-101.

García de Enterría, M.C. (1994). La Hagiografía popular barroca: entre lo maravilloso y lo fantástico, *Draco. Revista de Literatura española* 3(4), 191-204.

García de Enterría, M.C. (1996). Relaciones de sucesos en pliegos de villancicos del siglo XVII. In H. Ettinghausen, M.C. García de Enterría, V. Infantes and A. Redondo (eds.), *Las relaciones de sucesos en España (1500-1750). Actas del Primer Coloquio Internacional (Alcalá de Henares, 8, 9 y 10 de junio de 1995).* Madrid: Publications de la Sorbonne and Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá. 167-176.

García de Enterría, M.C. (1998). Magos y santos en la literatura popular (superstición y devoción en el Siglo de las Luces. In J. Huerta Calvo and E. Palacios Fernández (coods.), *Al margen de la Ilustración. Cultura popular, arte y literatura en la España del siglo XVIII.* Amsterdam: Rodopi. 53-76.

Marín Arrese, J.I. and Carretero, M. (2014) The Expression of Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in English and other European: A cross-linguistic study of *must* and *deber (de).* In I. de la Cruz Cabanillas and C. Tejedor Martínez (eds.) *Linguistic Insights: Studies on Languages.* Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá de Henares. 336-346.

Marín Arrese, J., Hidalgo, L. and Molina, S. (2002) Evidentiality and Modality in English and Spanish: Connections and Interactions. In R. Facchinetti (ed.), *English Modality in Perspective. Genre Analysis and Contrastive Studies.* Verona: Centro Arti Grafiche Universitá di Verona. 135-146.

Marín Arrese, J.I, Hidalgo, L. and Molina, S. (2004) Evidential, epistemic and deontic modality in English and Spanish: The expression of writer stance in newspaper discourse. In R. Facchinetti & Frank Palmer (eds.), *English Modality in Perspective. Genre Analysis and Contrastive Studies.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag. 121-139.

Sánchez Iglesias, A. (2017). *Las relaciones de sucesos en la colección de Jesuitas de la Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia (1600-1650): catálogo completo junto con el estudio y edición de las relaciones sobre milagros.* Unpublished PhD dissertation. Salamanca: University of Salamanca.

Vatrican, A. (2015). Evidentiality and epistemic modality in the rumor/journalistic conditional in Spanish. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, *29*(1), 83-100.

Willett, T. (1988). A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12, 51–97.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

58

Juana I. MARÍN ARRESE
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
juana@filol.ucm.es

Evidentiality in Discourse: Inferential evidential values of expressions from the domains of perception, cognition and communication

This paper examines the phenomenon of multifunctionality of evidential expressions in unscripted conversation and in journalistic discourse in English and Spanish. Evidentials have been characterized as primarily indicating the source of information (Aikhenvald 2004), and the evidence on the basis of which the speaker feels entitled to make a claim (Anderson 1986). Evidentiality is conceived as a subdomain of the conceptual domain of epistemicity, in that it provides 'epistemic justification' for a proposition (Boye 2012). In a study on epistemicity and evidentiality based on a sample of 50 languages of a different genetic affiliation, Boye (2012: 137ff) observes that there are a number of expressions that are synchronically polyfunctional, and others that are moving diachronically, with respect to specific subspaces or notional regions within the semantic map of epistemicity, which would seem to point to the existence of certain bidirectional connecting links between those spaces. This paper focuses on the link between direct and indirect evidentiality, and on cross-domain extensions to the domain of indirect evidentiality. More especifically, the paper studies the extensions of core expressions in English and Spanish from the experiential domains of perception (*see*, ver), cognition (*know*, *conocer*) and communication (*say*, *decir*) to indirect evidentiality. The paper addresses the following research questions: (a) whether there are similarities or differences in the occurrence of multifunctionality of those expressions across languages, and across discourses and genres; and (b) the degree to which indirect inferential values are associated with particular expression types or constructions. In the literature, various dimensions and parameters have been proposed as criteria for the classification of evidential values or functions (cf. Plungian 2001; Squartini 2008). The framework for the analysis in this paper draws on the basic classification of evidential values proposed by Diewald and Smirnova (2010), 'direct', 'indirect inferential', and 'indirect reportative' evidence, and takes into account the distinction that Squartini (2008) observes between the mode of knowing and the source of evidence. The framework posited here considers the interaction between the following dimensions characterising the speaker/conceptualizer's access to the evidence: (a) mode of access to the information; (b) type of evidence or source of information involved; and (c) type of evidence or experiential domain of the evidence, that is, whether the evidence involves the perceptual, the cognitive or mental level, or the social level of communication. (cf. Marín-Arrese 2013; Cornillie, Marín-Arrese & Wiemer 2015). The data consists of naturally occurring examples of evidential expressions, randomly selected from the *BNC-Baby-Unscripted conversation* (English) and the *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual* (CREA) (*Subcorpus Oral del Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual*: en ESPAÑA), and from a comparable corpus of journalistic texts in the two languages (*Corpus of English and Spanish Journalistic Discourse,* CESJD-JMA, 2000-2012). Preliminary results point to similarities across languages in the extensions of expressions from the three domains of experience, though certain distinctions have also been observed

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

59

regarding the degree to which particular construction or expression types acquire indirect inferential values.

References

Anderson, Lloyd B. 1986. Evidentials, Paths of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically Regular Asymmetries. In *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, ed. by Wallace Chafe, and Johanna Nichols, 273–312. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. Boye,

Kasper. 2012. *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cornillie, Bert, Marín-Arrese, Juana I. and Björn Wiemer. 2015. Evidentiality and the Semantics–pragmatics Interface. An Introduction. *Belgium Journal of Linguistics* 29: 1–18.

Diewald, Gabriele and Elena Smirnova. 2010. *Evidentiality in German. Linguistic Realization and Regularities in Grammaticalization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Marín Arrese, Juana I. 2013. Stancetaking and Inter/Subjectivity in the Iraq Inquiry: Blair vs. Brown. In *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*, ed. by Juana I. Marín-Arrese, Marta Carretero, Jorge Arús and Johan van der Auwera, 411–445. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Plungian, Vladimir A. 2001. The Place of Evidentiality within the Universal Grammatical Space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 349–357. Squartini, Mario. 2008. Lexical vs. Grammatical Evidentiality in French and Italian. *Linguistics* 46 (5): 917–947.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

60

Javier MARTÍN ARISTA
Universidad de La Rioja
javier.martin@unirioja.es

Juana I. MARÍN-ARRESE
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
juana@filol.ucm.es

Marta CARRETERO
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
mcarrete@filol.ucm.es

Lexical evidentiality in Old English. The adverbial class

This paper aims to explore the degree to which the functions of evidentiality proposed in the literature (Cornillie, Marín-Arrese & Wiemer 2015; Diewald & Smirnova 2010; Marín Arrese 2013, 2017) are present in the lexical class of adverbs of perception in *-ly* in Old English. The analysis will focus on the following set of adverbs: *apparently, clearly, evidently, obviously, plainly, seemingly, visibly*. The aim is to ascertain which of the functions or values of evidentiality (Direct Perceptual Evidentiality, Indirect, Inferential Evidentiality, and Indirect-Reportative Evidentiality) are already present in the use of these adverbs in Old English. The results will be compared with data for these adverbs from present-day English (cf. Carretero et al. 2017). The data for Old English have been drawn from the *Dictionary of Old English Corpus* and checked against the information provided by the dictionaries by Bosworth-Toller, Hall-Merritt and Sweet, as well as the *Dictionary of Old English A-H* and the lexical database of Old English *Nerthus*. Preliminary results indicate the occurrence of these adverbs with evidential meaning in the case of *clearly, evidently, plainly, visibly,* and *apparently*; and the lack of the evidential meanings in the case of *obviously* and *seemingly*.

References

Bosworth, J. and T. N. Toller. 1973 (1898). *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carretero, M., Marín-Arrese, J. and Lavid, J. (2017) Adverbs as evidentials: an English-Spanish contrastive analysis of twelve adverbs in spoken and newspaper discourse. *Kalbotyra* 70: 32-59.

Cornillie, Bert, Juana I. Marín-Arrese and Björn Wiemer. 2015. Evidentiality and the semantics-pragmatics interface. An Introduction. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 29: 1–18.

Diewald, Gabriele and Elena Smirnova. 2010. *Evidentiality in German. Linguistic Realization and Regularities in Grammaticalization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hall, J. R. C. 1984 (1960). *A concise Anglo-Saxon dictionary*. With a supplement by H. D. Merritt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

61

Healey, A. diPaolo (ed.), with J. Price Wilkin and X. Xiang. 2012. *The dictionary of Old English web corpus*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto. http://www.doe.utoronto.ca/pub/webcorpus.htm.

Healey, A. diPaolo (ed.). 2016. *The Dictionary of Old English: A to H*. Toronto: Dictionary of Old English Project, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto.

Marín-Arrese, J. 2013. Stancetaking and Inter/Subjectivity in the Iraq Inquiry: Blair vs. Brown. In: J. Marín-Arrese, M. Carretero, J. Arús and J. van der Auwera (eds.), *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 411–445.

Marín Arrese, J. 2017. Multifunctionality of Evidential Expressions in Discourse Domains and Genres: Evidence from Cross-linguistic Case Studies. In: J. Marín-Arrese, G. Haβler and M. Carretero (eds) *Evidentiality Revisited: Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse-Pragmatic Perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 195-222.

Martín Arista, J. (ed.), L. García Fernández, M. Lacalle Palacios, A. E. Ojanguren López and E.Ruiz Narbona. 2016. NerthusV3. Online Lexical Database of Old English. Nerthus Project. Universidad de La Rioja. [www.nerthusproject.com].

Sweet, H. 1976. *The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

62

Daria MORDASHOVA
Lomonosov Moscow State University
mordashova.d@yandex.ru

Epistemic modality and its pragmatic effects: the case of a Hill Mari epistemic marker[4]

This paper deals with a modal marker *ə̂lne ə̃*, which functions in the domain of epistemic modality in Hill Mari (Finno-Ugric). The data were collected in fieldwork in the village of Kuznetsovo and neighbouring villages (Gornomari district, Mari El, Russia) in 2017-2018. Both elicitation and a corpus of transcribed oral narratives (ca. 36000 tokens) were involved into the research.

The inner form of *ə̂l-ne- ə̃* is actually that of the verb *ə̂laš* 'to be' with a suffix of desiderative mood *-ne-* and an agreement marker of 3SG *- ə̃.* In modern Hill Mari it functions as a 'frozen' form, lacking subject agreement. The descriptive grammar mentions *ə̂lne ə̃* only in the context of imperative, which it attenuates [Savatkova 2002: 192]. My field data, however, reveal that this marker is grammaticalized within the scope of epistemic modality.

(1) *kuxn'a-štə̂*   *sə̃nzä-lə̂k-em-ə̃m*   *köčäl-äm,*   *a-m*   *mo,*
kitchen-IN   eye-DEST-POSS.1SG-ACC   look.for-NPST.1SG   NEG-1SG   find

tišäk=ok   *pišt-en kod-en-äm*   **ə̂l-ne-žə̃**   / **ə̂l-ne-m*
here=EMPH   put-CVB   leave-PRET-1SG   be-DES-3SG   be-DES-1SG
'I am looking for my glasses in the kitchen and cannot find them, I am sure I have left them here.'

Epistemic markers are related to the speaker's estimation of the chance that "the state of affairs expressed in the clause applies in the world" ([Nuyts 2005: 6], see also [Palmer 2001]). As can be seen in (1), *ə̂lne ə̃* conveys a high level of the speaker's confidence in the truth of the proposition.

There is yet another class of contexts where *ə̂lne ə̃* is widely acceptable. In (2)-(3) it is used as a marker of an indirect speech act.

(2) *tä-gü*   *tol-ə̂n*   **ə̂l-ne-žə̃,**   *pi*   *opt-a*
INDEF-who   come-PRET   be-DES-3SG   dog   bark-NPST.3SG
'Somebody has come, the dog is barking. {Go open the door!}'

(3) *jur*   *tol-eš*   **ə̂l-ne-žə̃,**   *šudə̂-m pog-aš kel-eš*
rain   come-NPST.3SG   be-DES-3SG   hay-ACC   collect-INF   need-NPST.3SG
'The rain is coming! We need to collect the hay.'

