

Evidentials and questions

Natasha Korotkova

University of California, Los Angeles
n.korotkova@ucla.edu

Differentiating contents
Carnegie Mellon University
December 5, 2015

Evidential shift(s)

- Evidentials are relativized to some individual, evidential origo (the exact term due to Garrett (2001), following Fillmore (1971); Lyons (1977) on deixis)
 - **Root declaratives:** evidential origo = speaker
- (1) Florida governor has **allegedly** banned climate change terminology for all government officials.
- **Elsewhere:** other options available
 - **Attitude and speech reports:** origo *may be* attitude subject (Korotkova 2015)
 - **Questions:** origo = addressee
- (2) From where did the early native Americas **allegedly** originate?
- Cases of switch in orientation as in (2): evidential shift

Today's talk

- Evidentials-in-questions always shift across languages
- Approaches that hardwire shift to the syntax/semantics of evidentials:
 - do not explain why the non-shifted—logically possible—interpretation is systematically absent
 - make wrong predictions about indexical pronouns (Lim 2010; Murray 2012) and other *potentially shiftable* elements (Speas and Tenny 2003; McCready 2007)
- Shift itself is best analyzed in Gricean terms
- Under this approach, evidential shift is only expected and lack of indexical shift is more peculiar

The pattern I

(3) And when, **allegedly**, will be the “end of the world”?

(i) NON-SHIFTED \approx ‘Given what **I** heard, when will be the “end of the world”?’:

The speaker requests that the addressee say when the end of the world will be based on what was **alleged to the speaker**.

(ii) SHIFTED \approx ‘Given what **you** heard, when will be the “end of the world”?’:

The speaker requests that the addressee say when the end of the world will be based on what was **alleged to the addressee**.

(ii) SHIFTED \approx ‘Given what **you** heard, when will be the “end of the world”?’:

The speaker requests that the addressee say when the end

The pattern II: matrix questions

Context: Kathleen and I are hiking. We see fresh animal tracks, which may be dangerous as we are in the bear country. Fortunately we see a ranger, and Kathleen talks to him. I then ask her:

(4) Bulgarian

Mechka li e mina-l-a ottuk?

bear Q be.3SG.PRES pass-IND-SG.F from.here

'Did a bear pass here?'

- (i) #NON-SHIFTED: according to speaker
- (ii) SHIFTED: according to addressee

The pattern III: embedded questions

(5) Bulgarian

*Natasha popita Stefan [dali mechka e
 Natasha ask.AOR.3SG Stefan whether bear be.3SG.PRES
 mina-l-a ottuk]
 pass-IND-SG.F from.here
 'Natasha asked Stefan whether a bear passed here.'*

(i) the only interpretation available: according to Stefan

NB: same pattern with 'wonder'-like predicates: addressee=att.subject;
 other question-embedders are more tricky

Cross-linguistic uniformity

If evidentials can be used in questions at all, they shift: Bulgarian (South Slavic); Cheyenne (Algonquian; Murray 2010); Cuzco Quechua (Quechuan; Faller 2002); German (Germanic); Korean (Lim 2010); St'át'imcets (Salish; Matthewson et al. 2007); Tagalog (Austronesian; Schwager 2010); Tibetan (Tibeto-Burman; Garrett 2001); Turkish (Turkic).

(6) No correlations with shift under e.g. 'say' or 'think':

| | <i>Bulgarian</i> | <i>German</i> | <i>Korean</i> | <i>St'át'imcets</i> | <i>Tagalog</i> | <i>Tibetan</i> | <i>Turkish</i> |
|-----------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| q-shift | obl | obl | obl | obl | obl | obl | obl |
| att-shift | opt | opt | obl | obl | obl | obl | opt |

(Chart represents only languages where embedding is possible)

The bottom line

Evidentials-in-questions shift across languages

Quotative readings: the upshot

- Some hearsay evidentials allow **relayed questions** readings
- These readings have been mistaken for speaker orientation
- But it is a different phenomenon in fact

Quotative readings

(7) Cuzco Quechua

Pi-ta-s Inés-qa watuku-sqa? (Faller 2002: 230, ex.189b; *my*
 who-acc-**rep** Inés-top visit-pst2

- (i) SHIFTED \approx 'Given what you heard, who did Inés visit?'
 speaker expects addressee to base their answer on hearsay
- (ii) QUOTATIVE \approx 'I heard someone asking: who did Inés visit.'
 speaker indicates that somebody else is asking

Asymmetry between (7i) and (7ii):

- (7i): a speech act of question performed by the speaker and requesting particular actions from the addressee
- unclear status of (7ii): the speaker is not requesting information from the addressee but merely reports a third-party question

