Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

EVIDENTIALS: SUMMATION, QUESTIONS, PROSPECTS

Brian D. Joseph

The Ohio State University

0. Introduction

Summing up the results of as interesting a set of reports as are presented in the chapters of this volume is a daunting task to be sure, especially since the topic of evidentiality does not particularly fall within my area of expertise, my primary language of specialization being Greek, a language that shows any active participation in the grammatical marking of evidentiality. Thus, I have no first-hand experience with the notion to draw on here.[1] But one does not have to be an expert to appreciate both fine research and interesting linguistic phenomena, and the range of perspectives on evidentiality treated in these chapters is both impressive and stimulating to anyone with an interest in language, all the more so if the topic falls outside one's usual linguistic line of sight.

There are several areas covered in these chapters that deserve some comment, especially with regard to certain recurring issues that appear throughout: the semantics of evidentiality, the categorial status of evidentiality in particular languages, the fate of evidentiality in contact situations, the origins of evidentiality, and the methodology employed in studying the phenomenon. I address these seriatim below, and then in closing, I signal some directions for further research in part by applying lessons learned about evidentiality from the works contained herein to a novel language not usually thought of in the context of discussions of evidentiality and in part by mentioning some issues that have not been definitively addressed in the preceding chapters.

1. Semantics

A basic issue to confront with regard to evidentials is whether there is a core meaning that covers all the various systems, categories, strategies, and techniques that natural languages show for this phenomenon, and if so, what that essential meaning is. Among other things, this task aims at

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

finding the intersection of a number of functions and values that certain types of markers in a language can have and trying to see which of these are basic, primary notions and which are reasonably treated as extensions.

Some authors in this volume, e.g. Fortescue, have located evidentiality at least in part in “epistemic modality”, i.e. having to do with inferential judgments about knowledge (evaluating it as factual necessity, probability, possibility, etc.), whereas others, e.g. Dixon and Chirikba, have seen it more as a matter of reception to information, assimilation of information, judgment regarding source of information, or degree of certainty about the information, and one, Johanson, uses the characterization of indirectivity for the basis of evidential marking. These various concerns — all of which undoubtedly are valid for some language or other and actually in no way mutually exclusive — in turn bring to mind the Jakobsonian notion of “shifters”.[2] That is, the ‘truth value’ as it were, of a shifter differs according to context — the referent of *I* uttered by me is different from that of *I* uttered by Paul McCartney for instance — just as the ‘truth value’ imputed to a statement can shift according to the context in which it is embedded and the perspective on an action that a speaker takes, e.g. whose point of view is adopted. Since shifters typically involve deixis (e.g. pronouns or demonstratives), evidentiality in part at least may well be thought of therefore as connected to matters of deixis,[3].in that in systems that overtly mark evidentiality, utterances typically include indicators pointing directly to particular sources or away from potential sources, as the speaker takes a particular point of view in describing an action.

While it is suggested below that searching for a core invariant meaning for any category may be the wrong approach in general to take, nonetheless I offer here my own hypothesis about the essence of the notion of evidentiality, drawing in part on the notion of shifting of deixis.

Let me start by introducing yet another term that I consider to be a reasonable characterization of what is going on with evidentiality: as suggested above, marking for evidentials involves the speaker’s adopting a particular point of view — I hereby call this a *stance*[4] — with regard to

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

information sources. This is consistent with the idea of looking at evidentiality as deixis, and especially with thinking about it in terms of perspective and point of view.

Interestingly, some seemingly contradictory characterizations of what evidentials allow or require one to do are given in various chapters in this volume. In some languages/cultures, e.g. the Tariana that Aikhenvald describes so richly in her chapter, speakers appear to use a highly developed evidential system to be as precise as possible about information sources whereas in other languages/cultures, e.g. West Greenlandic Eskimo as described by Fortescue in his chapter, speakers use a less developed evidential system as a way of distancing themselves from having to be precise about information source.[5]

Are these contradictory functions compatible? I would argue that they are indeed, and further that they represent two different but equally functional responses – or, better, *stances* — to a basic constraint/principle of human interaction, and a basic stance: namely HEAR NO EVIL / SEE NO EVIL / (and especially) SPEAK NO EVIL, or in other words, AVOID (POTENTIAL) TROUBLE (= AVOID NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES).[6] Both of these responses are ways of avoiding possible negative outcome. In the one type of response, by being specific the speaker is giving him/herself an out, as if stating “I didn’t say that X was true; someone else did – I am just reporting things as I heard them or inferred them”; in the other, by being vague the speaker is also giving him/herself an out, as if stating “This may be true; I don’t know for sure and it isn’t clear where the information comes from but I pass it along to you in case it interests you or is important to you”.

There are linguistic parallels for looking for a common denominator in seemingly contradictory phenomena. These isofunctional ways of satisfying an AVOID TROUBLE constraint are like the situation in phonology, where, for instance, one language might satisfy an AVOID CONSONANT CLUSTERS constraint by cluster reduction and another might accomplish the same goal by vowel epenthesis.

More tellingly, in the realm of semantics, the range of meanings — whether primary meanings or secondary extensions — seen in various evidentiality systems compares very interestingly in its scope with the wide range of meanings found with diminutivity as a "category" (cf. Jurafsky 1996). Note for instance that it is common for diminutives to have a physical sense (presumably but not necessarily the primary sense) but also various extended senses, including an endearing value as well as a directly opposite derogatory value, with quite a range in between (ordinariness, nonthreateningness, powerlessness, etc.), together with the possibility for irony and sarcasm thrown into the mix as well. To some extent, the semantics of diminutivity can be viewed in terms of a stance that a speaker takes toward some object, an evaluation of the speaker's merits and strengths, so to speak, compared with those of the object. In that way, there is a situational and structural parallel with the semantics of evidentiality (though there is no implication here that the semantics of one have anything to do with the semantics of the other).