According to my consultants, (2) might be said by a person who is busy and cannot open the door herself, thus she hints to the addressee to do that. In (3) the expectation from the

---

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

63

addressee's reaction to the statement is made explicit (namely, the addressee is expected to help collect the hay).

I claim that these two uses of *ə̂lne ə̈* are not controversial. I will argue that the function of the indirect speech act marking may derive from the epistemic sense of the modal marker on the grounds of pragmatic intersubjectivity, when a linguistic unit acquires addressee-orientation in a particular context (see [Traugott 2010: 36]). The imperative flavour of (2)-(3) thus occurs as a pragmatic effect of the fact that the speaker shares her knowledge (judgment about the probability of the state of affairs) with the addressee and expects a subsequent reaction.

According to [Traugott 2010], it is a common path for epistemic modals to arise from verbs of desire and volition (cf. the English *will*), but their development into a directive strategy is rather challenging. In the case of *ə̂lne ə̈* one probably deals with (inter)subjectification of a desiderative form. A possible way of its diachronic development in Hill Mari will also be covered in the talk.

Abbreviations

1.3 – 1st, 3rd person, ACC – accusative, CVB – converb, DES – desiderative, DEST – destinative, EMPH – emphatic particle, IN – inessive, INF – infinitive, NEG – negation, NPST – non-past tense, POSS – possessive, PRET – preterite, SG – singular

References

Nuyts 2005 – *Nuyts J.* Modality: Overview and linguistic issues. // W. Frawley (Ed.), *The Expression of Modality*, 1-26. (The Expression of Cognitive Categories 1.) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006.

Palmer 2001 – *Palmer F. R.* Mood and Modality. 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, 2001. 236 p.

Savatkova 2002 – *Savatkova A. A.* Gornoje narechie marijskogo jazyka. {The Hill dialect of Mari.} Savariae, 2002. 298 p.

Traugott 2010 – *Traugott E. C.* (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. // K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte, & H. Cuyckens (Eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, 29-71. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

64

Tanja MORTELMANS
University of Antwerpen
tanja.mortelmans@uantwerpen.be

High certainty/strong evidence. How English, Dutch and German deal with this epistemic/evidential domain

Although the modal verbs *moeten* (Dutch) and *müssen* (German) have a higher relative frequency than their English counterpart *must* (whereby the frequency of *must* is overall decreasing; see Leech 2003, Close & Aarts 2010), the opposite (still) holds for the epistemic and/or evidential (in the following: abbreviated as ep./ev.) uses of *must*, i.e. ep./ev. uses of *must* are considerably more frequent than ep./ev. uses of either *moeten* or *müssen* (Mortelmans 2012). Mortelmans (2012) has argued that the higher frequency of English ep./ev. *must* can be accounted for on functional grounds. More specifically, English ep/ev. *must* is argued (1) to have a wider distribution as it also expresses pure conjectures which lack a straightforward evidential basis (whereas ev./ep. *müssen* and *moeten* typically evoke the presence of some kind of evidence) and (2) ep./ev. *must* is also used for intersubjective pragmatic purposes, i.e. to signal consolidation and solidarity with the addressee, a function which ep./ev. *müssen/moeten* lack. In my presentation, I would like to further pursue this line of contrastive research. First, I want to have a closer look at the translation strategies used to render ep./ev. *must* in Dutch and German, on the one hand (these involve the use of adverbs like Dutch *vast* 'surely' and German *bestimmt* 'surely' or other modal verbs like *zullen* 'will'). Second, I want to address the ep./ev. uses of Dutch *moeten* and *German müssen* more explicitly, in order to grasp the characteristics of the ep./ev. use of these verbs, also in contrast to English ep./ev. *must*. The ultimate goal is to arrive at a better, more nuanced understanding of how the conceptual domain of (epistemic) high certainty/ (evidential) inference on the basis of strong evidence (see Boye 2012) is structured in German, Dutch and English, whereby a) other markers (adverbs, modal particles, other modal verbs) will be taken into account as well and b) pragmatic factors (the expression of solidarity, assurance, politeness) will be considered. This also involves the question whether and if so, how epistemic uses can be distinguished from evidential ones in this particular conceptual domain. The corpus will consist of two-parts: a self-compiled contrastive parallel corpus, on the one hand, mainly based on occurrences of ep./ev. *must/müssen/moeten* in detective novels (in which epistemic assessments and inferences on the basis of evidence play an important role) and an analysis of ep./ev. instances of *moeten/müssen* in German and Dutch, on the basis of both written and spoken present-day Dutch and German corpora.

References

Boye, Kasper (2012). *Epistemic Meaning: A Crosslinguistic and Functional-Cognitive Study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.Close, Joanne & Bas Aarts (2010). Current change in the Modal System of English: A case study of *Must*, *Have To* and *Have got to*. In U.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

65

Lenker, J. Huber, and R. Mailhammer (eds), *The history of English verbal and nominal constructions*, 165-181. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leech, Geoffrey (2003). Modality on the move: the English modal auxiliaries 1961-1992. In *Modality in contemporary English*, R. Facchinetti, M. Krug & F. Palmer (eds.), 223-240. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mortelmans, Tanja (2012). Epistemic *must* and its cognates in German and Dutch. The subtle differences. *Journal of Pragmatics* 44, 2150-2164.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

66

Cecilia Mihaela POPESCU
Oana Adriana DUŢĂ
University of Craiova, Romania
cecilia99_ro@yahoo.com / oana.duta@yahoo.com

Epistemic Modality or Indirect Evidentiality? On the Meaning of Romance Future in Concessive Adversative Contexts

Our communication focuses on a special type of use of "epistemic future" (hereinafter: FUT) in Italian, Spanish and Romanian[5], in adversative or concessive syntactic and discursive matrixes (see (1), (2) and (3) below), having the semantic and pragmatic function of counterargument for an explicitly presented conclusion:

(1) ***Avrà*** *un dottorato,* ma *non è troppo sveglio* (Rocci 2000: 248).
(2) *Le* ***parecerá*** *una tontería,* pero *aquello me salvó* (RAE 2010: 448).
(3) ***Om semăna*** / ***om fi semănând*** *noi amândouă,* dar *nici nu se compară* (Reinheimer-Rîpeanu 1994: 514).

The interpretation of FUT forms in such contexts oscillates in scientific literature, between a purely epistemic reading and an evidential-reportative one (see Squartini 2001, 2004, 2005, 2012; Rodriquez Rosique 2015; Zafiu 2002, 2009, 2017; etc.). Considering this situation, our approach aims at proving that a complex rhetorical strategy is involved in such contexts, where the FUT in fact only actualizes the prototypical feature [+placement in a subsequent relation ("ultériorité", according to Bres 2012: 1719-1730)], exclusively marking the relation of subsequence of the hypothesis compared to a previously mentioned state of facts (see Popescu 2013, 2015).

In the first part of our intervention, we aim at performing a compared analysis of the semantic and functional behaviour of FUT in adversative and concessive contexts and other types of epistemic utterances, so as to mainly emphasize that a description of inferential cognitive processes is actualised in both cases. However, we shall see that the situation described in conversational matrixes with a purely epistemic value has a strongly uncertain character. From an evidential perspective, such structures actualise direct, inferential evidentiality, and the speaker takes a participatory attitude regarding the asserted propositional content. Adversative or concessive discursive structures are, instead, neutral from a vericonditional perspective, as the analysed verbal morpheme only performs an explicit description of the modality of neutral possible, like the equivalent French structures, such as: il se peut que / peut-être que. However, from an evidential perspective, such adversative and concessive conversational matrixes entail indirect, reportative evidentiality, with the speaker expressing a certain distance from the asserted propositional content.

---

[5] The epistemic future in Romanian is referred to as "presumptive" by the grammars of this linguistic system.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

67

The second part of the communication tries to show, by resorting to the Romance typological perspective, that FUT verbal forms involved in concessive and adversative structures do not have an evidential reportative value per se, like the conditional. We are dealing with a par défaut meaning, actualised through the semantic and syntactic framework the analysed verbal morphemes are inserted in. They inherently express only the inferential cognitive process that is subsequent to a referential complex (R), subjectively assessed by the speaker and compared to which a relation of subsequence of the hypothesis is established, by predication to FUT. This R may be a real state of facts (as in (1), „Lui ha un dottorato" «He has a PhD ») or a „discursive truth" (as in (3), where the predication „Om semăna noi" «We may be alike» is a metadiscursive representation of the structure „Tu zici/Se zice: noi două semănăm" «You say/It's said: the two of us are alike»).

References

Academia Română / Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" (2005), *Gramatica Limbii Române* (GALR), vol. I: *Cuvântul*, vol. II: *Enunţul*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române.

Barceló, Gérard Joan (2006), « Le futur des langues romanes et la modalité : monosémie et dialogisme », in *Cahiers de praxématique* [Gérard Joan Barceló / Jacques Bres / Adeline Patard (eds.), *Aspectualité, temporalité, modalité*], 47, p. 177-190.

Berretta, M. (1991), "Parliamo del nostro futuro", in Italiano e Oltre, 6, 3, p. 135-140.

-------- (1997), "Sul Futuro Concessivo: riflessioni su un caso (dubbio) di de/grammaticalizzazione", in *Linguistica e Filologia* 5, p. 7-40.

Bres, Jacques (2012), « Conditionnel et ultériorité dans le passé: de la subjectivité à l'objectivité », in SHS Web of Conferences, Volume 1, 3ème Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Française, retrieved from: http://www.linguistiquefrancaise.org/index.php?option=com_article&access=standard&Itemid=129&url=/articles /shsconf/pdf/2012/01/shsconf_cmlf12_000037.pdf, p. 1719-1730.

Gennari, Silvia (2000), "Semantics and pragmatics of future tenses in Spanish", in Héctor Campos / Elena Herburger / Alfonso Morales-Front / Thomas J. Walsh (eds.), *Hispanic Linguistics at the Turn of the Millennium. Papers from the 3rd Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, Somerville MA, Cascadilla Press, p. 264-281.

Popescu, Cecilia Mihaela (2013), *Viitorul şi condiţionalul în limbile romanice. Abordare morfosintactică şi categorizare semantică din perspectivă diacronică*, Craiova, Editura Universitaria.

-------- (2015), « Le „futur épistémique inférentiel" dans les langues romanes. Une approche contrastive (domaine: français – espagnol – italien – roumain) », in *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* (RSP), 38, p. 59-76, thematic issue coordinated by Lotfi Abouda and Sophie Azzopardi, *Le futur*, Presses Universitaires d'Orléans.

-------- (in press – 2018), „Il futuro concessivo romanzo, un marcatore polifonico, evidenziale e/o inferenziale" in Elena Pîrvu (a cura di), *Il tempo e lo spazio nella lingua e nella letteratura italiana. Atti del VIII Convegno internazionale di italianistica dell'Università di Craiova, 16 -17 settembre 2016*, Franco Cesati Editore, Firenze.

-------- / Duţă, Oana (2017), "Romanian Presumptive in Romanian Language, an Evidential and/or Epistemic marker", in Juana I. Marin-Arrese/ Julia Lavid López/ Marta Carretero/ Elena Dominguez Romero/ Victoria Martín de la Rosa / María Pérez Blanco, *Evidentiality and Modality in European Languages. Discourse-pragmatic perspectives*, Berlin, Peter Lang, p. 33-56.

Real Academia Española / Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española (2010), *Nueva gramática de la lengua española. Manual*, Madrid, ESPASA (RAE 2010).

Reinheimer-Rîpeanu, Sanda (1994), „Ce-o fi o fi", in Revue Roumaine de Linguistique, 29, 5-6, p. 511-527.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

68

-------- (2000), « Le présomptif roumain: Marqueur évidentiel et épistémique », in M. Coene / W. De Mulder / P. Dendale / Y. D'Hulst (ed.), *Traiani Augusti vestigia pressa sequamur: studia linguistica in honorem Lilianae Tasmowski*, Padova, Unipress, p. 481–491.

Renzi, Lorenzo / Giampaolo Salvi / Anna Cardinaletti (eds.) (1988-1995), *Grande Grammatica italiana di consultazione*, 3 vol. [vol. 1: 1988, vol. 2: 1991, vol. 3: 1995], Bologna, Il Mulino.