Quotative readings

- subject to cross-linguistic variation: only *hearsay* evidentials in *some* languages (Cuzco Quechua, Faller 2002; Kaalalisut, Bittner 2008; Tagalog, Schwager 2010)
- require particular pragmatic conditions
- (contra the confusion) nothing special needed to rule them out: such readings will not arise under any standard view on questions
- in fact, it is problematic to derive such *relayed* speech acts (questions and also imperatives, as in Mbyá, Thomas 2014), see (Korotkova forth.) for an analysis

Quotative readings: the bottom line

Availability of quotative readings does not violate the generalization that evidentials shift in questions

Ignorance readings: the upshot

- Sometimes sentences with evidentials and *wh*-words have ignorance readings
- This has been mistaken for speaker orientation in a special kind of question
- But in fact *wh*-word is only one of the functions of respective pronouns

Ignorance readings

Littell et al. (2010); Roque et al. (2015): evidentials may be speaker-oriented in questions

(8) Gitksan (Tsimshianic)

a. *naa* 'an-t gi'nam-(t)=hl xhla'wsxw 'as John
 who S.REL-3 give-3=COND shirt PREP John
 'Who gave this shirt to John?'

b. *naa=ima* 'an-t gi'nam-(t)=hl xhla'wsxw 'as John
 who=INFER S.REL-3 give-3=COND shirt PREP John
 'I wonder who gave this shirt to John.'

(Littell et al. 2010: 91, ex.7)

Ignorance readings

- Same pattern: Cheyenne (Murray 2010), Cuzco Quechua (Faller 2002), Korean (Lee 2012), Eastern Pomo (McLendon 2003), Thompson Salish and St'át'imcets (Littell et al. 2010), Warlpiri (Aikhenvald 2004)
- Littell et al. (2010), (Lee 2012): such sentences are *conjectural* questions
 - ignorance effect is due to the presence of an evidential
 - sentence induces alternatives *therefore* it is a question
 - just a special kind of question
- but ignorance effects are most commonly due to pronouns and alternatives are induced not just by questions

Ignorance readings

Claim I

Ignorance is due to evidentials

Solution I

Ignorance effects across languages are commonly due to **indefinite pronouns** used as what is called “specific unknown”

- some languages: dedicated series of specific unknown indefinites, cf. Russian *kto-to* ‘someone (I don’t know who)’ vs. *koe-kto* ‘someone (I don’t want to say who)’; also Lithuanian, Kannada (Haspelmath 1997: 45–48)
- many languages (cf. English *some*): an indefinite that has ignorance among its other uses, along with e.g. plain existential
- some languages: *wh*-indefinites, same word for ‘who’ and ‘someone’; famously in Japanese (Kuroda 1965; Kratzer and Shimoyama 2002); also e.g. Tlingit (Na-Dene, Cable 2010), Passamaquoddy (Eastern Algonquian, Bruening 2007), or some varieties of German

Ignorance readings

Hard to tell questions from declaratives with an indefinite in languages
(i) with *wh*-indefinites and (ii) without overt question marking

(9) Korean (disambiguation only by prosody)

Yuna-ka nwukwu-lul mann-a

Yuna-NOM IND.PR-ACC meet-INT

- (i) 'Yuna is seeing someone (I don't know or don't care who).'
- (ii) 'Is Yuna seeing someone (I don't know or don't care who)?'
- (iii) 'Who is Yuna seeing?' (Yun 2012: 285, ex.1)

Scrutiny reveals similar patterns in e.g. Gitksan, a putative *wh*-indefinite language (Brown 2015) or St'át'imcets (data from (Davis 2001) and texts (Matthewson 2005))

Ignorance readings

Claim II

Questions induce alternatives; therefore sentences above are questions

Solution II

Not only questions induce alternatives

- Alternative-based frameworks: content questions, indefinites, disjunction ...

- (10)
- | | | |
|----|--|------------------|
| a. | [[Who flew to the Moon?]] | content question |
| b. | [[Someone flew to the Moon.]] | indefinite |
| c. | [[Meaghan or Kathleen flew to the Moon.]] | disjunction |

- ...all have a common core:

- (11) [[Meaghan flew to the Moon]] \vee [[Kathleen flew to the Moon]]

Ignorance readings: the bottom line

Availability of ignorance readings does not violate the generalization that evidentials shift in questions

- What we do not have to worry about:
 - quotative readings
 - ignorance readings
- What we do have to worry about:
 - how to derive shift
 - how to preclude lack of shift

The upshot

- Evidential origo is treated as an indexical that may switch its reference
- Overgeneration for ordinary indexicals (*I*) in some languages

Core data point

Independently Murray (2010, 2012) for Cheyenne; Lim (2010, 2011); Lim and Lee (2012) for Korean:

- Evidentials shift in questions
- Indexical pronouns do not shift in questions

(12) Korean

- a. *John-i na-lul po-te-la* [Declarative]
 John-NOM I-ACC see-DIR-DECL
 'Given *my* perceptual evidence, John saw *me*.'
- b. *John-i na-lul po-te-nya?* [Question]
 John-NOM I-ACC see-DIR-Q
 'Given *your* perceptual evidence, did John see *me*?'
 (Lim 2010: 35-36, ex.44)

Main idea

- Variety of indexicals: (cf. pronoun-centric approaches to indexical shift in attitudes, Schlenker 1999; von Stechow 2002)
 - ① always refer to the actual utterance context (as per Kaplan 1989)
 - ② *may* switch their reference under *certain* circumstances
- Evidential origo an indexical of the second type, i.e. a shiftable indexical
- Implementation I: Murray (2012) within *Update with Centering, UC* (Bittner 2007, 2011)
 - all indexicals are relative to some speech event
 - questions introduce an answering event that becomes topical (in contrast with the backgrounded uttering event)
 - evidentials are relative to a topical event, therefore shift in questions
- Implementation II: Lim (2010, 2011); Lim and Lee (2012)
 - all indexicals are relative to some context
 - questions introduce a new context
 - evidentials shift indexicals in their scope, and evidential origo has to shift

Shifted indexicality

- English *I* refers to someone other than the current speaker in quotation

(13) English: no indexical shift

- Jane said: “*I* {Jane, *the speaker} am a vegetarian”
- Jane said that *I* {the speaker, *Jane} am a vegetarian.

- Across languages, *I* may or has to refer to the speaker of reported context (syntactic evidence for embedding):

(14) Zazaki: Optional indexical shift

Hesenij (m̩k-ra) va [kɛ ɛzj/k dɛwletia]
 Hesen.OBL (I.OBL-to) said that I rich.be.PRES

- non-shifted: ‘Hesen said that *I* {the speaker} am rich’.
- shifted: ‘Hesen said that he {Hesen} is rich’.

(Anand and Nevins 2004: ex.4)

Shifted indexicality

- **Optional pronominal shift:** Aghem, Amharic (Schlenker 2003, secondhand data); Catalan Sign language (Quer 2005); Japanese (Sudo 2012); Korean (Park 2014); Kurmanji (Koev 2013); Mishar Tatar (Podobryaev 2014), Navajo (Speas 1999); Nez Perce (Deal 2013); Slave (Rice 1986); Tamil (Sundaresan 2012); Turkish (Özyildiz 2013)
- **Obligatory pronominal shift:** Balkar (Koval 2014); Matses (Munro et al. 2012); Uyghur (Shklovsky and Sudo 2014)

Predictions and problems

If:

- 1 indexicals may sometimes switch their reference
- 2 questions introduce an entity indexicals may shift to

Then:

- we expect indexicals in indexical-shifting languages to be able to shift in questions
- In fact, this is a direct consequence of combining Murray (2012)'s treatment of evidential shift and analyses of indexical shift in attitudes as perspectival recentering within Update with Centering: Bittner (2012) for Slavé, Koev (2013) for Kurmanji
- Next two slides: the prediction not borne out

Predictions and problems

Predicted and observed:

(15) Evidentials and non-shiftable indexicals in questions

| | 'I'=speaker | 'I'=addressee |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Evidential origo = speaker | * | * |
| Evidential origo = addressee | ✓ | * |

Predicted and not observed:

(16) Evidentials and shiftable indexicals in questions

| | 'I'=speaker | 'I'=addressee |
|------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Evidential origo = speaker | * | * |
| Evidential origo = addressee | ✓ | ✓ |

Predictions and problems

Indexicals, even in indexical-shifting languages, **never** shift in questions (matrix or embedded)

(17) Turkish (an indexical-shifting language per Özyildiz 2013)

a. *Natasha* [*sever-im*] *di-yor* [Declarative]
 Natasha.NOM like-1SG.PRES say-PROG

(i) NON-SHIFTED: 'Natasha says I (speaker) like it.'

(ii) SHIFTED: 'Natasha says I (Natasha) likes it.'

b. *sev-er* *mi-yim?* [Question]
 like-PRES POL.Q-COP.1SG

(i) NON-SHIFTED: 'Do I like it?'

(ii) SHIFTED: #'Do you like it?'