2. Category Status

Another question that arises several times in the preceding chapters, though perhaps without a definitive answer, is how much and what sorts of evidence are needed to permit talking about a *grammatical* category in the case of evidentiality marking. This is of course a broader question that goes beyond just evidentiality, namely how do we argue for linguistic categories in general? This question is relevant to the issue of how to distinguish between English-type circumlocutory indication of evidentiality from the Turkish-type described by Johanson in his chapter or the Tariana-type. Is it enough just to talk about obligatory marking vs. optional marking, or does affixal vs. periphrastic marking matter? Is paradigmaticity relevant here, i.e., whether the marking is part of a recognizable verbal paradigm? Do we focus on form, as Fortescue suggests by emphasizing (§9) morphological expression, or on meaning, as Aikhenvald implies (though perhaps does not wholeheartedly endorse), or both?

It is probably worth noting that two recent dictionaries of linguistic terminology, Trask (1993) and Matthews (1997) are quite vague in their definitions of the term 'category':

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

Trask (p. 37) – 'a term of very wide and diverse application, variously denoting any of several classes of formal objects"

Matthews (p. 48) – 'any class or system of grammatical or lexical units distinguished at some level in the structure of a language'.

Moreover, Trask goes on to say 'usage of the term is so varied that no general definition is possible; in practice, a category is simply any class of related grammatical objects which someone wants to consider'.

Clearly, if there is no agreement as to what is needed to constitute a category, a decision as to whether some entity or set of entities is a category is not going to be possible.

This situation does not mean that anything goes, however; the general criteria mentioned above — obligatoriness, morphological vs. lexical, etc. — are all worth considering, but it is not clear that they will advance the cause at all, or bring it to any sort of satisfying point even.

Part of the problem is that probably all languages have some means of indicating one's degree of taking a covering stance towards statements and events that are not a matter of category or grammar per se. This insight is what is behind the distinction made by Aikhenvald in her introductory position paper between an evidentiality strategy and an evidentiality system. We run the risk of vitiating the whole enterprise of examining evidentiality if we are so broad in our investigation and classification as to include every means under the sun, stretegies as well as systems.[7]

Thus the matter of defining and identifying categories becomes especially important as a way of deciding whether one is confronting in a particular language a strategy or a system, since category status implies a degree of embedding in the grammatical apparatus of a language and thus true systematicity. Still, one key issue brought out by Aikhenvald in the introduction is the fact that the realization of evidentiality can be manifested across different parts of the grammar, what she referred to as 'scattered realization'.[8] My suggestion here is that such cases can indeed be a

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

cognitive "system" and can in fact be a significant linguistic category, what we might informally call a 'scattergory' (to borrow from the name of the Milton Bradley board game, *Scattergories*).

Of particular relevance here is the construct that I have argued for elsewhere in a number of publications with my colleague and collaborator Richard Janda, namely the linguistic *constellation*.[9] The basic problem that a constellation' is designed to solve can be summed up as how to capture 'unity-in-diversity / diversity-in-unity' among linguistic objects, i.e., situations in which a group of potentially relatable elements show both similarities and differences. We define a *(rule) constellation* as a set of elements which share at least one characteristic property of form but are distinguished by individual idiosyncrasies — both of form and of function — that prevent their being collapsed with one another, and we posit moreover that the identity of the shared formal elements is shown by a *meta-(level) redundancy-rule*, or '(partial) meta-template', which equates (or "parses") all relevant instances of a particular formal configuration that share certain properties. Moreover, these two constructs are related, in that morphological constellations are ensembles of distinct or uncollapsible word-formational rules or morphemes united by meta-templates which express the formal and functional identities these morphological rules or morphemic elements share. The constellation then recognizes the differential properties among elements and the meta-(level) redundancy rule expresses their similarities.

A ready example of this construct is provided by the Modern Greek sometime negator *mi(n)*, as presented in Janda and Joseph (1999). There are, we claim, at least 10 manifestations of *mi(n)(-)* in Modern Greek, with different but not unrelated functions, e.g. various types of negation but also dubitative questions, *fear* complement marking, etc., and with forms that are similar though not exactly identical: independent *mi*, independent *min*, affixal *mi-*, and affixal *min-*. These all show enough similarity, e.g., sharing the form [mi] and having some connection with non-affirmativity, to warrant wanting to unify them but also show enough differences among one another to prevent collapsing them easily into a single element at some level of analysis. The set of cross-cutting similarities and differences that unite and divide these 10 manifestations can be displayed conveniently in a matrix, with the properties along which the similarities and differences align listed across the top, and the manifestions listed by function together with their canonical form down the left side; + in a cell indicates that the manifestation shows the relevant property, – indicates that it does not, and ± indicates that the manifestation in question shows some ambiguity or duality in the realization of that property:

PROPERTY:	/n/-final	affixal	strongly negative meaning	occurs in COMP	pre-V(P)
mi(n)(-) MANIFESTATION:					
(a) subjunctive neg *min-*	+	+	+	-	+
(b) participial neg *mi(n)-*	±	+	+	-	+
(c) pleonastic neg *min-*	+	+	-	-	+
(d) neg imperative *min-*	+	+	+	+	+
(e) *fear* complementizer *min*	+	±	-	+	±
(f) interrogative *min-*	+	+	-	+	+
(g) prohibitive *mi*	-	-	+	+	-
(h) lexical neg *mi*	-	+	+	-	-
(i) elliptical neg *mi*	-	-	+	±	-
(j) derivational *mi(n)(-)*	±	+	±	-	-

Thus we say that the various *mi*'s are too similar to be ignored but too different to be collapsed; we thus locate the 'category' *mi(n)(-)* in the union of all the various *mi*'s, rather than (as is more customary in linguistic analysis) in their intersection. In this way, one does not have to look, as attempted above regarding the semantics of evidentiality, for a core/invariant/primary meaning, since ultimately, that can prove to be a tricky enterprise at best.