Rivero, María Luísa (in press – 2014), « Spanish inferential and mirative futures and conditionals: An evidential gradable modal proposal », in *Lingua*-2177, no. of papers 19.

Rocci, Andrea (2000), « L'interprétation épistémique du futur en italien et en français: une analyse procédurale », in *Cahiers de Linguistique Française*, no. 22: *Inférences directionnelles, représentations mentales et subjectivité*, p. 241-274 and in Internet <semanticsarchive.net/Archive/2FhMWUxO/futur.pdf>.

Rosique, Rodríguez, Susana (2015), "Distance, evidentiality and counter-argumentation: Concessive future in Spanish", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 85, p. 181-199.

Rossari, Corinne / Ricci, Claudia / Salsmann, Margot (in press), "Modal forms expressing probability and their combination with concessive sequences in French and Italian", Conference Paper, Colloque CRH Corpus-based Research in the Humanities (Varsovie), 10.12.2015.

Squartini, Mario (2001), "The internal structure of evidentiality in Romance", in *Studies in Language* 25, p. 297–334.

-------- (2004), "Disentangling evidentiality and epistemic modality in Romance", in *Lingua*, 114, p. 873-895.

-------- (2005), "L'evidenzialità in rumeno e nelle altre lingue romanze", in *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 121, 2, p. 246-268.

-------- (2012), "Evidentiality in interaction: The concessive use of the Italian Future between grammar and discourse", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, p. 2116-2128.

Vet, Co / Kampers-Manhe, Brigitte (2001), « Futur simple et futur du passé: leurs emplois temporels et modaux », in Dendale, Patrick / Tasmowski, Liliane (eds.), *Le conditionnel en français*, Paris, Librairie Klincksieck, p. 89105.

Zafiu, Rodica (2002), „Evidenţialitatea în limba română actuală", in Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii române actuale*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, p. 127-144.

-------- (2009), „Interpretări gramaticale ale prezumptivului", in R. Zafiu / B. Croitor / A.-M. Mihail (ed.), *Studii de gramatică. Omagiu Doamnei Profesoare Valeria Guţu Romalo*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, p. 289-305.

-------- (in press – 2017), "Epistemic and evidential markers in the rhetorical context of concession", in *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 115.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

69

Tabea REINER
LMU Munich
tabea.reiner@lmu.de

Against "TAM-E" – from a semantic perspective

It has become customary to mention evidentiality (E) in the same breath with tense, aspect, and mood/modality (TAM), as witnessed by, e.g., conference titles like "TAM-E" (Paris, 2016). In my talk, I am going to argue that this is a misconception. In a nutshell: either evidentiality is part of modality, then it is not a category of its own – or it is a category of its own, then it is not on a par with TAM. The former implication seems to be uncontroversial and I will merely check its premise, raising some empirical questions. In contrast, the latter implication requires a good deal of argumentation. According to Klein 1994 and subsequent work, tense is the relation between the Topic Time (TT) and the Time of Utterance (TU), while aspect is the relation between TT and the Time of Situation (TSit). Crucially, TT means 'the time for which a claim is made'. In recent proposals (e.g., Reiner 2018), this approach is extended to include mood/modality as the relation between the Topic World (TW) and some other world, typically the world that the speaker considers to be the real one. In analogy to TT, TW is the world for which a claim is made. Thus, TAM restricts claims to times and worlds. E(videntiality), however, if not viewed as part of modality, does not restrict the claim to anything but rather specifies the claim's source (as has been argued extensively by Aikhenvald 2004, 2014, also cf. Aikhenvald 2012:431). Thus, pure evidentiality does not share the essential property of tense, aspect, and mood/modality (also cf. Murray 2017). To sum up, evidentiality may very well be a category of its own, but then it differs crucially from tense, aspect, and mood/modality.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004): Evidentiality. Oxford [et al.]: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2012): Gabriele Diewald, Elena Smirnova (eds.). 2010. Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languageses. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. Reviewed by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (The Cairns Institute, James Cook University). Studies in Language, 36(2), 431–439.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2014): The grammar of knowledge. A cross-linguistic view of evidentials and the expression of information source. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & Dixon, R. M. W. (eds.), The grammar of knowledge. A cross-linguistic typology. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Explorations in linguistic typology, 7), 1–51.

Klein, Wolfgang (1994): Time in language. London [et al.]: Routledge (Germanic Linguistics). Murray, Sarah E. (2017): The semantics of evidentials. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Oxford Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics, 9).

Against TAM-E 2 Reiner, Tabea (2018): Existiert ein Infinitiv Posterior im

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

70

Anna RUSKAN
Vilnius University
anna.ruskan@flf.vu.lt

Modal and evidential markers in English and Lithuanian business news discourse: cross-genre and cross-linguistic perspectives

The distribution and use of modal and evidential markers in news discourse vary across newspaper genres (report vs comment), formats (broadsheet vs tabloid), discourse types (written vs spoken) as well as languages and cultures. From a cross-linguistic and cross-genre perspective, much attention has been devoted to the expression of epistemic modality and evidentiality in English and Spanish news discourse (Hidalgo 2006; Marín 2006; Marín-Arrese 2015, 2017; Domínguez Romero 2016). The present study aims to compare the use and frequency of modal (epistemic and non-epistemic) and evidential markers in English and Lithuanian news reports and editorials/opinion columns collected from the domain of business news. In Lithuanian news discourse, modal and evidential markers have been considered in terms of their functions, syntactic status (Wiemer 2007, 2010; Jasionytė 2012; Usonienė, Šinkūnienė 2017) and variation in print and online newspapers (Ruskan 2017); however, their distribution has not been addressed across news genres and languages. The present study focuses on modal verbs (1) – (2), complement-taking predicates (CTPs) (3) and adverbials (4):

(1) *Post Brexit, there **may** be fewer jobs, but they **will** be better paid.* (The Guardian)

(2) *Hammond **must** learn from Osborne's mistakes.* (The Guardian)

(3) *Taisyklės dar nepatvirtintos, tačiau **tikėtina, kad** įmonėms nereikės teikti VMI konfidencialios informacijos.* (V)
    'The rules have not been approved yet, but it is **likely that** companies will not have to provide confidential information to the STI.'

(4) ***Tiesa**, net ir Davose nėra stebuklingo stiklinio rutulio, rodančio ateitį.* (V)
    '**Actually**, even in Davos there is no crystal ball foretelling the future.'

It explores the epistemic and non-epistemic qualifications of modal markers (Palmer 2001) and inferential and reportive values of evidential markers (Diewald, Smirnova 2010) in English and Lithuanian business news discourse and looks into their distribution across the news genres. The English data have been drawn from the self-compiled corpus of news reports, editorials and opinion columns related to the topic of business in *The Guardian*, whereas the Lithuanian data have been obtained from the corresponding genres in the newspaper *Verslo inios* 'Financial News'. The articles were collected in the years 2016-2017.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

71

Preliminary results show that both English and Lithuanian business news reports show the salience of reportive markers, foregrounding the author's reliance on external sources, and inferential markers based on external sources of information. These findings are in line with previous studies into the distribution of evidential markers in English and Spanish news reports and editorials/opinion columns (Marín-Arrese 2015, 2017). The argumentative news genres abound in markers of deontic modality, displaying a range of modal strength (from strong to weak obligation), and markers of epistemic modality, expressing prediction, likelihood as well as reality and actuality (Biber *et al.* 1999). Evidential markers attested in the argumentative genres express mainly the author's inferences drawn from perceptual or conceptual evidence. The study also identifies differences in the distribution of modal and evidential markers in the two languages, which confirms differences in reporting and argumentative styles across languages and cultures (Hidalgo 2006; Marín-Arrese 2017: 212).

References

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan, eds. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English.* London: Longman.

Diewald, Gabriele, and Elena Smirnova. 2010. *Evidentiality in German. Linguistic realization and regularities in grammaticalization.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Domínguez Romero, Elena. 2016. Object-oriented perception: Towards a contrastive approach to evidentiality in media discourse. *Kalbotyra* 69, 82–104.

Hidalgo, Laura. 2006. The expression of writer stance by modal adjectives and adverbs in comparable corpus of English and Spanish newspaper discourse. *Corpus linguistics: Applications for the study of English.* Hornero, Ana Maria, María José Luzón, and Silvia Murillo, eds. Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang. 125–140.

Jasionytė, Erika. 2012. Lithuanian impersonal modal verbs reik(ė)ti 'need' and tekti 'be gotten': A corpus-based study. *Multiple perspectives in linguistic research on Baltic languages.* Usonienė, Aurelija, Nicole Nau, and Ineta Dabašinskienė, eds. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 206–228.

Marín, Juana I. 2006. Epistemic stance and commitment in the discourse of fact and opinion in English and Spanish: A comparable corpus study. *Corpus linguistics: Applications for the study of English.* Hornero, Ana Maria, María José Luzón, and Silvia Murillo, eds. Bern, Berlin: Peter Lang. 141–157.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. 2015. Epistemicity and stance: a cross-linguistic study of epistemic stance strategies in journalistic discourse in English and Spanish. *Discourse Studies* 17 (2), 210–225.

Marín-Arrese, Juana I. 2017. Multifunctionality of evidential expressions in discourse domains and genres: Evidence from cross-linguistic case studies. *Evidentiality revisited: Cognitive grammar, functional and discourse-pragmatic perspectives.* Marín-Arrese, Juana I., Gerda Haßler, and Marta Carretero, ed. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 195–221.

Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and modality* [2nd ed.]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruskan, Anna. 2017. Markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian newspaper discourse: A corpus-based study. *Evidentiality revisited: Cognitive grammar, functional and discourse-pragmatic perspectives.* Marín-Arrese, Juana I., Gerda Haßler, and Marta Carretero, ed. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 271–295.

Usonienė, Aurelija, and Jolanta Šinkūnienė. 2017. Potential vs use: Revisiting an evidential participial construction in Lithuanian. *Evidentiality revisited: Cognitive grammar, functional and discourse-pragmatic perspectives.* Marín-Arrese, Juana I., Gerda

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

72

Haßler, and Marta Carretero, ed. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 171–192.

Wiemer, Björn. 2007. Lexical markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19 (1), 173–208.

Wiemer, Björn. 2010. Lithuanian *esą* a heterosemic reportive marker in its contemporary stage. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 245–308.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

73

Erika SANDMAN
University of Helsinki, General Linguistics
erika.sandman@helsinki.fi

Egophoric marking, epistemic status and epistemic stance in Wutun

In my talk I will discuss how speakers of Wutun use egophoric marking to manage epistemic rights in conversation. Wutun is a variety of Northwest Mandarin spoken by ca. 4000 people in Qinghai Province, Western China. It is spoken in a context of a linguistic area best termed *Amdo Sprachbund*, which consists of Sinitic, Tibetic, Mongolic and Turkic languages (Janhunen 2007). While most of the Wutun basic vocabulary and grammatical morphemes come from Chinese, its morphosyntax has been heavily influenced by Amdo Tibetan (Sandman 2016).

Egophoric marking is one of the striking Tibetan features in Wutun. In egophoric marking languages the same morpheme (EGO) is typically associated with speakers in declaratives and addressees in interrogatives, while another morpheme (NON-EGO) is used elsewhere, as in 1):

1)   a.   *ngu   huan   xhe-di-yek*
                1SG   food   drink-PROGR-**EGO**
        'I am eating.'
        b.   *ni/gu   huan   xhe-di-li*
                2SG/3SG food   drink-PROGR-**NON.EGO**
                'You are eating/(S)he is eating.'
    c.   *ni   ma-ge   nian-di-yek*
        2SG   what-REF   read-PROGR-**EGO**
        'What are you reading?'

In earlier studies on the phenomenon, egophoric marking has usually been viewed as a type of person marking (Hale 1980) or evidential system (see e.g. Garrett 2001; Tournadre 2008; San Roque & Loughnane 2012). However, these theories do not explain the commonly found cases of ego with non-first person and non-ego with first person in Wutun. My goal is to investigate the interactional principles underlying the choice of egophoric marking morphemes in naturally-occurring data. My data is based on fieldwork among the Wutun community in 2007 and 2010 and it includes audio-recorded everyday conversations and narrative telling.