Indexical approaches do not get us what we want

Core data point

- Shift is not unique to evidentials, hence the term interrogative flip (Tenny 2006)
- A plethora of other phenomena are prone to it

(18) **Experiencer predicates**; Japanese (pattern first described by Kuno (1973))

a. Root declarative

watashi / **anata* / **kare wa sabishii desu.*

I / you / he TOP lonely COP.PRES

'I am/ *you are/ *he is lonely.' (Tenny 2006: 247; ex.2)

b. Question

**watashi* / *anata* / **kare wa sabishii desu ka*

I / you / he TOP lonely COP.PRES Q

'*Am I / Are you / *Is he lonely?' (Tenny 2006: 247; ex.4)

Main idea

- Many elements express a point of view of some sentient individual
- In root declaratives, sentient individual is the speaker
- In questions, sentient individual is the addressee
- (In attitude reports, it is attitude subject; see below)
- Implementation I: Speas and Tenny (2003) and subsequent work:
 - discourse roles—speaker, addressee—are in the syntax
 - sentient individual is some kind of a pronoun
 - syntactic configuration directly determines its antecedent (cf. Stephenson 2005; Hacquard 2006)
- Implementation II: McCready (2007) (and a follow-up by Bylinina, Sudo, and McCready 2014):
 - Kaplanian context also has a *judge*: $c = \langle \text{author}, \text{addressee}, \text{judge}, \dots \rangle$
 - sentient individual directly refers to this coordinate
 - in declaratives: $\text{Judge}_c = \text{Author}_c$
 - in questions, $\text{Judge}_c = \text{Addressee}_c$ with the help a special operator:

$$\llbracket \text{Sh } \phi \rrbracket \langle \text{Author}_c, \text{Addressee}_c, \text{Judge}_c, \dots, w_c \rangle = \llbracket \phi \rrbracket \langle \text{Author}_c, \text{Addressee}_c, \text{Addressee}_c, \dots, w_c \rangle$$

Predictions and problems

The biggest issue

Different phenomena putatively sensitive to point of view behave differently across environments

Besides, no coherent way to identify a perspective-sensitive expression: various people have included epistemics, evidentials, experiencer predicates, expressives (*darn*), logophoric pronouns (special pronouns whose antecedent must be an attitude holder), speech-act adverbials (*honestly*, *seriously*), shiftable indexicals, spatial deixis (*to the left*), taste predicates (*awful*)

Predictions and problems: root declarative clauses

- The exact semantics of epistemic modals and taste predicates is a matter of debate:
 - ① they may be relative to a community
 - ② or to an individual defined by context of utterance
 - ③ or context of assessment
 - ④ or no individual whatsoever, just body of knowledge or information state
- Such semantics is unwarranted for evidentials (at least hearsay and direct markers): evidential origo is unmistakably the speaker, even in e.g. eavesdropping scenarios

Unified semantics is unwarranted based on the behavior in root declarative clauses

Predictions and problems: attitudes

Potsian supplements—expressives and non-restrictive relative clauses—are subject to an optional pragmatic shift (Amaral et al. 2007) that is not even constrained by a specific syntactic configuration (Harris and Potts 2009, 2011):

- (19) *Context: My aunt is extremely skeptical of doctors in general.*
- a. She says that dentists, **who are only in it for the money anyway**, are not to be trusted at all.
 - b. Dentists, **who are only in it for the money anyway**, are not to be trusted at all.

(Harris and Potts 2009: Appendix A, ex.3)

Predictions and problems: attitudes

- Epistemics and taste predicates shift obligatorily ... in predicative position (Stephenson 2007; Hacquard 2006):

- (20) Scylla thought [that Odysseus' ship **might** pass Charybdis].
- a. non-shifted, speaker-oriented: # ...but Scylla was sure it would pass.
 - b. shifted, subject-oriented: ...but I was sure it would pass.

- ...but not in attributive position:

- (21) *Context*: Meaghan and I are lost in the backcountry. We managed to get stranded on a ledge from which we can proceed no further. Meaghan said that a cliff was overhanging a **possible** escape route.
- a. non-shifted, speaker-oriented: ...but she thinks that this route that I pointed to will eventually turn into a dead-end.
 - b. shifted, subject-oriented: ...but I think that the route she pointed to will eventually turn into a dead-end.

Predictions and problems: attitudes

- Languages fall into three classes with respect to evidential shift in attitudes (Korotkova 2015):
 - ① **No shift:** obligatorily speaker-oriented in Bulgarian (South Slavic) as reported in (Sauerland and Schenner 2007; Koev 2011); Georgian
 - ② **Obligatory shift:** obligatorily subject-oriented in Japanese; Korean (Lee 2013); Tibetan (Tibeto-Burman; Garrett 2001); St'át'imcets (Salish; Matthewson et al. 2007); Zazaki (Iranian; Gajewski 2004)
 - ③ **Optional shift:** speaker-oriented or subject-oriented in Bulgarian (R. Pancheva, p.c.); German; Turkish (Şener 2011)
- A similar typology is observed **only** for indexical shift (remember from above)

Unified semantics is unwarranted based on the behavior in attitudes

Predictions and problems: questions

Interrogative flip is non-uniform

- Evidentials have to shift
- Spatial expressions do not have to shift

(22) Who is the person **on the left**?

- And what about taste predicates:

(23) Was it **fun**? I don't remember.