Thinking of categories in terms of constellations, moreover, might help to solve some minor problems that come up in the analysis of evidentials in particular languages. For instance, under a constellational point of view, the situation that Johanson describes for Turkish in his chapter may be interpreted somewhat differently. That is, he argues (§§6-7) that the Turkish inflectional suffix *–mIh*, a 'marker of indirectivity, mostly with past time reference', and the allomorphs of the copula *imIh* (with suffixal forms *–(y)mih*) are different entities synchronically, since, among other things, they attach to different categories of host, though many 'linguists … confuse the two'. Yet, given their similarity in form and similarities in function, any such differences in and of themselves need not be a basis for rejecting a connection between two elements — Greek *mi(n)(-)*, after all, has realizations as an affix and as a separate word, which thus show very different distributions, but nonetheless are relatable, constellationally. A definitive assessment remains to be made of course, as not all potentially connectable elements are in fact to be connected, even under a constellational approach. Still, if the notion of 'sameness' and thus categorization is broadened constellationally, then if there are some features that link two elements, it may be that they can be connected, even in the face of some differences.

Morphological constellations are more like Roschian 'family resemblance' sets[10] or the formal side to Lakoffian radius-and-hub semantic networks[11] than morphemes in the sense of structural linguistics, yet it provides a useful addition to the range of linguistic basic entities, and it seems to be useful here with regard to evidentials as well. The 'scattered realization' of evidentiality within various languages would seem to be exactly the sort of linguistic phenomenon that would lend itself to treatment — and unification in the face of difference — under a constellational approach.

Yet another side of category question is what constraints or limits there are — if any — on the range of evidential (etc.) categories a language might encode. The preceding chapters present systems with a number of categories – from two-term systems[12] to five-term systems, Tariana being the most complex described in detail. But is five the upper limit? Aikhenvald in her introduction does refer to the system in the Papuan language Fasu (see also Foley 1986) that has 6 distinctions, as shown by these 6 ways of translating the English sentence 'It is coming':

apere	'I see it'
perarakae	'I hear it
pesareapo	'I infer it from other evidence'
pesapakae	'Somebody says so, but I don't know who'
pesaripo	'Somebody says so, and I know who'
pesapi	'I suppose so'

Of course, it is not clear that these are all *grammatical* distinctions, and there are languages which are said to have more distinctions (e.g. Makah, cf. Jacobsen 1986, reportedly with 8 distinctions)

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

but not necessarily all of a fully grammatical nature. Still, this question of upper limits is one that cannot be ignored.

More generally, it is well-known that systems that encode perception of the world can be very elaborate. The situation with noun classes (‘gender’) is a case in point, for there are certainly languages with more than 6 classes (e.g. many Bantu languages, where even more noun classes, as many as 23, are often reported, though the actual number depends on how one measures what counts as a ‘different’ class),[13] and there is no clear upper limit cross-linguistically.

Furthermore, when one moves out of the realm of perception-encoding classes, and looks to such areas as morphological noun class or verb-stem class, ‘systems’ (or at least sets of forms) can be found that are far more numerous in their membership. For instance, the Latin classification into 5 noun declensions and 4 verb conjugations can be cited, especially when one considers how artificial these are and how one really needs instead to recognize numerous subclasses within the Latin 3rd declension.[14] And, the situation can get even worse if Gross (1979) is taken seriously about the number of ‘frames’ (read: ‘(sub-)categories’) needed for a full description of French verbal complement subcategorization — there are some 2000 or so distinct patterns of complementation, by his reckoning.

These cases are perhaps different since they involve arbitrary classes, but they do show that speakers can juggle sets of entities with a rather large number of members. It is unlikely therefore that any real limit could ever be recognized. Moreover, in this regard, if there were such a limit, it would need to be asked if it is a practical limit, i.e., a limit imposed by independent forces of discourse and human interaction and human cognition, or instead is one that is somehow a purely linguistic universal.

3. Diffusibility

I turn now to evidentials and language contact. Several chapters point to the extreme diffusibility of evidentials and suggest that they are ‘handy’ and useful in some sense. And, there certainly are numerous documentable instances of the diffusion of evidentials, as Friedman and

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

Aikhenvald show for the Balkans and for Amazonia, respectively, in their chapters. Thus it behooves us to pay attention to evidentiality and contact. In particular, it is fair to ask why evidentiality should be a category that is easily borrowed/diffused between languages (or at least relatively so).

Going out on a limb somewhat, let me suggest a reason, namely that it might have to do with the pragmatics of what would go on in a contact situation involving imperfect bilinguals.

Consider the contact scenario between speakers of a language that has evidentiality marking (E) and of one that does not (N), where both have a rudimentary command of the other's language (an essential in contact if there is to be any contact-induced change) — E says something (UE for 'utterance by E') and it has evidentials in it as marking for evidentiality is an obligatory part of E's grammar; N is caught unawares by the extra information that is present in E's utterance and struggles to figure out what is there. Moreover, when N says something (UN) to E in E, and does not include any marking for evidentiality, E will feel that something is missing and may query N about it, leading N to realize that he had better include something to that effect another time.[15] Therefore, even though we might think a priori that there would be simplification in such a situation, and that the more complex utterance-type would be given up in favor of the less complex, it seems plausible that to meet the communicative needs of both speakers in such a situation, the grammar that provides more information would actually prevail.