Examining conversations and narratives in Wutun reveals that egophoric marking is tied neither to person nor the information source. Instead, the choice of egophoric marking morphemes is constantly manipulated to express the moment-by-moment relationships between the participants in interaction. Therefore, I suggest that the key function of this category is connected with the expression of epistemic status and epistemic stance; concepts commonly used in conversation analysis and interactional linguistics (cf. Englebretson 2007;

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

74

Heritage 2012). Epistemic status refers to speaker's access to information in relation to other participants in conversation. It is relatively stable and influenced by several factors such as personal experience on the subject, the recency and certainty of information (Heritage 2012: 5). Epistemic stance, on the other hand, refers to moment-by-moment expression of these relations in conversation (Heritage 2012: 6). For example, the speaker who has the privileged epistemic status does not necessarily express it in interaction.

Wutun basic egophoric marking pattern can be explained as being due to epistemic status; in assertions it is usually the speaker who has the privileged access to information, while in questions it is usually the addressee. However, the speakers often manipulate egophoric marking morphemes to express unexpected epistemic stances. For example, by using non-ego with first person the speaker does not construct herself as the epistemic authority relative to the addressee, even if s/he would have privileged access to the instigation of the event.

References

Englebretson, Robert. 2007. Stancetaking in discourse: An introduction. In Robert Englebretson (ed.) *Stancetaking in discourse. Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction.* Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 164, 1-25. Amsterdam /Philadelphia: John Benjamin's.'

Garrett, Edward J. 2001. *Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan.* PhD dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Hale, Austin 1980. Person markers: finite conjunct and disjunct forms in Newari. In R. Trail et al. (eds.) *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics* 7, 95-106.

Heritage, John 2012. Epistemics in action: Action formation and territories of knowledge. *Research on Language & Social Interaction* 45 (1). 1-29.

Janhunen, Juha 2007. Typological interaction in the Qinghai linguistic complex. *Studia Orientalia* 101, 85-103.

Sandman, Erika 2016. *A Grammar of Wutun.* PhD dissertation, University of Helsinki.

San Roque, Lila and Robyn Loughnane 2012. The New Guinea Highlands evidentiality area. *Linguistic Typology* 16, 111-167.

Tournadre, Nicolas 2008. Arguments against the Concept of 'Conjunct'/'Disjunct' in Tibetan. In *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek: Festschrift für Roland Bielmeir zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, B. Huber & M. Volkart & P. Wildmer (eds), 281-308. Halle: IITBS.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

75

Andreu SENTÍ
Universitat de València
andreu.senti@uv.es

The modal verb *deure* and other attitudinal constructions in Modern Catalan: a corpus-based study

State of the art

Modality and evidentiality have been included as qualificational categories, together with time and aspect. However, as Nuyts (2017) points out, modality and evidentiality differ from time and aspect in that the former are not coherent categories at all. Only inferential evidentiality, epistemic modality and deontic modality share some semantic features, and therefore they are considered attitudinal categories (Nuyts 2005, 2017). Other notions, however, such as hearsay and direct evidentiality are excluded from attitudinal domains. It is also relevant that obligation is distinguished from deontic modality: unlike the traditional conception, Nuyts (2005) and Nuyts *et al.* (2010) argue that deontic modality refers to the degree of moral acceptability of the state of affairs, and therefore it is an attitudinal category, whereas obligation is a speech-act notion in which the speaker is ordering to someone to do something.

Among the attitudinal categories, epistemic modality and inferential evidentiality have not been settled clearly (Nuyts & van der Auwera 2016; Cornillie 2009; Boye 2012). Although traditionally the non-deontic reading of modal verbs such as English *must* or French *devoir* has been qualified as epistemic, there are several studies arguing that the essential element in these constructions is actually evidential (Dendale 1994; Cornillie 2007; Squartini 2008).

Goals

The aim of this presentation is to describe the semantic meanings and pragmatics of the modal auxiliary *deure* ('must') in Modern and Contemporary Catalan (19th c.), focusing on colloquial registers and assessing diatopic and textual variation. We deal with its semantic properties (speaker commitment, performativity, scalarity, (inter)subjectivity and scope) and show its inferential or epistemic nature. Likewise, we contrast these data with other evidential and modal constructions (such as *poder* 'can', *haver de* 'have to', *em sembla que* 'it seems to me that', *es veu que* 'it seems that', etc.), following Nuyts' (2017) proposal on the qualificational hierarchy.

Data, methodology and approach

This is a corpus-based study with data from several diatopic corpora (*COD, COC*) and diachronic ones (*CICA, CIMTAC, CTILC*). From the theoretical perspective, our study adopts a functional-cognitive approach (Nuyts 2005, 2017; Traugott & Trousdale 2013; Langacker 1987, 1991, 2006).

Expected results

Catalan *deure* is a subjective polysemic modal verb with an inferential core meaning (1), and different degrees of reliability. However, a fully subjective conjectural extension is found (2-3). Also some intersubjective and mirative pragmatic uses will be discussed.

(1) *Pues en sa primavera **deu ser**, que és quan hei ha més herbes.* (COD)
    'Well, it **must be** in spring, because it is when there are more herbs'
(2) *La caseta eixa qui la **degue fer**?*

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

76

'Who **must have built** that house?'

(3) *–No cal que agafes les ulleres de sol, oi? –Sortirà poc [el sol], però **deurà sortir**, no?*
[Packing to travel to England] 'You don't need your sunglasses, don't you? –There won't come out much, but **I suppose it will come out**, won't it?'

The semantic configuration of *deure* sketched above is the result of the diachronic evolution and grammaticalization of the modal verb (Sentí 2017). It is also worth mentioning that in some varieties *deure* has preserved a deontic reading. Nuyts' (2005) qualificational hierarchy, which distinguishes deontic modality from obligation, reveals to be crucial to explain the semantics of this reading and its relation with other deontic verbs (*haver de*).

Corpus references

CICA = *Corpus Informatitzat del Català Antic (CICA)*, J. Torruella (dir.), Manuel Pérez Saldanya, Josep Martines.

CIMTAC = Martines, Josep / Martines, Vicent (dirs.): *Corpus Informatitzat Multilingüe de Textos Antics i Contemporanis*, Alacant: ISIC-IVITRA.

COC = Payrató, Lluís & Núria Alturo (ed.) (2002): *Corpus oral de conversa col loquial. Materials de treball*. Barcelona: Publicacions de la Universitat de Barcelona.

COD = *Corpus oral dialectal.* [http://www.ub.edu/cccub/corpusoraldialectal-cod.html]

CTILC = Institut d'Estudis Catalans: *Corpus textual informatitzat de la llengua catalana*.

References

Boye, Kasper (2012): *Epistemic meaning. A cross-linguistic and functional-cognitive study*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Cornillie, Bert (2007): *Evidentiality and epistemic modality in spanish (semi-)auxiliaries: a cognitive-functional approach*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.

Cornillie, Bert (2009): "Evidentiality and epistemic modality. On the close relationship between two different categories", *Functions of Language* 16: 1, p. 44-62.

Dendale, Patrick (1994): "*Devoir* épistémique, marqueur modal ou évidentiel?". *Langue française* 102. 24-40.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1987): *Foundations of Cognitive Linguistics*, vol. I, *Theorical Prerequisites*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (1991): *Foundations of Cognitive Linguistics*, vol. II, *Descriptive Application*, Stanford, Stanford University Press.

Langacker, Ronald W. (2006): «Sujectification, Grammaticization, and Conceptual Archetypes» In Angeliki Athanasiadou, Costas Canakis and Bert Cornillie (eds.), *Subjectification: Various Paths to Subjectivity*, Berlin/Nova York, Mounton de Gruyter, 17-40.

Nuyts, Jan (2005): "The modal confusion: on terminology and the concepts behind it". In A. Klinge, H. Müller (ed.) *Modality: studies in form and function*. London: Equinox.

Nuyts, Jan (2017): "Evidentiality reconsidered" In Juana I. Marín Arrese, Gerda Haßler & Marta Carretero: *Evidentiality Revisited. Cognitive grammar, functional and discourse-pragmatic perspectives*. John Benjamins.

Nuyts, Jan & van der Auwera, Johan (eds.) (2016): *The Oxford handbook of modality and mood*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nuyts, Jan, Pieter Byloo & Janneke Diepeveen (2010): «On deontic modality, directivity, and mood: The case study of Dutch *mogen* and *moeten*», *Journal of Pragmatics* 4: 1, 16-34.

Sentí, Andreu (2017): *Modalitat i evidencialitat en català antic. Un acostament cognitiu a les perífrasis verbals amb* deure *i amb* haver. Barcelona: PAM / IIFV.

Squartini, M. (2008): "Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian", *Linguistics*, 46:5, p. 917-947.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. & Graeme Trousdale (2013): *Constructionalization and constructional changes*. Oxford: OUP.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

77

Jolanta ŠINKŪNIENĖ
Vilnius University
jolanta.sinkuniene@flf.vu.lt

Emerging discourse markers in Lithuanian research writing: GALIMA 'it is possible' constructions within the epistemicity domain

The past few decades of studies on research writing have convincingly shown that *author voice* or *author stance* (Hyland & Sancho Guinda 2012) plays an important role in the presentation and shaping up of scientific argumentation (cf. Hyland 2005; Fløttum *et al.* 2006). One of the central categories of author stance expression in research writing are hedging devices (e.g. *probably*, *perhaps*, *may*) which make the proposition sound less categorical. While hedging is substantially researched in English research writing, there are less studies done in other languages, especially regarding the linguistic items less readily associated with stance expression and mitigation.

This paper focuses on the non-agreeing passive participle of the verb *galėti* 'can/be able' and its constructions with infinitive in Lithuanian academic discourse. Based on the 9 million word corpus of academic written Lithuanian (CorALit), the paper explores three different science fields (humanities, technology, medicine) in order to define the semantic-pragmatic profile of these constructions in Lithuanian.

Though the semantic potential of GALIMA 'it is possible' is typically described in literature as limited to expressing dynamic and deontic modality (Holvoet 2009), it is argued in the paper that the constructions with GALIMA + mental/speech act verbs acquire epistemic-evidential overtones. Especially in the humanities they are used by scientific writers to convey stance, and act as discourse markers performing the pragmatic function of hedging. Within a broader perspective, these constructions could be viewed as manifestations of (inter)subjectivity (Traugott 2010) and pragmaticalization (Aijmer 1997) in research writing.

References

Aijmer, Karin. 1997. I think – an English modal particle. *Modality in Germanic Languages.* Eds. Toril Swan and Olaf J. Westvik. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-47.

Fløttum, Kjersti, Dahl Trine & Kinn Torodd. 2006. *Academic voices: across languages and disciplines.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Holvoet, Axel. 2009. Modals in Baltic. *Modals in the languages of Europe.* Eds. Bjoern Hansen & Ferdinand de Haan. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 199–228.

Hyland, Ken. 2005. *Metadiscourse: exploring interaction in writing*. London/New York: Continuum.

Hyland, Ken & Sancho Guinda, Carmen (eds.). 2012. *Stance and voice in written academic genres*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2010. (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: a reassessment. *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*. Eds. Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte & Hubert Cuykens. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 29–74.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

78

Anna SOCKA
University of Gdansk
anna.socka@ug.edu.pl

Does interrogative sentence mode trigger epistemic doubt implicature in German reportive modal verb construction *sollen*+infinitive?

In the majority of contemporary studies the reportive construction *sollen*+infinitive is treated as merely agnostic, with the negative epistemic component emerging qua conversational implicature (cf. e.g. Diewald 1999, Schenner 2008a, b). The following contextual factors have been stated to potentially trigger or strengthen the implicature: explicit naming of the information source, contextual indication of its unreliability, first person subject, introductory clauses containing negated verba sentiendi (e.g. *ich kann mir nicht vorstellen* ‚I cannot imagine'), non-declarative sentence mode (cf. Mortelmans 2000, 2009).