Predictions and problems: questions

- “High” adverbials maybe do not shift at all:

(24) Why did John **unfortunately** leave? #Something I personally find extremely fortunate (Gärtner and Steinbach 2006: ex. 13a)

- *Honestly*, often listed under the same rubric (Garrett 2001; Speas and Tenny 2003; Lim and Lee 2012; Zu 2015)

(25) **Honestly**, when will you finish the paper?

- (i) NON-SHIFTED: the speaker is honest in asking;
- (ii) SHIFTED: the speaker requests an honest reply from the addressee.

- (25ii): seems to presuppose that the speaker has asked this same question before and requests that the addressee rethinks their answer

Unified semantics is unwarranted based on the behavior in questions

Universal approaches do not get us what we want

The biggest issue for indexical approaches

If evidential shift in questions is a variety of indexical shift, indexical pronouns in indexical-shifting languages are expected to be able to shift in questions

The biggest issue for universal approaches

Not fine-grained enough to distinguish between different kinds of behavior across constructions

The upshot

- Why shifts in questions are possible?
- Why evidential shift is obligatory?
- Why indexical shift is not attested?

What are questions anyway?

NB: only ordinary questions are discussed (leaving aside rhetorical questions, exam situations etc)

- **Semantic content:**

- set of propositions comprising in the answer set (Hamblin/Karttunen tradition)
- partition on the set of worlds such that each cell of the partition is the same with respect to what the answer is (Groenendijko–Stokhofian tradition)

- **Pragmatics:**

- The speaker prefers that the addressee assert one the possible answers to the question.

- **Illocutionary effect:**

- Sincere inquiry for information = self-ascription of ignorance

It is only natural that overt markers of point of view—broadly construed—have the ability to shift in questions

In other words:

- we do not need a dedicated shifting mechanism
- rather, we can get away with pragmatic conventions (as in (Potts 2006; Lauer 2013))
- very similar to (Garrett 2001)'s view on evidential shift, except that addressee will come from pragmatics of questions, not semantic denotation

The first piece of the puzzle

- Shift is possible because pragmatics of questions makes the addressee available
- Advantage: no need to take a stand on a particular view of e.g. epistemics

(Non-)optionality of evidential shift

Criticism (Lim and Lee 2012)

- A pragmatic shift should be optional
- Evidential shift in questions is obligatory

Solution

- More than one way to handle non-optionality
- Obligatory 'de se' construal blocks non-shifted readings without forcing the shift per se

A second look at non-shifted readings

(26) And when, **allegedly**, will be the “end of the world”?

(i) NON-SHIFTED \approx ‘Given what I heard, when will be the “end of the world”?’:

- (26i) requires that a **third party** evaluates whether or not p in view of **origo’s information**
- Evidentials cannot be used with precisely this interpretation in speech and attitude reports (Korotkova 2015):
 - they have to be evaluated wrt world/context of evidential origo
 - in other words, evidential origo is a ‘de se’ individual

Litmus test for de se construal

Evidentials can only be used in ‘de se’ scenarios:

(27) Korean; direct perception *te* (adapted from Lee (2013): ex. 22)

Context 1, ‘de se’: Chelswu thinks he went outside and saw the rain [We don’t know or care if it indeed was the case].

Context 2, non ‘de se’: Chelswu went outside during the rain yesterday. He has forgotten it and thinks he knows about the rain from his neighbors.

Chelswu-nun [*pi-ka ecey o-te-la-ko*] *malha-yess-e*.

Chelswu-TOP rain-NOM yesterday fall-**DIR**-DECL-COMP say-PST-DECL

- (i) C.2: ‘Chelswu said that, **as he has perceived**, it was raining yesterday.’
- (ii) #C.1: ‘Chelswu said that—**and he has perceived it, according to me**—it was raining yesterday.’

The same constraint accounts for the lack of non-shifted readings in questions

- De se construal is a property of grammatical evidentials, not just any expression of evidence (contra McCready 2011)
- Prediction: some evidential-looking expressions may allow for non-addressee-oriented readings
- Prediction borne out: e.g. English interrogative parentheticals (slifts: Ross 1973; Reinhart 1983; Rooryck 2001a,b; Simons 2007)

- (28)
- Declaratives:** preference for a 1st person subject
The climate is changing fast, **I think**.
 - Questions:** preference for a 2nd person subject preference
How fast is the climate changing **do you think?**
 - But it is just a preference (Haddican et al. 2014 pace Lahiri 2002):
And how fast is the climate changing, **does John think?**

The second piece of the puzzle

Obligatory 'de se' construal ensures that only addressee-oriented readings are possible

Recap

Indexicals, even in indexical-shifting languages, do not shift in questions

- **Why no pragmatic shift?**
 - Indexical pronouns are not about opinion and their reference is determined strictly by the context of utterance/reported speech/thought

- Cf. *egophoric* (“about self”) agreement (see Floyd et al. (forth.) on egophoricity)
 - only used with: 1st person subject in root declaratives, 2nd person subject in questions, 3rd person subject in attitudes
 - have an additional semantic layer: indicate intention or awareness on part of the agent (self-ascription; Wechsler forth.)