This outcome would not necessarily be the case with all linguistic features in contact situations, but rather only those that bear directly on transfer of information — for instance, the placement of a definite article, a feature which has been involved in language contact in the Balkans, is not contentful, in and of itself.[16] As a result, while such a feature could spread, and the postposed certainly seems to have spread in the Balkans,[17] its spread would not be tied to pragmatics in any way. Thus, informativeness cannot be all there is to grammatical diffusion, and further, simplification does take place in some contact situations.

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

Nonetheless, these considerations might lead one to predict that evidentials will always spread, though with the added condition that the contact must be of the right type in terms of intensity and cultural pressure (cf. the 'borrowing scale' of Thomason and Kaufman 1988:74-75). However, counter-examples appear immediately: Aikhenvald in the introduction (notes 52, 53) points out that evidentials have been lost under contact in Retuarã, Johanson in his chapter (§17) refers to the loss of evidentials in Turkish dialects and Turkic languages in contact with Indo-European in Trabzon and in Lithuania, and there is as well the failure of Greek and Romani in the Balkans (a hotbed of evidentiality diffusability) to take on Turkish evidentials, and so on. So perhaps the hypothesis here is simply wrong, but some insight can be gained by looking to socio-historical reasons for the lack of diffusion of evidentials — in the case of Balkan Greek,[18] it probably has to do with the attitude Greek speakers have about their language,[19] the literary tradition of Greek, the identification of Greek with religion, the importance of religion in identity formation among Greeks, and the like; regarding Romani, it is relevant that its speakers are involved in one-way not reciprocal bilingualism; with regard to Greek in Trabzon, it must be borne in mind that it was the dominant language in the speech community that speakers would eventually have to assimilate into.[20] That is, in these cases, as in all contact situations, as Thomason and Kaufman (1988) have repeatedly stressed, social factors rule — there are no purely structural imperatives that guide outcomes in contact situations.

In any case, in a substratum situation in which there is language shift, rather than adstratal contact, the prediction might be different. If an E speaker has to shift to a non-E language, s/he has to learn to suppress E's if the contact is going to be mainly with real non-E speakers and the E group's population is not large (or powerful) enough to make an impact in the overall speech community. If on the other hand, s/he uses non-E mainly with other nonnative speakers of non-E who come from E-language backgrounds (e.g. Turks and Bulgarians in a Gastarbeiter-type situation in Germany), then it seems possible that an E-version of the non-E language could emerge

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

for use among those various non-E speakers, again in response to their communicative needs and expectations.

One other significant concern with regard to language contact involving evidentials, besides attending to the exact nature of the contact situation and social/communicative interaction involved, is the determination of which forms would be used most frequently by speakers in a contact situation. It stands to reason that frequency could well play an important role in guiding the outcome of language contact, since speakers most likely have no access to structural markedness, except insofar as it is reflected in frequency of usage.

4. Origins

In the light of the spread of evidentiality, it must be realized that evidentials can also arise independently in a language; in one sense, they have to be able to since without independent origin in at least one language, there would never be a category anywhere in any language that could diffuse. It is thus appropriate to consider the issue of the kinds of sources for evidentials that can be found.

The preceding chapters give examples of past, perfect, and future forms all apparently serving as elements that feed into the marking of evidentiality. Similarly, elements having to do with saying have been linked to quotative and reportive markers. And, there are surely other possibilities, once evidential strategies are taken into account, as the range of available adverbials is quite broad.[21] Such developments are generally considered, these days at least, under the rubric of ‘grammaticalization’.

It in fact need not be disturbing that a few different ‘pathways’ for the emergence of evidentials are available, as long as a plausible link can be demonstrated amongst them and/or the logic of a particular development can be defended. If there can be manifestations of the expression of evidentiality that are as different as those catalogued in the various languages presented in this volume, then it is reasonable that there could be many different ways to reach those points.

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

Still, a cautionary note about ‘grammaticalization’ and ‘pathways’ is in order. A tacit assumption that many linguists make and seem to accept quite readily is that if there is a main verb or lexical item with a given form and an appropriately evidential-like meaning, as well as a grammatical piece such as an affix that had an appropriate meaning in the same language or a related language, then one is justified to say that the affix was derived historically from the fuller lexical item. In fact, claims have even been made, e.g. by Hopper and Traugott (1993: 128-129) that all affixes and grammatical material have a ‘prior lexical history’. Given the belief that many proponents of grammaticalization have that the only movement one finds with grammatical elements is from less grammatical to more grammatical (the so-called ‘unidirectionality principle’ — see Hopper and Traugott 1993, Haspelmath 1998, and Janda 2001, for discussion), this is a natural assumption to make. However, it is incontrovertible that ‘counter-directional’ movement, from more grammatical to less grammatical, is indeed possible and is reasonably well-attested, even if less frequent in absolute terms than the reverse. Some 70 or more cases in the literature are cited and discussed in Janda (2001) and other examples are given in Joseph (2001) and Newmeyer (2001).

That being the case, we have to be cautious in inferring a lexical source for affixal evidentiality, however reasonable it may seem. That is, a grammatical marker -X and a lexical item XY with similar meanings could in principle be related to one another not via reduction of XY to give X but instead via a reanalysis/resegmentation/liberation/demorphologization of –X and an augmentation of the newly freed or recognized base to give XY. Since delocutive derivations are possible, in which an element involved in a speech act becomes the basis for a derivative,[22] and since a piece of a word can be liberated (by whatever process — the exact means is irrelevant) as with *–ism* being cut off of *communism*/*socialism* etc. and being treated as a lexical item (as in *the great* *isms* *of the modern world*), why in principle could an affix with a discourse function not be extracted out of that discourse and treated as the basis for lexical derivation? Thus even if reconstruction of a lexical source for an affix is reasonable, it is not 100% certain and should never be treated as such.[23] In this context, an observation made by Michael Fortescue in his chapter on Eskimo is particularly

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

important: he states (§7) that at least some affixal evidential elements in modern Eskimo languages are reconstructible as affixes for Proto-Eskimo-Aleut, thus dating back some 3000 years as such, with no (obvious or likely) lexical sources.