The present paper aims at testing if the interrogative sentence mode can be seen as a contextual trigger for the negative epistemic implicature of the reportive *sollen*+infinitive. The corpus research is based on the Deutsches Referenzkorpus (DeReKo) and takes into consideration four different text types (literary fiction, non-fiction, daily press, parliamentary debate). In particular it addresses the following topics:

i. Since in all the examples cited by Mortelmans the *sollen*+infinitive construction cooccurs with first person subjects, it must be tested, if the negative epistemic overtone is also present with other subjects.

ii. As it was shown by San Roque et al. (2017:128), the perspective-holder of the reportive *sollen*+infinitive, i.e. the person who perceived an original utterance, can be either the speaker (cf. 1) or the addressee of the current question (cf. 2).

1. (1) *"Bitte, sage mir, was du gesehen hast?!"*
   ‚"Please, tell me, what did you see?!"'
   "Gar nichts! Was soll ich deiner Meinung nach gesehen haben?!"' ‘Nothing at all! **What was I to see in your opinion**?"' (Planert, *Seleno*)
2. (2) [Conversation between a doctor and a patient who has lost his memory]

D: *So besinnen Sie sich also auf gar nichts, betreffs des gestrigen Abends? [...] Sie sollen einmal getanzt haben.*

‘So, you can't remember anything about yesterday evening? You're said to have danced once.' P: *Getanzt? Das wäre fast ein Wunder. Ich pflege nicht zu tanzen. **Wer soll denn meine Tänzerin gewesen sein?***

‘Danced? That would almost be a miracle. I don't normally dance. **Who is said to have been my dance partner?'** (May, *Der verlorene Sohn*, cit. in Faller 2006:14)

Thus, the question comes up, if the triggering effect of the interrogative mode on the negative epistemic implicature of *sollen*+infinitive depends on the speaker vs. addressee perspective.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

79

iii. Although polar interrogatives are suggested to be much more frequent than content interrogatives cross-linguistically, most examples of speaker perspective questions that San Roque et al. (2017:128) found in the cited literature are content interrogatives. The authors presume "that speaker perspective will be more compatible with content questions than with polar questions as, for the former, the reality of the event is to some extent presupposed by the speaker". For the present study the question arises, if the implicature triggering effect of the interrogative mode depends on the type of interrogative sentence. Furthermore, the possible interaction of the interrogative sentence type with the speaker vs. addressee perspective is to be investigated.

References

Diewald, Gabriele (1999): *Die Modalverben im Deutschen. Grammatikalisierung und Polyfunktionalität.* Tübingen: Niemeyer (Reihe Germanistische Linguistik 208).

Faller, Martina (2006): Evidentiality below and above speech acts. In: *semanticsarchive.net/Archive/GZiZjBhO/.*

Mortelmans, Tanja (2000): On the ‚Evidential' and the ‚Epistemic' Use of the German Modals *müssen* and *sollen*. In: van der Auwera, Johan (ed.): *Modal verbs in Germanic and Romance languages.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 131-148.

Mortelmans, Tanja (2009): Erscheinungsformen der indirekten Rede im Niederländischen und Deutschen *zou, soll(te)-* und der Konjunktiv I. In: Abraham, Werner / Leiss, Elisabeth (eds.), *Modalität. Epistemik und Evidentialität bei Modalverb, Adverb, Modalpartikel und Modus.* Tübingen: Stauffenburg (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 77), 171-187.

San Roque, Lila / Floyd, Simeon / Norcliffe, Elisabeth (2017): Evidentiality and interrogativity. *Lingua* 186-187, 120-143.

Schenner, Mathias (2008a): Double Face Evidentials in German: Reportative 'sollen' and 'wollen' in Embedded Contexts. In: Grønn, Atle (ed.): *Proceedings of SuB12.* Oslo: ILOS, 552-566.

Schenner, Mathias (2008b): Semantics of evidentials: German reportative modals. In: *Proceedings of ConSOLE* XVI, 179-198.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

80

Daisuke SUZUKI
Setsunan University
suzuki0213@gmail.com

Takashi FUJIWARA
Doshisha University

Modality and discourse as determinants of the use of modal adverbs

This aim of this study is to show on the basis of a case study of *conceivably*, *maybe*, *perhaps*, and *possibly* that we make a functional split between modal adverbs. These modal adverbs are nearly equivalent in meaning (i.e., implying a small chance), and can thus be classified in the same semantic category. Although the existing literature offers various interpretations of the usage of these modal adverbs (Greenbaum 1969; Bellert 1977; Lyons 1977; Watts 1984; Quirk et al. 1985; Doherty 1987; Swan 1988; Hoye 1997; Biber et al. 1999; Ernst 2002, 2009; Huddleston & Pullum 2002; Swan 2005), it is still unclear whether discourse and modal factors influence their use. In this paper, we will show the prominence of the discourse and modal marking based on a corpus investigation. For the source of the analysis data, we selected the British National Corpus (BNC XML Edition) because its large scale and wide range of genres provide sufficient data concerning theuse of the modal adverbs for various purposes within various contexts. The collection of the data for analysis proceeds as follows. First, we extracted all occurrences of the modal adverbs from the corpus and obtained 266 instances of *conceivably*, 10,080 of *maybe*, 33,521 of *perhaps* and 7,038 of *possibly*. Then, we examined each occurrence to identify those in which one of the four modal adverbs functioned as a sentence adverb. In this case, we identified 236 suchinstances of *conceivably*, 6,694 of *maybe*, 22,189 of *perhaps*, and 3,409 of *possibly*. In this paper we selected two factors that have particular significance for the usage pattern of modal adverbs: (i) in which position the adverbs are placed in the clause (i.e., initial, medial, final); and (ii) whether or not the adverbs co-occur with modal verbs (e.g., *may*, *must*, *will*). As a result, the findings for the initial use of *maybe* and *perhaps* are markedly high, compared to those of *conceivably* and *possibly*. On the other hand, *conceivably* and *possibly* tend to occur much more frequently in the medial position and with modal verbs than *maybe* and *perhaps*. These findings can be interpreted in terms of discourse and modality. The results of the analysis demonstrate that whether or not modal adverbs contain the form *-ly* is closely associated with discourse or modal demands (*maybe* and *perhaps* vs. *conceivably* and *possibly*). A close relationship can be seen between form and function among the modal adverbs. It has been shown as well that the factors determining the use of these adverbs are strongly associated with the parameters of discourse and modality.

References

Bellert, I. (1977) On semantic and distributional properties of sentential adverbs. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 8(2): 337-351.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

81

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech & S. Conrad. (1999) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.* Harlow: Pearson.

Coates, J. (1983) *The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries*. London: Croom Helm.

Doherty, M. 1987. Perhaps. *Folia Linguistica*, 21(1): 45-65.

Ernst, T. (2002) *The Syntax of Adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ernst, T. (2009) Speaker-oriented adverbs. *Nat Lang Linguist Theory*, 27: 497-544.

Greenbaum, S. (1969) *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. Coral Gables: University of Miami Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1970) Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English. *Foundations of Language*, 6: 322-361.

Halliday, M. A. K. & C. M. I. M. Matthiessen. (2014) *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th edn. Abingdon, Oxon.: Routledge.

Hoye, L. (1997) *Adverbs and Modality in English*. London: Longman.

Huddleston, R. & G. K. Pullum. (2002) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perkins, M. R. (1983) *Modal Expressions in English*. London: Frances Pinter.

Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Swan, M. (2005) *Practical English Usage*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, T. (1988) *Sentence Adverbials in English: A Synchronic and Diachronic Investigation*. Oslo: Novus.

Watts, R. J. (1984) An analysis of epistemic possibility and probability. *English Studies*, 65(2):129-140.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

82

Miriam THEGEL
Uppsala University
miriam.thegel@moderna.uu.se

Modality and tense in interaction: the deontic and dynamic categories represented in Spanish modal verbs

Although researchers within the field of modality tend to agree upon the existence of modal subcategories, there is disagreement on their number and their main differences. Some researchers prefer a bipartite division, making a main distinction between epistemic modality and deontic or agent-oriented modality (Coates 1982, Heine 1995 and Silva-Corvalán 1995), whereas other scholars defend a tripartite division, consisting of epistemic modality and two other independent categories: deontic modality and dynamic modality (Palmer 1979, Fernández de Castro 1999 and Thegel 2017)

This study aims to shed light on this highly debated question, focusing on the deontic and dynamic categories and how they are represented in Spanish modal verbs. Empirical evidence from corpus-based examples will be presented in favor of the tripartite division, looking particularly at the interaction of modality and tense. As was shown in Thegel (2017), the notions of *volitivity* and *factuality* are crucial when differentiating between deontic and dynamic necessity expressed in the modal verbs *deber* 'must' and *tener que* 'have to'. In this study it will be demonstrated how these notions may condition the manifestations of Spanish modal verbs in different tenses, for example the past tense *pretérito perfecto simple*, the present perfect or the future tense. In other words, it is considered that the semantics related to the deontic and dynamic categories, respectively, will favor or limit their occurrence in specific tenses.

Research questions that will be addressed in this study are:

- How can the notions of *volitivity* and *factuality* be related to tense?
- With what frequency do modal verbs such as *deber* 'must', *tener que* 'have to', *haber que* 'have to' (impersonal verb) and *poder* 'can' appear in different tenses?
- How can these frequencies be related to the semantics of deontic and dynamic modality, respectively? Are these two categories differently distributed in different tenses?

The approach of the paper has been inspired by both cognitive frameworks such as presented by Narrog (2005a; 2005b) and functional approaches, as can be found in Coates (1982) and Verhulst (2012). The study is corpus-based, applying an analysis in which both quantitative and qualitative methods are utilized, in order to discover general frequencies as well as specific tendencies related to the appearance of modal verbs in different tenses.

As has been put forward by Cornillie (2007) and Thegel (2017), there are few studies that focus on the semantic and pragmatic aspects of the Spanish core modal verbs, especially studies with a solid empirical basis, two exceptions being Olbertz (1998) and Thegel (2017). Much remains to be studied in this particular research area, and the present paper intends to

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

83

fill some of these gaps. The interaction of tense and modality is believed to contribute substantially to the understanding of both the deontic and dynamic categories in general and the semantics and pragmatics of Spanish modal verbs in particular.

References

Coates, Jennifer. 1983. *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries*. (Croom Helm linguistics series). London: Croom Helm.

Cornillie, Bert. 2007. *Evidentiality and epistemic modality in Spanish (semi)auxiliaries. A cognitive-functional approach*. (Applications of cognitive linguistics 5). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fernández de Castro, Félix. 1999. *Las perífrasis verbales en el español actual.* (Biblioteca románica hispánica 2). Madrid: Gredos.

Heine, Bernd. 1995. Agent-oriented vs. epistemic modality: Some observations on German modals. In: Joan Bybee y Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 17–53. (Typological studies in language 32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Narrog, Heiko. 2005a. On defining modality again. *Language Sciences* 27 (2), 165–192.

Narrog, Heiko. 2005b. Modality, mood and change of modal meaning: a new perspective. *Cognitive Linguistics* 16 (4), 677–731.

Olbertz, Hella. 1998. *Verbal periphrases in a functional grammar of Spanish*. (Functional grammar series 22). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Palmer, Frank R. 1979. *Modality and the English modals.* (Longman linguistics library 23). London: Longman.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1995. Contextual conditions for the interpretation of 'poder' and 'deber' in Spanish*. In: Joan Bybee y Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 67–105. (Typological studies in language 32). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Thegel, Miriam. 2017. *¿Opiniones, normas o pura necesidad. La modalidad deóntica y la modalidad dinámica a través de* deber *y* tener que*. (Studia Romanica Upsaliensia 85) Uppsala: Uppsala universitet.