(29) Tsafiki (Barbacoan)

- a. Egophoric form; first person subject

la ya=ka machite=chi pore-yo-e
 1MASC 3=ACC machete=INSTR cut-CJ-DECL
 ‘I cut him (intentionally) with the machete.’


- b. Ordinary form; first person subject

la ya=ka machite=chi pore-i-e
 1MASC 3=ACC machete=INSTR cut-DISJ-DECL
 ‘I cut him (unintentionally) with the machete.’

(Wechsler forth.: ex.19) from (Dickinson 2000: 387)

- Why not the same mechanism as in attitudes?

- Indexical shift is highly constrained (a problem for pragmatic accounts by Bittner (2008); Koev (2013))
 - 1 almost exclusively under 'say' or 'say'-complementizers
 - 2 banned in nominalized clauses (Korean, Turkish, Uyghur)
 - 3 interaction between different kinds of shift in Nez Perce (Deal 2013)
 - 4 possible with nominative but not accusative subjects in Ughur (Shklovsky and Sudo 2014)
- the easiest way to formulate licensing conditions: context-shifting operators (Kaplanian monsters) in the syntax

(30) [... *attitude verb* ... [...  ...]]

- if constraints are syntactic, monsters are just not licensed in questions

The third piece of the puzzle

- Pragmatic shift is not applicable to indexicals
- Context-shifters are banned from questions

Necessary ingredients

- Pragmatics of questions makes the shift available
- Semantics of evidentials rules out speaker-oriented readings
- Indexical shift is subject to independently motivated syntactic constraints

Next steps

- Understand what happens to other point-of-view expressions
- Formulate an account rooted in the dynamics of dialogue and general cognitive principles (rather than semantics of particular expressions)

Acknowledgements I

Thank you!
slides available at <http://nkorotkova.net>

Acknowledgements II

I also thank Natasha Abner, Maria Aloni, Pranav Anand, Adrian Brasoveanu, Ivano Caponigro, Amy Rose Deal, Ivan Derzhansky, Donka Farkas, Jesse Harris, Ed Keenan, Dan Lassiter, Deniz Özyildiz, Roumi Pancheva, Hazel Pearson, Philippe Schlenker, Vesela Simeonova, Yael Sharvit, Dominique Sportiche, Ed Stabler, Tim Stowell, Anna Szabolcsi, Igor Yanovich, Henk Zeevat, and audiences at: Institut Jean Nicod, Paris; ILLC and ACLS, Amsterdam; *Sinn und Bedeutung 19*, Göttingen; *Pronouns in the embedded contexts at the syntax-semantics interface* in Tübingen; ZAS, Berlin; *Semantics and Linguistic Theory 25*, Stanford; Zukunftskolleg, Konstanz.

References I

- Aikhenvald, A. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford: OUP.
- Amaral, P., C. Roberts, and E. A. Smith (2007). Review of *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures* by Chris Potts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30(6), 707–749.
- Anand, P. and A. Nevins (2004). Shifty operators in changing contexts. In R. B. Young (Ed.), *Proceedings of SALT 14*, pp. 20–37.
- Bittner, M. (2007). Online update: Temporal, modal, and *de se* anaphora in polysynthetic discourse. In C. Barker and P. Jacobson (Eds.), *Direct compositionality*, pp. 363–404. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bittner, M. (2008). Reportative evidentials in Kalaallisut. Fieldwork notes, Rutgers. http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~mbittner/i11108_top5.pdf.
- Bittner, M. (2011). Time and modality without tenses or modals. In R. Musan and M. Rathers (Eds.), *Tense across Languages*, pp. 147–188. Niemeyer.
- Bittner, M. (2012). Perspectival discourse referents for indexicals. In H. Greene (Ed.), *SULA 7: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting on the Semantics of Under-represented Languages in the Americas*.
- Brown, C. (2015). Gitksan wh-indefinites. Handout, McGill university.