5. Methodology

All of these musings would not be possible without the right methods to get at the data. Just about everything discussed in this volume is based on naturally occurring conversation or narration or on textual evidence; only very rarely did a researcher have to resort to the elicitation of data cold from informants. Furthermore, in the discussion at the workshop, it was noted overtly by many how hard it is to elicit data on the use of evidentials, yet it was also recognized that sometimes there is no other way — sometimes the situations that would test whether evidentials are used in a particular way simply do not occur often in the course of natural and ordinary conversational interactions or in texts. Thus, in some instances, one has to resort to whatever means one can, and elicitation is often the answer. Moreover, as Pilar Valenzuela notes in her chapter (§1), elicitation can be useful in indicating the need for evidentials, since “it becomes evident that any declarative sentence [in Shipibo] requires the use of either *–ra* or *–ronki* to be considered fully acceptable; their omission would simply yield “incomplete” sentences’. Also, there can be some real value to knowing what can not be said or used, and that is something that is not derivable simply from texts.[24]

A real issue though — appropriate enough to ask in the context of discussing evidentiality — is what can we know here? Speakers clearly can manipulate evidentiality markings/strategies for dramatic or narrative or pragmatic effect, e.g. to convey irony (noted by Friedman in his chapter, e.g., §§2.2.2, 3.2); if so, the analyst is thus seemingly placed in the role of literary critic or narratologist, moving out of science and the objective and into more subjective evaluations of materials. This is perhaps inevitable, but one has to wonder whether at such a point we are entirely engaging in ‘the science of language’, to use a common characterization of the field of linguistics.

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

Thus there would seem to be a danger in reading too much into examples found in texts and in conversations, but also in relying too heavily on the reflective statements of native informants. To some extent, though, there is a real dilemma here. On the one hand one has to look to texts and spontaneous speech for ‘real’ data, yet at the same time also do some elicitation. In the latter case, one can argue that native speakers are the authorities, but linguists have also long recognized that native speakers’ knowledge of their language generally involves knowledge that is not readily accessible to them for reflection and discussion.[25] If so, can we ever expect to get fully reliable information by asking informants why they chose a particular marker or phraseology?

There is no obvious solution to this problem, other than simply being aware of the methodological limitations: we have to mine all of the potential sources of information but also be cautious not to rely too heavily on any one type of data. We have to be open to the possibility that we might not be able to know all that we might like to about these elements — this is not necessarily an agnostic stance, but rather a realistic one.

One very promising methodological angle is to test what happens with evidentiality marking when speakers are confronted with new technology; thus, television or the telephone or even books, or other advances still to come (3D graphics or olfactory internet sites, etc.) offer an exciting prospect for testing hypotheses about evidentials, and intriguing data on that topic is to be found in the chapters by Aikhenvald on Tariana and Randy LaPolla on Qiang.

This particular methodology sparks some random but interrelated thoughts. It is fair to wonder, for instance, if there might be changes in a relatively short period of time in the treatment of technological innovations are treated from an evidential point of view as speakers grow more accustomed to them and see them more as an everyday sort of piece of their material culture. The situation with photography in the mid-19th century is instructive in this regard: when this new technology first came into the public’s consciousness, photographs were thought to be unassailable records of what actually happened, the ultimate in fully verifiable and confirmatory technology, until, that is, someone came up with the further technology of trick photography. One could imagine speakers of an evidentiality language using one sort of evidential at first with photos until

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

they learn more about them and come to realize that looks can be deceiving even in photographs; perhaps they would then switch to a different kind of evidential at that point. Again, a speaker's stance towards the photograph is at issue, and that conceivably could also be a personality issue, subject to individual differences, e.g., if someone were regularly a 'doubting Thomas'.

The questions posed in Aikhenvald's introduction about drunkenness and dreams and evidentiality in a sense provide a glimpse into reactions to technological advances, since these situations might be thought of as the first kind of 'technology' that speakers with an evidential system had to figure out what to do with. Alcohol is of course a very old 'technology' and mind-altering substances occur in nature, but at some point speakers must have realized that things happen while one is under the influence and that it is possible to talk about those events; so also are dreams of course common to all humanity, but there must have been a point where speaking humans realized that what goes on in their heads while asleep is a shared experience that they can talk to others about. If those speakers spoke an evidentiality language, then some choices would have to be made, and that would have been a novel testing ground for studying evidentials, something that is not readily available in the same way now.[26]

Or is it? In a sense, studying the acquisition of evidentials by children is a fertile testing ground: when, for instance, does a child learn to talk about his/her dreams? Are there changes in the way children talk about them — or other sensory-based 'knowledge'— at different stages of their cognitive development? And so on — we can thus keep child language acquisition as an area for future research regarding evidentials.

6. Towards a Conclusion — Applying New Insights?

By way of testing if the insights contained in this volume have extension beyond the languages discussed herein, we can consider the enterprise of the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European. In particular, Proto-Indo-European (PIE) is not generally reconstructed as having anything like evidential marking; indeed, one of the telling pieces of evidence that points to the appearance of evidentiality in three different branches of Indo-European in the Balkans (Albanian, Italic (via

Romanian and Vlach), and Slavic, as Friedman so convincingly argues in his chapter) and in Lithuanian (cf. Aikhenvald in her introduction, §2.2.3) as being an innovation, possibly contact-induced, is the overwhelmingly agreed upon reconstruction of PIE as not having evidential marking.