Verhulst, An. 2012. *A corpus-based analysis of root necessity meanings expressed by* should, *ought to* and *be supposed to* in late 20th century British English*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

84

Liisa VILKKI
University of Helsinki
liisa_vilkki@hotmail.com

The use of the English epistemic and inferential modals in linguistic and philosophical research articles

This presentation discusses how the English epistemic (e.g. *may, could*) and inferential (e.g. *should*, *ought*) modals are used in linguistic and philosophical research articles, published in internet journals. My theoretical framework is cognitive-functional, and as a background study, I refer to the results of my typological study of epistemic modality and inferentiality, based on the sample of 130 languages. In addition, I draw on studies in academic discourse and in politeness (e.g. Terkourafi 2015). The English epistemic modals prototypically express degrees of the speaker's certainty, while the inferential modals prototypically express both various inferential properties and degrees of the speaker's certainty. From the typological perspective, the semantic domain of inferentiality is partly a subdomain of evidentiality, encompassing various types of meanings, indicating information source, and it is partly an overlapping area between epistemic modality and evidentiality. Several epistemic and inferential modals have often been discussed as belonging to hedging strategies, and hedges have been considered the most significant aspect of interpersonal metadiscourse in various academic genres in a number of disciplines (e.g. Hyland 1998a,b, 2005). In this presentation, I mainly focus on those modals that are used as hedges. Hedges have been shown to frequently express several meanings simultaneously. Writers may use them to distinguish fact from opinion, to offer a credible representation of themselves and their work, and to give polite deference to colleagues' views. According to a study of research articles in different disciplines (Hyland 2005), applied linguistic and philosophic articles do not have significant quantitative differences in the usage of hedges. In this presentation, the main questions addressed are: What kind of uses of the selected modals can be distinguished in linguistic and philosophical research articles? Are there differences in the usage of the modals in linguistic and philosophical research articles? How can the possible differences be explained? To answer these questions, an electronic corpus of 60 research articles was compiled. They were taken from five linguistic and five philosophical internet journals, published in 2015 and 2016. A detailed contextual analysis of utterances containing the modals shows that these modals often have similar, multifunctional uses in both types of articles. Some of these uses are predominantly epistemic or predominantly inferential, and they can placed along the dimension of subjectivity versus intersubjectivity (cf. Nuyts 2012). Other uses are predominantly polite, and they can be interpreted as interpersonal or intersubjective, as defined by Traugott (2010). Different types of uses can be described by means of cognitive domains and meaning potentials (cf. Langacker 2006, 2008). However, important differences were also found. Especially, philosophical articles include a greater amount of various predominantly reader-oriented, polite usages of these modals. This difference can be explained by the nature of philosophical research: it essentially involves reassessing prior positions and presumptions. Philosophers must take special care of controlling the level of personality in order to build convincing arguments. More generally, various uses of the

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

85

selected modals are discussed in terms of focusing, which represents construal phenomena (e.g. Verhagen 2007).

References

Hyland, Ken 1998a. Boosting, hedging and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text* 18(3):349- 382.

Hyland, Ken 1998b. *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Hyland, Ken 2005. Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse studies* 7(2):173-192.

Langacker, Ronald 2006. On the continuous debate about discreteness. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17:107- 151.

Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Nuyts, Jan 2012. Notions of (inter)subjectivity. *English Text Construction* 5:53-76.

Terkourafi, Marina 2015. Conventionalization: A new agenda for im/politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics* 86:11-18.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2010. (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. In Kristin Davidse, Lieven Vandelanotte, and Hubert Cuyckens, eds*., Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 29-71.

Verhagen Arie 2007. Construal and perspectivization. In Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 48-81.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

86

Tina WEST
University of Regensburg, Germany
Tina.West@stud.uni-regensburg.de

The relation between evidentiality and epistemic modality – a typological study

There is an old disagreement in the typological literature on the relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality. The following claims can be found:

1. Evidentiality is a subdomain of epistemic modality, e. g. Palmer (1986),
2. Epistemic modality is a subdomain of evidentiality, e. g. Matlock (1989),
3. Epistemic modality and evidentiality are two different categories that overlap, e. g. van der Auwera & Plungian (1998),
4. Epistemic modality and evidentiality are two different categories that do not overlap, e. g. Aikhenvald (2004),
5. Epistemic modality and evidentiality are two different categories that are both subdomains of the same category, e. g. Leiss (2009).

This paper presents preliminary results of an ongoing typological study on the relation between evidentiality and epistemic modality. The preliminary result of this study is that evidentiality and epistemic modality constitute two separate categories which are, however, tightly linked so that interrelations and implicit semantic overlaps occur occasionally (cf. hypothesis 4). Data for the study come from descriptive grammars and theoretical studies. In addition, numerous texts from language documentations of a range of different languages are consulted. In order to find answers to the research question, a theoretical and deductive as well as an inductive corpus-based approach is chosen. A representative sample of 75 - 100 languages will be analysed in regard to the nature of the connection between evidentiality and epistemic modality; for the choice of languages, genealogical, typological and areal diversity is taken into account. At the end of the study, cross-linguistic conclusions will be drawn. It will be shown that there are language-universal patterns for the relation between evidentiality and epistemic modality. So far, the following languages have been examined: Tariana (Arawak), Hixkaryana (Carib), Lega (Bantu), Eastern Pomo (Hoka), Qiang (Sino-Tibetan), Kolyma Yukaghir (UralicYukaghir) and Jarawara (Arawá). As a first result, it can be stated that in each of these languages the evidential markers do not solely state the source of information but can also convey a certain degree of (un)certainty on behalf of the speaker. One common characteristic is that markers of non-direct evidentiality, e. g. reportative, quotative and inferential evidentiality, tend to express uncertainty, whereas markers of visual evidentiality can convey certainty. However, in all the analysed languages, this epistemic meaning is merely a connotation besides the markers' primary evidential meaning. Up to this point, these findings support the hypothesis that evidentiality and epistemic modality are two separate categories with a strong connection that can lead to semantic as well as formal interrelations.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

87

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
Auwera, Johan van der, und Vladimir A. Plungian: „Modality's Semantic Map".
Linguistic Typology 2. 1998, 79-124.

Boye, Kasper: „Semantic Maps and the Identification of Cross-Linguistic Generic
Categories:Evidentiality and its Relation to Epistemic Modality". *Linguistic
Discovery* 8, Ausg. 1. 2010, 4-22.

Cornillie, Bert: „Evidentialitäy and epistemic modality - On the close relationship between
two different categories". *Functions of Language* 16, Ausg. 1. 2009, 44-62.

Diewald, Gabriele, und Elena Smirnova: „Abgrenzung von Modalität und Evidentialität
im heutigen Deutsch". In: Andrzej Kątny, und Anna Socka (Hg.): *Danziger Beiträge
zur Germanistik* Band 30. 2010a. Frankfurt am Main (u. a.): Peter Lang, 113-131.

Haan, Ferdinand de. 1999: „Evidentiality and Epistemic modality - setting boundaries". 1.
Jan.
<https://www.academia.edu/755475/Evidentiality_and_epistemic_modality_Setti
ng_b oundaries> (zugegriffen am 21.12.2016).

Leiss, Elisabeth: „Drei Spielarten der Epistemizität, drei Spielarten der Evidentialität und
drei Spielarten des Wissens". In: Werner Abraham, und Elisabeth Leiss (Hg.):
Modalität.Epistemik und Evidentialität bei Modalverb, Adverb, Modalpartikel und Modus.
2009. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag Brigitte Narr GmbH, 3-24.

Matlock, Teenie: „Metaphor and the grammaticalization of evidentials". *Proceedings of the
15th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 15. 1989, 215-225.

Palmer, Frank. 1986: *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plungian, Vladimir A.: „The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical
space". *Journal of Pragmatics* 33. 2001, 349-357.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

88

Panel | Evidentiality and Shared Knowledge: Drawing the Boundaries

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

89

Panel | Evidentiality and Shared Knowledge: Drawing the Boundaries

Convenor: Susana Rodríguez Rosique (University of Alicante)
Participants: Marta Albelda Marco (University of València), Jordi Antolí (University of Alicante), José Luis Cifuentes Honrubia (University of Alicante), Nicole Delbecque (K. U. Leuven), Carolina Figueras Bates (University of Barcelona), Dorota Kotwica (University of València), Susana Rodríguez Rosique (University of Alicante).

Description

From the first studies (Boas 1911, 1938, 1947), evidentiality has been conceived as the category related to the source of information and the type of evidence or mode of access to knowledge. From these early studies to the most recent revisions, the analysis of evidentiality has bifurcated into two trends: one defining evidentiality as a grammatical category in the sense of Aikhenvald (2004) –that is, as information about the source which is necessarily codified in the grammar of certain languages–; and one defining evidentiality as a functional, semantic category which deals with the different mechanisms to express source of information and mode of access to it that are available in a language (Marin-Arresse 2004; Squaritni 2008; Boye and Harder 2009; Diewald and Smirnova 2010; Albelda 2015; González, Izquierdo and Loureda 2016).

The limits of the category are not uncontroversial either. In this way, the interaction between evidentiality and epistemic modality is already classical. If from a theoretical perspective both categories are distinct –whereas evidentiality relates to the source of information and the mode of access to it, epistemic modality evaluates the speaker"s degree of certainty about the utterance (Nuyts 2001a, Cornillie 2009)–, it is not such a simple task to differentiate them in practical terms (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998), as it is shown by the well-known three kinds of relations established by Dendale and Tasmowski (2001) –i.e., disjunction, inclusion and overlap–.

The boundaries between evidentiality and some other phenomena linked to informational configuration have received less attention, however. It is true that some proposals have addressed the relation between evidentiality and shared knowledge, but they also have triggered a number of questions. For instance, Bermúdez (2005) argues that the traditional conception of evidentiality poses several problems since certain schemas related to the source of information and dealing with shared knowledge remain out of the category. In order to solve it, he proposes a new parameter in the description of the evidential domain: a continuum extending from the private access to knowledge – restricted to the speaker– to the unrestricted, universal access.

From an informational perspective, shared knowledge –or common ground– is defined as the sum of suppositions, beliefs and mutual expectations shared by two or more people

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

90

(Stalnaker [1974] 1998; Coseriu 1969; Dik [1978] 1997; Clark 1996). This piece of information does not simply stay there, but the speaker must figure it out in every interaction by venturing a hypothesis about what is the information which is already assumed by his addressee (Gutiérrez Ordóñez 1997). The first step to carry out this task is to find the appropriate shared bases. According to Clark (1996), there are two kinds of sources that feed shared knowledge: communitarian and personal bases. On the one side, communitarian shared knowledge is based on the existence of cultural communities –i.e., a group of people with shared experiences related to the human being condition, cultural events, social norms, abilities and procedures, beliefs or even ineffable emotions–. Cultural communities can thus emerge from nationality, academic career, ethnicity, politics, certain kind of subculture, gender, etc. On the other side, personal shared knowledge is based on joint personal experiences, such as perceptions or joint actions. As it can be seen, the bases feeding shared knowledge or common ground are quite similar to the types of sources isolated in the studies on evidentiality. In fact, whereas the theories on evidentiality focus on the point of departure, the models dealing with shared knowledge focus on the point of arrival.

Bermudez"s proposal poses a problem since he does not specify the status that his new parameter occupies within the evidential domain. The answer to this question is partly found in Nuyts" (2001a, 2001b, 2012) notion of (inter)subjectivity. This notion arises as a critical revision of the distinction made by Lyons (1977) between a subjective epistemic modality and an objective epistemic modality. Specifically, Nuyts (2001a, 2001b) proposes to conceive the dichotomy as a new parameter of evidentiality and to move this opposition based on the quality of the evidence to the perspective of the participants in the interaction: on the one hand, subjectivity indicates that only the speaker has access to the evidence, so he thus assumes a personal responsibility in his utterance; on the other, intersubjectivity indicates that the evidence is known or accessible to a larger group of people, and the responsibility is thus also shared. Later on, Nuyts (2012) claims that (inter)subjectivity can be considered neither an inherently modal category nor a parameter of evidentiality anymore. (Inter)subjectivity is rather a new, separate semantic category which plays the role of a discursive tool –that is, it serves to negotiate the respective stances in interaction– and emerges vis-à-vis mirativity –i.e., the category that analyzes the introduction of information as new and surprising (DeLancey 1997): "But, although the exact semantic relationship is in need of further investigation [...], they [(inter)subjectivity and mirativity] somehow do share the property of marking (an aspect of) the status of the information in the utterance (the state of affairs) in terms of the assessor"s position in the (discursive) world" (Nuyts 2012: 63).