References II

- Bruening, B. (2007). *wh*-in-situ does not correlate with *wh*-indefinites or question particles. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(1), 139–166.
- Bylinina, L., Y. Sudo, and E. McCready (2014). The landscape of perspective-sensitivity. Talk presented at the workshop *Pronouns in embedded contexts at the syntax-semantics interface*, University of Tübingen, November 7–9, 2014.
- Cable, S. (2010). *The grammar of Q: q-particles, wh-movement and pied-piping*. Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax. Oxford University Press.
- Davis, H. (2001). On negation in Salish. Ms., UBC.
- Deal, A. R. (2013). Nez Perce embedded indexicals. In H. Greene (Ed.), *Proceedings of SULA 7*, Amherst. GLSA. To appear.
- Dickinson, C. (2000). Mirativity in Tsafiki. *Studies in language* 24(2), 379–422.
- Faller, M. (2002). *Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*. Ph. D. thesis, Stanford.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1971). *Lectures on deixis*. CSLI Publications.
- Floyd, S., E. Norcliffe, and L. S. Roque (Eds.) (Forthcoming). *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

References III

- Gajewski, J. (2004). Evidentiality in Zazaki. In M. Kenstowicz (Ed.), *Studies in Zazaki Grammar*, Volume 6 of *MIT Working Papers on Endangered and Less Familiar Languages*. MIT Press. <http://archive.is/QDs8P>.
- Garrett, E. J. (2001). *Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan*. Ph. D. thesis, UCLA.
- Gärtner, H.-M. and M. Steinbach (2006). A skeptical note on the syntax of speech acts and point of view. In P. Brandt and E. Fuss (Eds.), *Form, Structure, Grammar*, pp. 213–222. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Hacquard, V. (2006). *Aspects of modality*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Haddican, W., A. Holmberg, H. Tanaka, and G. Tsoulas (2014). Interrogative slifting in English. *Lingua* 138, 86–106.
- Harris, J. A. and C. Potts (2009). Perspective-shifting with appositives and expressives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 32(6), 523–552.
- Harris, J. A. and C. Potts (2011). Predicting perspectival orientation for appositives. In *Proceedings of CLS* 45.
- Haspelmath, M. (1997). *Indefinite pronouns*. OUP.
- Kaplan, D. (1977/1989). Demonstratives. In J. Almog, J. Perry, and H. Wettstein (Eds.), *Themes from Kaplan*, pp. 481–563. OUP.

References IV

- Koev, T. (2011). Evidentiality and temporal distance learning. In *Proceedings of SALT XXI*, pp. 115–134.
- Koev, T. (2013). *Apposition and the structure of discourse*. Ph. D. thesis, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.
- Korotkova, N. (2015). Evidentials in attitudes: do's and don'ts. In E. Csipak and H. Zeijlstra (Eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung (SuB) 19*, pp. 340–357.
- Korotkova, N. (Forth.). Evidentials and speech acts: quirky reportative evidentials. In *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 25*.
- Koval, P. (2014). Indexical shifting in Balkar. To be presented at the workshop *Pronouns in the embedded contexts at the syntax-semantics interface*, November 7–9, 2014, Tübingen.
- Kratzer, A. and J. Shimoyama (2002). Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese. In Y. Otsu (Ed.), *The Proceedings of the Third Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*, Tokyo, pp. 1–25. Hituzi Syobo.
- Kuno, S. (1973). *The structure of the Japanese language*. MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. (1965). *Generative Grammatical Studies in The Japanese Language*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.

References V

- Lahiri, U. (2002). On the proper treatment of *wh*-expletive in hindi. *Lingua* 112(7), 501–540.
- Lauer, S. (2013). *Towards a dynamic pragmatics*. Ph. D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Lee, C. (2012). Evidentials and modals: what makes them unique. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung: International Journal for Language Data Processing*, 71–98.
- Lee, J. (2013). Temporal constraints on the meaning of evidentiality. *Natural Language Semantics* 21, 1–41.
- Lim, D. (2011). Evidentials in interrogatives: A case study of Korean. In I. e. a. Reich (Ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 15, pp. 419–433.
- Lim, D. and C. Lee (2012). Perspective shift of Korean evidentials and the effect of contexts. In *Proceedings of SALT* 22, pp. 26–42.
- Lim, D. S. (2010). *Evidentials as interrogatives: a case study from Korean*. Ph. D. thesis, USC.
- Littell, P., L. Matthewson, and T. Peterson (2010). On the semantics of conjectural questions. In T. Peterson and U. Sauerland (Eds.), *Evidence from evidentials*, Volume 28 of *University of British Columbia Working papers in Linguistics*, pp. 89–104.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics (vols I & II)*. Cambridge: CUP.

References VI

- Matthewson, L. (2005). *When I Was Small Ū I Wan Kwikws. A Grammatical Analysis of St'átšimc Oral Narratives*. UBC Press.
- Matthewson, L., H. Davis, and H. Rullman (2007). Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St'át'imcets. In J. van Craenenbroeck (Ed.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, Volume 7, pp. 201–254. John Benjamins.
- McCready, E. (2007). Context shifting in questions and elsewhere. In E. Puig-Waldmuller (Ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, pp. 433–447.
- McCready, E. (2011). What is evidence in natural language. Unpublished manuscript. <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/TAYYTI1N/evidMcc.pdf>.
- McLendon, S. (2003). Evidentials in Eastern Pomo with a comparative survey of the category in other Pomoan languages. In A. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *Studies in evidentiality*, Chapter 5, pp. 101–130. John Benjamins.
- Munro, R., R. Ludwig, U. Sauerland, and D. W. Fleck (2012). Reported speech in Matses: Perspective persistence and evidential narratives. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 78(1), 41–75.
- Murray, S. (2010). *Evidentiality and the Structure of Speech Acts*. Ph. D. thesis, Rutgers.