Even though the chronology and the geography of the appearance of evidentiality in these branches of Indo-European would require that they be treated as an innovation, and thus relatively recent developments, it is interesting to reconsider the question of evidentiality in PIE, to see if there might be any basis for reconstructing the proto-language differently. As it happens, there are a few assorted facts from various Indo-European languages that point in the direction of some sort of at least primitive evidential system early on in the family. As such, they provide a useful case-study, showing what applying the results of the investigation of evidentiality to a novel domain can lead to.

First, the oldest attested branch of IE, namely Anatolian, has a well-entrenched bound-word[27] element that is generally called a 'quotative' marker and which is used to indicate direct speech; this is the form *–wa(r)* that occurs in Hittite (*-wa* before consonants, *-war* before vowels), Luvian, and Palaic. The presence of a quotative marker in and of itself need not tell anything about evidentiality, except that under each of its possible etymologies, there is something striking from the point of view of systemic evidential marking.

One hypothesis — the standard view, cf. Friedrich (1952: s.v.) — derives *-war* from the verb 'say' (*werH- as in Latin ***ver****-b-um* 'word', Greek *eíro:* < *werH-yo:, and Hittite *weriya-* 'say'). Under this view, the development of *–war* is like other quotative strategies discussed in previous chapters, and may involve a direct assertion about the truth of what follows, or else a way of marking clearly at least who is responsible for the truth of the words in question. The other competing hypothesis, argued for most recently by Joseph (1981), takes *-war* to be from an adverbial *-wo (maybe a disjunctive marker, cf. Sanskrit *va:* 'or') plus an adverbial suffix *-r (as in English *where/here/there*). Under that view, the use of a cognate form, Sanskrit *iva* (thus, *i-wo) 'like; thus' is interesting, since *iva* can be used in a mitigating sense in the oldest layers of Sanskrit (Vedic Sanskrit), e.g. *rebhati iva* 'he is making noise, as it were' — the mitigation here may reflect a type of equivocating about the truth of the asserted statement, and if so, may suggest some distancing on the speaker's part from the content of the statement. To get from that distancing to a direct quote use in Hittite, if that is indeed the path of development, would involve treating the Hittite usage as a way of distancing oneself from the direct statement that follows by being specific about the source (i.e., these are not my words, but rather are what X says).

Second, in Vedic Sanskrit there is a special verbal mood, referred to in many discussions as the 'injunctive', which has past tense endings but no past tense prefix, e.g. *gamam* (1SG of *gam-* 'go') which is used among other things for timeless truths and statements in the mythic past; this is paralleled by the so-called 'gnomic aorist' in Greek, in which a past-tense form (the aorist) is used for timeless truths. In Greek the past tense prefix became obligatory and so the simple past with the prefix continues functionally the form seen in the Vedic injunctive, which can thus be projected back into PIE. Interestingly, some languages with evidential systems, e.g. Jarawara as discussed by Dixon (this volume) and Tariana as discussed by Aikhenvald (this volume), have a special marking for the expression of timeless statements, essentially unwitnessed but part of common knowledge, as part of that system. To the extent, then, that the PIE injunctive had such a function, it may well be yet another piece suggesting that evidentiality was relevant in PIE.

There are as well various sorts of lexical evidence which might point to evidentiality marking in PIE, e.g. seemingly synonymous but formally distinct roots for 'know' (*g'neH-, as in Greek *gnó:-sko:*, and *weyd-, as in Greek *oída*) that invite the possibility of the encoding of different types of knowledge or modes of knowing. Overall, though, the evidence is at best suggestive, and clearly a lot more remains to be worked out before one can say that these bits and pieces scattered here and there across the whole family actually add up to a supportable claim that PIE is to be reconstructed with even an evidentiality strategy let alone a system.[28] Still, this discussion shows that the insights that have emerged from this volume are applicable to novel domains and can at the very least make practitioners in all language families, even those languages that have not been significant players on the evidential pitch — diggers in the evidential trenches, so to speak — sit up and take notice; evidentiality clearly is a response to a basic human desire and to the dynamics of

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

human interaction, and as such, is something that all languages may well have some reflection of in some way.

7. Conclusion — Some Unanswered (and Maybe Unasked) Questions

To bring these remarks to a close, by way of pointing to some prospects for future research, I signal here some issues and questions that are unanswered or unaddressed and possibly, for some of them, even unasked before this:

a. As already mentioned, there is the intriguing matter of language acquisition (about which more can be learned, though Aksu-Koç and Slobin 1986 offer a start in that regard).

b. Why do evidentials develop in language X but not in language Y even under similar stimuli? Is it in their "group psychology", their shared culture, their shared attitudes, etc.? We may have a partial answer to that in regard to the resistance of some languages (e.g. Greek, see §3 above) to borrowing evidentials, but clearly more is needed here.

c. If one were to map evidentials on a global basis, are there geographically coherent areas that are devoid of evidentials? An even more basic question: is mapping even a fruitful enterprise here? Is there something to be learned from the geography of evidentiality-marking languages? How would this exercise interact with the matter of deciding categorial status for evidentiality? Is it important to focus also on the time-period the mapping might refer to?

d. Does the size of the speech community have any correlation with the size or nature of the evidential system?[29] Here we have to realize that even in a language with thousands or even millions of speakers, there can be pockets of very limited interaction where speakers are in a relatively closed community even if there are potential links to larger numbers outside the community.

e. What happens when there are multiple sources of information present? Is there a hierarchy that speakers follow? Is it culturally determined or is it possibly universal? Does the apparent default status of visually based information hold across all languages and cultures?