The continuum of (inter)subjectivity argued by Nuyts originally arises between the realms of epistemic modality and evidentiality, and progressively moves to the domain of discourse. A number of questions arise at this point: a) what is the relation between Nuyts" (inter)subjectivity –or the conception of evidentiality as a discursive tool– and several phenomena that have been traditionally related to the management of shared knowledge and the configuration of information –such as the distribution between old versus new information and activated versus non-activated information (Chafe 1994; Dryer 1996), the existence of informative presuppositions (Lambrecht 1994), the process of accommodation (Lewis 1979), etc.; b) what is the relation between this notion of (inter)subjectivity and other discursive categories, such as (counter)argumentation, mitigation or any other category dealing with the speaker"s position in discourse.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

91

The present panel precisely aims to discuss these questions. It includes six presentations which range from more evidentialist, epistemic perspectives to different approaches such as those provided by models based on information structure. Furthermore, this theme session deals both with lexically motivated structures and with more general grammatical constructions or even grammatical categories. A preliminary sketch is provided by the tentative program which is displayed here below.

References

Aikhenvald, A. (2004): Evidentiality. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Albelda, M. (2015) (ed.): "Evidentiality in non-evidential languages: Are there evidentials in Spanish?". Journal of Pragmatics 85: 135-137.

Bermúdez, F. W. (2004): La evidencialidad. La codificación pragmática del punto de vista. Doctoral Dissertation. Stockholms Universitet.

Boas, F. (1911): "Kwakiutl", en F. Boas (ed.): Handbook of American Indian languages. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 423-557.

Boas, F. (1938): "Language", en F. Boas (ed.): Anthropology. Boston / New York: Heath, 124- 145.

Boas, F. (1947): "Kwakiutl grammar, with a glossary of the suffixes". Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 37: 201-377.

Boye, K. and P. Harder (2009): "Evidentiality. Linguistic categories and grammaticalization". Functions of Language 16 (1): 9-43.

Chafe, W. (1994): Discourse, consciousness and time. The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Cornillie, B. (2009): "Evidentiality and epistemic modality. On the close relationship between two different categories". Functions of Language 16 (1): 44-62.

Coseriu, E. (1969): "Determinación y entorno. Dos problemas de una lingüística del hablar", in Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general: cinco estudios. Madrid: Gredos, 282-323.

DeLancey, S. (1997): "Mirativity: the grammatical marking of unexpected information". Linguistic Typology 1 (1): 33-52.

Diewald, G. and E. Smirnova (2010b) (eds.): Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dik, S. C. ([1978] 1997): The theory of functional Grammar. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dryer, M. S. (1996): "Forms, pragmatic presupposition, and activated propositions". Journal of Pragmatics 26: 475-523.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

92

González, R., D. Izquierdo and Ó. Loureda (2016b): "Un acercamiento a los fundamentos de la evidencialidad y a su recepción y tratamiento en la lingüística hispánica", in R. González Ruiz, D. Izquierdo Alegría and Ó. Loureda (eds.): La evidencialidad en español. Teoría y descripción. Madrid / Frankfurt am Main: Iberoamericana / Vervuert, 9-45.

Gutiérrez Ordóñez, S. (1997): Temas, remas, focos, tópicos y comentarios. Madrid: Arco Libros.

Lewis, D. (1979): "Scorekeeping in a language game". Journal of Philosophical Logic 8: 339- 359.

Lyons, J. (1977): Semantics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Marin-Arrese, J. (2004) (ed.): Perspectives on evidentiality and modality. Madrid: Editorial Complutense.

Nuyts, J. (2001a): Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, J. (2001b): "Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions". Journal of Pragmatics 33: 383-400.

Nuyts, J. (2012): "Notions of (inter)subjectivity." English Text Construction 5 (1): 53-76.
Squartini, M. (2008): "Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian". Linguistics 46 (5): 917-947.

Stalnaker, R. C. ([1974] 1998): "Pragmatic Presuppositions", en A. Kasher (ed.): Pragmatics.

Critical Concepts. London / New York: Routledge, 16-31.
Van der Auwera, J. and V. A. Plungian (1998): "Modality"s semantic map". Linguistic Typology 2: 7-124.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

93

Panel Program

S. Rodríguez Rosique: Introduction

M. Albelda Marco and C. Figueras Bates: "Mitigation of speaker commitment? The case of Spanish se ve que and por lo visto („apparently")

J. Antolí: "From inferential to hearsay evidentiality: the case of the verbs parèixer and semblar in old Catalan"

N. Delbecque: "Spanish cierto vs seguro: constructional reflexes of intersubjective vs subjective evidentiality"

D. Kotwica: "Reporting without commitment. The case of Spanish „(o) eso dicen""

S. Rodríguez Rosique: "From inferentiality to persuasion: Shared knowledge and argumentative strategies in Spanish future"

J. L. Cifuentes Honrubia: "Anaphora, presupposition and accommodation: Exploiting common ground in lexicalized feminine clitic constructions" Ç

S. Rodríguez Rosique: Conclusions

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

94

Abstracts

Mitigation of speaker commitment?: The case of Spanish se ve que and por lo visto ('apparently')

Marta Albelda Marco
University of València

Carolina Figueras Bates
University of Barcelona

This contribution aims to discuss the relationship between the semantic phenomenon of evidentiality and the pragmatic strategy of mitigation. A large part of the bibliography on evidential markers in Spanish points to mitigation of commitment (or responsibility) for what has been said as one of their defining features. However, the notion of mitigation and that of speaker commitment have both been used in different senses in different studies. In this presentation, the meanings assigned to these terms are reviewed and, following Cornillie & Delbecque (2008), the notions of speaker commitment and speaker involvement are distinguished. These operate in opposite directions in some evidential uses: (i) from reportative evidences to conjectural inferentials, there is a scale of lesser to greater speaker involvement; (ii) among the inferentials, a scale of greater to lesser speaker commitment ranging from circumstantials to conjecturals can be observed.

This proposal is applied to the evidentials por lo visto and se ve (que). The analysis has been carried out over a large corpus of Spanish colloquial conversations and semiformal interviews (Val.Es.Co. 2002, Briz & Val.Es.Co. Group; Cogila, Barros et alii 2010; PRESEEA, Gómez Molina et alii 2005, 2007, 2009). The elicitation of the occurrences is based on the functional definition of evidentiality according to Aikhenvald (2004), Boye (2010), and Kotwica (2015). These authors claim that evidentiality expresses the source of information and has the restriction of syntactic propositional scope, which is a very appropriate approach for typologically non- evidential languages. The recognition of the mitigating function follows the criteria proposed in Briz (2007), Albelda (2010) and Albelda et alii (2014). The parameters in the analysis encompass grammatical characteristics of the utterances, socio-situational features and pragmatic features (illocutive force and the kind of content regarding the interlocutors).

The corpus shows that compared to por lo visto, se ve (que) indicates more mitigation of speaker commitment but greater speaker involvement.

References

Aikhenvald, Aleksandra (2004): Evidentiality. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Briz, Antonio and Val.Es.Co. Group (2002): Corpus de conversaciones coloquiales. Madrid, Arco.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

95

Cabedo, Adrián and Salvador PONS (Eds.): Corpus Val.Es.Co 2.0: www.valesco.es. Albelda Marco Marta, Antonio Briz Gómez, Ana Cestero, Dorota Kotwica and Cristina Villalba (2014): "Ficha metodológica para el análisis pragmático de la atenuación en corpus discursivos del español. ES.POR.ATENUACIÓN", in Oralia 17.

Boye, Kasper (2010): "Evidence for what? Evidentiality and scope", in: STUFLanguage. Typology and Universals Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 63/4, 290–307. BRIZ, Antonio (2007): "Para un análisis semántico, pragmático y sociopragmático de la cortesía atenuadora en España y América". LEA, XIX, pp. 1-38.

Cornillie, Bert, y Nicole Delbecque. "Speaker commitment: Back to the speaker. Evidence from Spanish alternations". Belgian Journal of Linguistics 22 (2008): 37–62.

Kotwica, Dorota (2015): Evidential al parecer: Between the physical and the cognitive meaning in Spanish scientific prose of the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries. Journal of Pragmatics, 85, 155-167.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

96

From Inferential to Hearsay Evidentiality: the Case of the Verbs parèixer and semblar in Old Catalan

Jordi Antolí
University of Alicante

The aim of this study is to delve into the process of semantic change through which the appearance verbs produce hearsay evidentials (a possibility already described by authors such us Nølke 1994; Cornillie 2007, 26-27; Dendale and Van Bogaert 2007). To do so, we will focus on the pseudoimpersonal construction created by the verbs semblar and parèixer in Catalan, which can be integrated in today''s language with an inferential or hearsay value, depending on the context: „In third person of singular, used in an absolute way, it denotes that what is exposed it is known because of general knowledge or because of what it has been heard" (DDLC, s.v. semblar, 3b i s.v. parèixer, 7b). To explain the origin of this hearsay value, it has been studied the pseudoimpersonal construction in old and modern Catalan. It has been concluded that, during the 15th century, from the inferential value, first, the hearsay value derives from some linking contexts where the information is presented as intersubjective (using the concept in Nuyts 2001). Therefore, in this study it will be described the process of semantic change allowing the appearance of this new value and it will be deeply analysed the linking contexts making possible the neutralization in the difference between inference and hearsay speech. To do so, this study has been based on the analysis of data from both old and modern Catalan computerised textual corpus, and on the interpretation of the phenomena through theoretical tools provided by the Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar based on the use of Traugott and Trousdale (2013), Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change (IITSC) (2012).

References

Cornillie, B. (2007) Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in Spanish (Semi)Auxiliaries, Berlín/Nova York, Mouton de Gruyter.

DDLC = Diccionari descriptiu de la llengua catalana (1985-), Institut d''Estudis Catalans, retrieved from: http://dcc.iec.cat/ddlc/index.asp.

Dendale, P. & J. Van Bogaert (2007) «A semantic description of French lexical evidential markers and the classification of evidentials», Italian Journal of Linguistics 19(1).

Nølke, H. (1994) «La dilution linguistique des responsabilités. Essais de description polyphonique des marqueurs évidentiels il semble que et il paraît que», Langue française, 102, pp. 84-94.

Nuyts, J. (2001) Epistemic modality, language and conceptualization: a cognitive-pragmatic perspective, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Traugott, E. C. (2012) «Pragmatics and language change», in Allan, K. & K. M. Jaszczolt, eds., The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 549-566.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

97

Traugott, E. C. i G. Trousdale (2013) Constructionalization and Constructional Changes, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

98

Spanish cierto vs seguro: constructional reflexes of intersubjective vs subjective evidentiality

Nicole Delbecque
KU Leuven

The present paper analyzes the epistemic modality expressed in Spanish by cierto „certain" and seguro „sure" revisiting Delbecque (2009) in the light of the ongoing debate on the relation between epistemicity and evidentiality. It draws, in particular, on the general insights developed by Palmer (1986), Nuyts (2001), Wachtmeister Bermúdez (2005), Boye (2012), and on the contribution on seguro by Vázquez Rozas (2010), and that on cierto by Maldonado (2017).

Cierto and seguro will be argued to activate a different epistemic-evidential interface. The full epistemic support associated with cierto will be shown to correspond to the intersubjective or non-subjective evidentiality associated with contents conceived of as part of common ground knowledge, whether they can be directly accessed by the speaker or not. The epistemic modality conveyed by seguro, on the other hand, goes from strong to full support, representing the speaker"s subjective evaluation, and reflecting a commitment justified on the basis of the speaker"s own perception and experience.

The distinction between objectified assessment - cierto - and subjective confidence - seguro – correlates with their respective constructional potential and manifests itself at various levels of discourse organization. The difference in pragmatic functionality of the lexicalized expressions por cierto „for certain" vs de seguro „of sure" and a buen seguro „to good sure", for instance, is corroborated by the contexts they appear in. The same holds for the combinatorial preferences of cierto and seguro in verbal expressions (e.g., estar en lo cierto „be in the certain", apostar sobre seguro „make a sure bet"), in adnominal position (e.g., una información cierta „an accurate information, una información segura „a secure information", un empleado seguro „a reliable employee"), and as secondary predication (e.g., dar por cierto „assume, take as given"/ dar por seguro „presume, take for granted").

Construed as predicate complement, cierto and seguro present distributional properties which are likewise revealing of their distinct meaning and pragmatic import. Three constructions can be distinguished: that with clausal subject (es cierto/seguro que... "[it] is certain/sure that..."), that with conceptualizing subject and complement clause (alguien está seguro/cierto (de) que... "somebody is certain/sure that..."), and the occasionally parenthetical one without finite (pseudo-)copula (cierto/seguro [que]... "certain/sure [that]...").