References VII

- Murray, S. (2012). The indexical component of evidentiality. At a workshop “Meaning as Use: Indexicality and Expressives” during NASSLLI 2012 in Austin, <http://conf.ling.cornell.edu/sem/NASSLLI.pdf>.
- Özyildiz, D. (2013). When I is not me: A preliminary case study of shifted indexicals in Turkish. Unpublished manuscript, École Normale Supérieure.
- Park, Y. (2014). Indexicals and the long-distance reflexive *caki* in Korean. Handout of the talk presented at *GLOW 37*, April 4, 2014, Brussels.
- Podobryaev, A. (2014). *Persons, Imposters, and Monsters*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Potts, C. (2005). *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: OUP.
- Potts, C. (2006). How far can pragmatic mechanisms take us? *Theoretical linguistics* 32(3), 307–320.
- Quer, J. (2005). Context shift and indexical variables in sign languages. In *Proceeding of SALT XV*, Ithaca, NY. CLC Publications.
- Reinhart, T. (1983). Point of view in language: the use of parentheticals. In G. Rauh (Ed.), *Essays on deixis*, pp. 169–194. Tübingen: Narr.
- Rice, K. (1986). Some remarks on direct and indirect speech in Slave (Northern Athapaskan). In *Direct and indirect speech*. Mouton de Gruyter.

References VIII

- Rooryck, J. (2001a). Evidentiality, part I. *Glott International* 5(4), 125–133.
- Rooryck, J. (2001b). Evidentiality, part II. *Glott International* 5(5), 161–168.
- Roque, L. S., S. Floyd, and E. Norcliffe (2015). Evidentiality and interrogativity. In preparation.
- Ross, J. R. (1973). Slifting. In M. Gross, M. Halle, and M. Schützenburger (Eds.), *The Formal Analysis of Natural Languages*, pp. 133–169. Paris: Mouton.
- Sauerland, U. and M. Schenner (2007). Embedded evidentials in Bulgarian. In E. Puig-Waldmüller (Ed.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 11*, pp. 495–509.
- Schlenker, P. (1999). *Propositional attitudes and indexicality : a cross-categorical approach*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Schlenker, P. (2003). A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(1), 29–120.
- Schwager, M. (2010). On what has been said in Tagalog: Reportative *daw*. In T. Peterson and U. Sauerland (Eds.), *Evidence from evidentials*, pp. 221–246.
- Şener, N. (2011). *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Turkish*. Ph. D. thesis, UConn, Storrs.
- Shklovsky, K. and Y. Sudo (2014). The syntax of monsters. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(3), 381–402.

References IX

- Simons, M. (2007). Observations on embedding verbs, evidentiality, and presupposition. *Lingua* 117(6), 1034–1056.
- Speas, M. (1999). Person and point of view in Navajo direct discourse complements. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Speas, M. and C. Tenny (2003). Configurational properties of point of view roles. In A. M. DiSciullo (Ed.), *Asymmetry in Grammar*, pp. 315–343. John Benjamins.
- von Stechow, A. (2002). Feature deletion under semantic binding: tense, person, and mood under verbal quantifiers. In *Proceedings of NELS 33*.
- Stephenson, T. (2005). Assessor sensitivity: Epistemic modals and predicates of personal taste. *New Work on Modality, MITWPL* 51.
- Stephenson, T. (2007). Judge dependence, epistemic modals, and predicates of personal taste. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30, 487–525.
- Sudo, Y. (2012). *On the semantics of phi-features on pronouns*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
- Sundaresan, S. (2012). *Context and (Co)reference in the syntax and its interfaces*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Stuttgart and University of Tromsø.
- Tenny, C. (2006). Evidentiality, experiencers and the syntax of sentience in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 15, 245–288.

References X

- Thomas, G. (2014). Embedded imperatives in Mbyá. In *Proceedings of NELS 43*.
- Wechsler, S. (To appear). Self-ascription in conjunct-disjunct systems. In S. Floyd, E. Norcliffe, and L. San Roque (Eds.), *Egophoricity (working title)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Yun, Y. (2012). The deterministic prosody of indeterminates. In J. Choi, E. A. Hogue, J. Punske, D. Tat, J. Schertz, and A. Trueman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 29th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Sommeville, MA, pp. 285–293. Cascadilla Proceedings.
- Zu, V. (2015). Bound pronouns in matrix clauses and the syntax of interclausal binding. Poster presented at *The 33rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL)*.