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

f. Clearly, 'distancing' matters with respect to evidentiality, and it is usually a mental or cognitive distancing or perhaps a temporal distancing (note the Jarawara remote past that Dixon describes in his chapter) — is 'distance' just a metaphor here, or can we talk of physical distance mattering too? What about being physically removed from the source of information — does that affect evidentiality marking at all? Is auditorily based information perhaps the physical analogue (no immediate visual stimuli) to the metaphorical distancing?

g. Are there other types of distancing ploys that speakers might utilize that are not evidentially based, and if so, do they have any relation to evidentiality? For example, 1996 U.S. presidential candidate Bob Dole had the habit of referring to himself in the 3rd person (e.g. he would say 'Bob Dole will work for you' instead of 'I will work …') — is this a type of stepping out of oneself, distancing oneself as an individual from oneself as speaker/narrator?[30] More generally, what about the very large area involving social distancing that politeness strategies and honorific systems provide? Are they at all (to be) connected with evidentials? An intriguingly suggestive bit of data comes from Shipibo-Konibo, where, as described by Valenzuela in her chapter (§5), one of the functions of the speculative marker *mein* is a courtesy use in interrogatives.

Putting all these remaining issues together, we see that there is still more to be learned about evidentiality, despite the very considerable progress towards an understanding of this phenomenon that the papers in this volume collectively constitute. Such a situation is actually a positive note to end on, though, since it both validates the utility of the investigation to date and points to its on-going vitality.

References

Aksu-Koç, A. A. and Slobin, D. 1986. 'A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish', pp. 159-167 of Chafe and Nichols, 1986.

Babiniotis, G. 1999. *Greek linguistics: Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on Greek linguistics*. Athens: Elinika Gramata.

Botne, R. 1995. 'The pronominal origin of an evidential', *Diachronica* 12.201-221.

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

Brislin, R. W., Bochner, S., and Lonner, W. J. 1975. Editors of *Cross-Cultural perspectives on learning*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Chafe, W. and Nichols, J. 1986. Editors of *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. (*Advances in Discourse Processes* 20.) Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Dixon, R. M. W. and Aikhenvald, A. 2002. Editors of *Word: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

Foley, W. A. 1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Friedrich, J. 1952. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch; Kurzgefasste kritishce Sammlung der Deutungen hethitischer Wörter*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Gross, M. 1979. ‘On the failure of generative grammar’. *Language* 55.859-885.

Hammond, M. and Nonan, M. 1986. Editors of *Theoretical Morphology*. New York: Academic Press.

Haspelmath, M., 1998. Does Grammaticalization Need Reanalysis? *Studies in Language* 22(2), 315-351.

Hopper, P. and Traugott, E. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacobsen, W. 1986. ‘The heterogeneity of evidentials in Makah”, pp. 159-167 of Chafe and Nichols, 1986.

Jakobson, R. 1957. ‘Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb’, Cambridge: Harvard University Slavic Department (pp 130–37 of *Selected Writings*, 2: *Word and Language*. The Hague: Mouton, 1971.)

Janda, R. D. 2001. ‘Beyond “pathways” and “unidirectionality”: On the discontinuity of language transmission and the counterability of grammaticalization’, *Language Sciences* 23.265-340.

Janda, R. D. and Joseph, B. D. 1986. ‘One Rule or Many? Sanskrit Reduplication as Fragmented Affixation’. *OSU Working Papers in Linguistics* 34.84-107 (earlier version in *ESCOL ‘85*, pp. 103-119).

Janda, R. D. and Joseph, B. D. 1999. 'The Modern Greek negator μη(ν)(−) as a morphological constellation', pp. 341-351 of Babiniotis, 1999.

Janda, R. D. and Joseph, B. D. 2002a. 'On Language, Change, and Language Change — Or, Of History, Linguistics, and Historical Linguistics', Chapter 1 of Joseph and Janda, 2002b.

Joseph, B. D. and Janda, R. D. 2002b. Editors of *Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Joseph, B. D. 1981. 'Hittite *iwar*, *wa(r)* and Sanskrit *iva*', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 95.93-98.

Joseph, B. D. 2001. 'Is there such a thing as "grammaticalization"?', *Language Sciences* 23.163-186.

Joseph, B. D. 2002a. 'The word in Modern Greek'. To appear in Dixon and Aikhenvald, 2002.

Joseph, B. D. 2002b. 'Defining "word" in Modern Greek: A response to Philippaki-Warburton and Spyropoulos 1999'. *Yearbook of Morphology 2001*.

Joseph, B. D. Forthcoming. Evidentiality in Proto-Indo-European? Unpublished Ohio State University ms.

Joseph, B. D. and Janda, R. D. 1988. 'The How and Why of Diachronic Morphologization and Demorphologization', pp. 193-210 of Hammond and Noonan, 1986.

Joseph, B. D. and Vasishth, S. 2002. 'Constellations, Polysemy, and Hindi *ko*'. *Papers from the 28th Annual Meeting of Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Jurafsky, D. 1996. 'Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive', *Language* 72:533-78.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Matthews, P. 1997. *The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mushin, I. 2001. *Evidentiality and Epistemological Stance*. *Narrative Retelling*. (*Pragmatics and Beyond* NS, 87). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Newmeyer, F. 2001. 'Deconstructing grammaticalization', *Language Sciences* 23.187-229.

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

Rosch, E. 1975. 'Chapter 7, Universals and cultural specifics in human categorization', pp. 177-206 of Brislin, Bochner and Lonner, 1975.

Thomason, S. G. and Kaufmann, T. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Trask, R. L. 1993. *A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics.* London: Routledge.