The exploration of the data provided for Spain by the reference corpus CREA further confirms the difference in knowledge management: unlike cierto, seguro regularly combines with degree modifiers (e.g. muy seguro „very sure", casi seguro „nearly sure"), with a future perspective, and with first and second person subjects. Such contexts clearly relate the statement to a personal belief state going from conviction, over conjecture, to anticipation.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

99

Cierto, on the contrary, situates the validation beyond the realm of one‟s responsibility; by acknowledging that a given content „exists out- there‟, cierto legitimizes the discussion of it. This explains that cierto typically appears in hearer-oriented adversative, conditional and concessive contexts (e.g. (si) bien es cierto „(if) it is admittedly true‟).

References

Boye, Kasper (2012): Epistemic meaning. A crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study. Berlin/Boston: W. de Gruyter.

Delbecque, Nicole (2009): Acerca de la relación entre cierto y seguro. En: Veyrat Rigat, Montserrat & Enrique Serra Alegre (Eds.), La Lingüística como reto epistemológico y como acción social. Estudios dedicados al Profesor Ángel López García con ocasión de su sexagésimo aniversario, 2 vols., Madrid: Arco/Libros S.L., 629-644.

Maldonado, Ricardo (2017): Sobre la intersubjetividad de cierto. Una nueva visita a partir de Delbecque (). Paper delivered at the Congreso internacional de lingüística hispánica 2017, Lovaina, 20-22 de septiembre 2017.

Nuyts, Jan (2001): Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Palmer, Frank Robert (1986): Mood and Modality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CREA) [en línea]. Corpus de referencia del español actual. http://www.rae.es

Vázquez Rozas, Victoria (2010): Sobre seguro: del riesgo presupuesto a la certeza epistémica. En: Rodríguez Espiñeira, María-José (coord.), Adjetivos en discurso: emociones, certezas, posibilidades y evidencias. Universidade de Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicaciones e Intercambio Científico, 109-146.

Wachtmeister Bermúdez; Fernando (2005): Evidencialidad. La codificación lingüística del punto de vista. Doctoral dissertation: Stockholms Universitet.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

100

Reporting without commitment. The case of Spanish '(o) eso dicen'

Dorota Kotwica
Unviersity of València

In this paper, we analyze Spanish reportative construction (o) eso dicen („(or) so they say"). It appears in several structures which differ in how specific and accessible the evidence is. The bare construction (parenthetical) often reports common knowledge and folklore. In fact, it is frequently used for quoting proverbs and sayings. The source remains indefinite in such uses, because the speaker refers to general truths and common believes rather than claims of an individual speaker. (O) eso dicen can also introduce more concrete information whose source is mentioned explicitly (e.g. o eso dicen los expertos médicos „or so medical experts say") or can be easily deduced from the context. Here the source of evidence is more specific, however, the accessibility of information is limited to a smaller group of people.

Our goal is to analyze formal features of these constructions as well as pragmatic-discursive functions they display. To do so, it is necessary to closely examine structural patterns in which they occur (position, scope etc.), as well as contextual clues. Moreover, the interplay between two evidential dimensions, namely a) accessibility of the evidence (Bermúdez 2005) / intersubjectivity (Nuyts 2002, 2012) and b) source specificity (Dehkordi and Allami 2010, Kotwica) seems crucial for understanding its argumentative use. We believe that typical uses of (o) eso dicen are examples of how the speakers exploit the "reportative exceptionality" (AnderBois 2014) in their discursive practices, since the construction is often used for denying reported claims. It tends to convey weak speaker's commitment with the reported proposition and/or distancing from the source of evidence. Both pragmatic functions seem to be connected with different degrees of accessibility/intersubjectivity and specificity of the evidence quoted in each case.

References

AnderBois, Scott. 2014. "On the exceptional status of reportative evidentials". Proceedings of SALT 24, 234-254.

Bermúdez, Fernando. 2005. Evidencialidad. La codificación lingüística del punto de vista, Doctoral Thesis, Stockholm: Stockholms Universitet.

Dehkordi Mojdeh Ebrahimi and Hamid Allami. 2012. "Evidentiality in Academic Writing", Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 2:9, 1895-1904.

Kotwica, Dorota (accepted). "Does the source matter? Specificity in reportative evidentiality in Spanish scientific discourse (1799-1920)". Pragmatics and Society.

Nuyts, Jan. 2001. "Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions", Journal of Pragmatics 33, 383-400

Nuyts, Jan. 2012. "Notions of (inter)subjectivity", English Text Construction, 5/1, 53-76.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

101

From inferentiality to persuasion:
Shared knowledge and argumentative strategies in Spanish future

Susana Rodríguez Rosique
University of Alicante

The future of necessity, as in (1), has been traditionally identified among the uses of the future tense in Spanish (Fernández Ramírez 1986; Pérez Saldanya 2002). It is characterized by introducing the information as necessary and expected.

(1) Como ambos atributos coinciden, resultará que se anulan
„Since both attributes coincide, it will follow that they cancel each other out" (Fernández Ramírez 1986)

From an evidetialist perspective, from which the morphological Spanish future is conceived as a subjective inferential –i.e., it reflects a conjecture (Squartini 2008), or in other words, it conveys that the speaker does not have a direct access to information and he thus has to obtain it through an inner inferential process–, the future of necessity has been considered an out-dated use and the result of a learned grammar (Escandell 2014).

However, cases such as (2) are usually found among the examples illustrating the future of necessity. In contrast to (1), these examples are quite frequent in interaction, where they play a communicative function.

(2) Era la primera posibilidad que se daba a los periodistas para hacer cursos académicos. Entonces, comprenderás que no pude dejar ya el periodismo y tuve que hacerlo
„That was the first opportunity given to journalists so that they could attend academic courses. Then you have to understand that I was no longer able to give up journalism, and I had to do it"

(RAE, CREA, oral, sf)

More specifically, the future does not operate in the epistemic level in (2), but has moved to discourse to develop a process of argumentation. In fact, the future does not describe here the speaker"s inferences, but invites the addressee to reach a certain conclusion (Rocci 2012). This new value is reflected in a number of formal features, such as its occurrence in the second person –singular or plural–, its restriction to a certain group of verbs, and its equivalence to modals of obligation or even to imperative.

The aim of this presentation is to explain the cases such as (2) as a new example of the deictic versatility of the future in Spanish. This verb form invokes a deictic instruction based on the template of „distance forward" (Fleischman 1989). The „distance forward" instruction can be projected into a subjectivity axle (Traugott 1989) which comes across the different levels of meaning established by Sweetser (1990) through successive widenings of scope (Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994). When the information occurring in future tense has been

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

102

previously activated (Dryer 1996), the distance instruction is projected upon the utterance, and the future comes to develop different interpersonal functions (Pérez Saldanya 2002) reflecting a process of intersubjectification (Traugott 2010).

References

Bybee, J., R. Perkins and W. Pagliuca (1994): The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Dryer, M. (1996): "Forms, pragmatic presupposition, and activated propositions." Journal of Pragmatics 26: 475-523.

Escandell Vidal, M. V. (2014): "Evidential futures: The case of Spanish", en P. De Brabanter, M. Kissine and S. Sharifzadeh (eds.): Future times, future tenses. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 219-246.

Fernández Ramírez, S. (1986): Gramática Española. 4. El verbo y la oración. Madrid: Arco Libros.

Fleischman, S. (1989): "Temporal distance: A basic linguistic metaphor". Studies in Language 13 (1): 1-50.

Nuyts, J. (2001a): Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nuyts, J. (2001b): "Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions." Journal of Pragmatics 33: 383-400.

Nuyts, J. (2008): "Qualificational meanings, illocutionary signals, and the cognitive planning of language use." Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics 6: 185-207. Nuyts, J. (2012): "Notions of (inter)subjectivity." English Text Construction 5 (1): 53-76.

Pérez Saldanya, M. (2002): "Les relacions temporals i aspectuals", en J. Solà, M. R. Lloret, J. Mascaró and M. Pérez Saldanya (Dirs.): Gramàtica del català contemporani. Barcelona: Empúries, 2567-2662.

Rocci, A. (2012): "Modality and argumentative discourse relations: A study of the Italian necessity modal dovere". Journal of Pragmatics 44: 2129-2149.

Squartini, M. (2008): "Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian". Linguistics 46 (5): 917-947.

Squartini, M. (2012): "Evidentiality in interaction: The concessive use of the Italian Future between grammar and discourse". Journal of Pragmatics 44: 2116-2128.

Traugott, E. C. (1989): "On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change". Language 65 (1): 31-55.

Traugott, E. C. (2010): "(Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment", en K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte y H. Cuyckens (eds.): Subjectification,

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

103

intersubjectification and grammaticalization. Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 29-71.

Traugott, E. C. y R. B. Dasher (2002): Regularity in semantic change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

104

Anaphora, presupposition and accommodation: Exploiting common ground in lexicalized feminine clitic constructions

José Luis Cifuentes Honrubia
University of Alicante

The RAE (2009: 2649-2654) highlights that the numerous verbal locutions formed with transitive verbs include a group with unstressed personal pronouns the referent of which is usually unspecified in most cases, that referent being given by the context instead. The clitics mentioned by the RAE are lo [MASC.ACC.SING.], la [FEM.ACC.SING.] and las [FEM.ACC.PL.], i.e. lexicalized direct complements functioning as a direct complement: dormirla [sleep-INF. it-FEM.ACC.SING. > sleep it off], deberla [owe-INF. it-FEM.ACC.SING. > owe], etc. The reconstruction of the clitic may seem synchronously easy in some cases, but it is most often impossible to return the noun to which the pronoun refers with certain guarantee.

Our paper will examine anaphoric relationships in lexicalized feminine clitic constructions (Cifuetes Honrubia 2018). One of the essential issues when analyzing pronouns is to determine how they establish referential relationships with different participants in the syntactic structure. This semantic and referential relationship between the pronoun and a full phrase -the antecedent- has usually been termed as „anaphora." Anaphora consequently implies an intratextual relationship.

A further step needs to be taken in the establishment of the previously mentioned reference relationship in the case of the feminine clitic constructions examined. There are processes in which the feminine clitic has no syntactic reference, but a contextual semantic reference is implicitly made to an implied and recognized concept: meterla [put-INF. it-FEM.ACC.SING>put in], dormirla [sleep-INF. it-FEM.ACC.SING > sleep it off], deberla [owe-INF. it-FEM.ACC.SING > owe]. The hearer must use the communicative situation to identify the concept that the feminine clitic refers to and thus update what was expressed by the speaker.

A growing process of subjectification (Traugott 1995: 32; 2016: 379) is thus taking place in the anaphoric relationships schematized above. Specifically, after ruling out the possible consideration of particularized and generalized implicatures to explain anaphoric relationships in lexicalized feminine clitic constructions and, within the aforementioned growing process of subjectification, such relationships can be explained as deriving from a process of accommodation (Beaver & Zeevat 2007), either in a singular context or in a multiple one.

References

Beaver, David I. & Henk Zeevat (2007): "Accommodation," in Gillian Ramchand & Charles Reiss (eds.): *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 503-538.

International Conference on Evidentiality and Modality
ICEM'18
Book of abstracts

105

Cifuentes Honrubia, J. L. (2018): *Construcciones con clítico femenino fosilizado en español* (forthcoming).

R.A.E. (2009): *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Traugott, E. C. (1995): "Subjectification in grammaticalization," in D. Stein & S. Wright (eds.): *Subjectivity and subjectivisation. Linguistic perspectives*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 31-54.

Traugott, E. C. (2016): "Identifying micro-changes in a particular linguistic change-type: the case of subjectification," in M. Kytö & P. Pahta (eds.): *The Cambridge Handbook of English Historical Linguistics,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 376-389.

ICEM'18

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
EVIDENTIALITY AND MODALITY 2018

19-22 SEPTEMBER 2018
FACULTAD DE FILOLOGÍA
UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID

Madrid 19-22 September 2018
Department of English Studies
Facultad de Filología
Universidad Complutense de Madrid