---

[1] Though, one can note that I am employing an evidential technique here (perhaps even a strategy, but certainly not, as far as English is concerned, a category) since, through my hedges, I am trying to distance myself from the task at hand, thus hoping to be held less accountable for the truth of what I might say here!

[2] This term, from Jakobson 1957, was mentioned explicitly by Sally McLendon in the context of evidentialityh during the general discussion at the end of the workshop that this volume is based on.

[3] This very notion was brought out explicitly in the general discussion by Dr. Ilana Mushin of the University of Melbourne. Moreover, Elena Maslova (this volume) refers in her §1 to evidentiality as an 'essentially deictic category'.

[4] Much to my surprise and delight, I learned only after first formulating these thoughts at the workshop itself that Mushin (2001) comes to the same conclusion and uses this same term; I am happy to have been anticipated by her and feel that to some extent, our each coming up with this characterization of evidentiality independently is an indication of it being on the right track.

[5] Fortescue (§2) describes the use of the "quotative enclitic" –*guuq* for what he calls "mediated illocutions" and states that "reports with –*guuq* suggest displaced responsibility for veridity".

[6] More crudely put, perhaps, this can be called a "cover one's rear" stance.

[7] This very apposite point was made explicitly by Bob Dixon during the general discussion at the end of the workshop that this volume is based on.

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

---

[8] See also the chapters by Michael Fortescue and by Willem de Reuse for further examples of scattered realizations of evidentiality, in West Greenlandic Eskimo and Western Apache, respectively.

[9] See, for instance, Janda and Joseph (1986), and Joseph and Janda (1988), among other works, and now as well, Joseph and Vasishth (2002).

[10] Interestingly, de Reuse in his chapter (§8) refers to Rosch's 'fuzzy category' (see, e.g., Rosch 1975) as a characterization of the Western Apache evidential system.

[11] See, e.g., Lakoff (1987) for an extended example of this approach.

[12] Timothy Curnow in his chapter suggests that one might view a two-term system of the sort X vs. non-X as really a one-term system, so that could be taken to be the most basic (and in any case would contrast with a zero-term 'system', i.e., a language with no marking for evidentiality.

[13] I would like to thank my colleague David Odden for help interpreting the Bantu facts.

[14] There is at least the traditional distinction between *i*-stems and non-*i*-stems in that class, and the –*io*- vs. non-*io*- distinction in the 3rd verbal conjugation, and those are far from the only sub-distinctions one has to make.

[15] Without belaboring the point, by the same token, if an E-speaker uses N, s/he might feel obliged to add in more information, to find a way in N to say E-type material; these strategies could then get encoded into the grammar of N if an N-speaker uses them in speaking N to an E-speaker, accommodating to the E-speaker's usage and/or expectations. In the discussion at the workshop, two anecdotal references to this phenomenon were reported: Sasha Aikhenvald noted that Tariana speakers in their Portuguese give the impression of including far more information than might be expected or ordinarily called for, and Victor Friedman reported the excessive use in his own English of disclaiming and confirmatory adverbs whenever he returns from the Balkans. It is as if crucial information is felt to be missing when one shifts from an evidential language to a nonevidential one. See also Friedman's chapter (§9) where he notes that 'speakers of Turkic and Balkan Slavic

---

languages have reported feeling the absence of a nonconfirmative verb form when speaking English'.

[16] Definiteness clearly carries communicative content, but the placement of the marking of definiteness is not obviously tied to content and instead seems somewhat arbitrary.

[17] In this case, however, the spread may have been a matter of substratum influence, not the adstratum sort of situation envisioned here in this hypothetical scenario involving evidentiality.

[18] As suggested by Victor Friedman in the discussion at the workshop.

[19] This is thus a *stance* (see above, §1) of a different but not irrelevant kind.

[20] This is the case also with the Tariana eventually learning correct Portuguese or with Victor Friedman returning to normal English usage (see note 15 above); under those circumstances, ultimately the more prestigeful and dominant norm prevails.

[21] See also Botne (1995), where a pronominal origin for an evidential marker in the Bantu language Lega.

[22] Consider for instance a verbal use such as *My sons can please-and-thank-you with the best of them!* or Benveniste's famous example of French *tutoyer* 'talk down to' from the use of *tu* and *toi* as markers of lower status and lack of respect/politeness.

[23] We might even think of assigning a probability quotient to such 'unidirectionality-based' reconstructions instead of an asterisk; on this suggestion for comparative reconstruction in general, see Janda and Joseph (2002a: §1.3.1).

[24] In the discussion at the workshop, this limitation on natural conversational data was noted by Victor Friedman. Timothy Curnow added the important caveat regarding the use of large textual corpora that while statistics on a large corpus can be suggestive as to what is unlikely or impossible, the absence of an item from a corpus is not the same thing as that item being absolutely impossible in the language.

[25] This important point was brought out by Bob Dixon in the workshop discussion.

Published in: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in Evidentiality* (*Typological Studies in Language* 54). Amsterdam: Benjamins (2003), pp. 307-327.

---

[26] The persistence of common strategies for talking about dreams and mind-alteration in evidentiality languages despite the age of these 'technologies' suggests that there might not be adaptation and change as a technology becomes more ingrained and more familiar. Still, the fact that each speaker learns about these anew in his/her life might mean that the technology never really gets old or too familiar.

[27] This element is traditionally referred to as an 'enclitic', though for various theoretical reasons I deliberately avoid the designation 'clitic'; see Joseph (2002ab) for discussion of this position.

[28] I attempt this fuller assessment in Joseph (Forthcoming).

[29] Sasha Aikhenvald brought this question up during general discussion at the workshop.

[30] Note the use of the term 'commentative' by Chirikba in his chapter with reference to one of the functions of evidentiality in Abkhaz.