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1. What’s an evidential and why does it matter?

- evidentials indicate the speaker’s source of information for a proposition
  - INDIRECT EVIDENCE via inference, report, hearsay, common knowledge
  - DIRECT EVIDENCE via sensory input, e.g. visual, auditory, tactile,…
  - specifically, evidentials indicate ORIGOSPEAKER’s perspective on a presented proposition

(1) English (Germanic); examples from Chafe (Chafe 1986)

a. Apparently, at the end of the paper she gave, she pulled out a giant hairbrush. (C1986:266, 42s)
   HEARSAY
b. It must have been a kid. (C1986:266, 23s)
   INDUCTION

c. He sounded like he thought very very slowly. (C1986:268, 37s)
   SENSORY

(2) Nuu-chah-nulth (Wakashan); examples from Waldie (In prep.)

a. [[mil(aa)-wa?iš] CP]
   rain-CONT-3.QUOT -wa?iš QUOTATIVE
   ‘It’s raining, according to what I’ve been told’

b. [[mil(aa)-hač] CP]
   rain-CONT-3.INDIR.INTER -hač INDIRECT
   ‘Is it raining, according to what you’ve been told?’

(c. [[mil(aa)-gač] CP]
   rain-CONT-3.DUB -gač DUBITATIVE
   ‘It must be raining’

(d. [[mil(aa-matak) CP]
   rain-CONT-IND.EVID-3.IND -matak INFERENTIAL
   ‘Maybe it’s raining’

(e. [[mil(aa-ckwi) CP]
   rain-CONT-3.DUB -ckwi PAST INFERENTIAL
   ‘It must have rained’

(f. [[mil(aa-ku) CP]
   rain-CONT-Vis.EVID-3.IND -ku VISUAL INFERENTIAL
   ‘It looks like it’s raining’

(g. [mil(aa)-piš] CP naʔaat
   rain-CONT-3.IND_AUD.EVID naʔaat AUDITORY
   ‘It sounds like it’s raining’
1.1 How speakers use evidentials: a lesson from Plains Cree

- **Linguist**: How do you say “John saw Mary?”
  **Consultant**: John ès è-wàpamât Mary-wa
  (3) John ès è-wàpam-â-t Mary-wa
  John ʔʔ c-see.VTA-DIR-3>3’ Mary-OBV

- **Linguist** parses sentence and is unable to identify ès
  **Linguist**: Can you say “John è-wàpamât Mary-wa”
  **Consultant**: Well [YOUFOC] could
  (4) John è-wàpam-â-t Mary-wa
  John c-see.VTA-DIR-3>3’ Mary-OBV

- **Linguist** is puzzled, and turns to other matters; later finds ès is REPORTATIVE evidential
  (5) John ès è-wàpam-â-t Mary-wa
  John REP c-see.VTA-DIR-3>3’ Mary-OBV
  ‘Reportedly, John saw Mary’
  (from Déchaine (2007))

1.2 How linguists analyze evidentials

(6) a. Evidentials contribute **epistemic modal force**: they tell us about the possible worlds in which a proposition is true. (Garrett 2001; Izvorski 1997; Matthewson 2008; Matthewson 2011; von Fintel and Gillies 2007)

b. Evidentials contribute **illocutionary/sentential force** (Blain and Déchaine 2007b; Déchaine 2007; Faller 2002; Garrett 2001; Murray 2010; Portner 2006)

c. Evidentials contribute **perspectival information** they introduce a dedicated discourse role: they tell us from whose perspective (“point of view”) a proposition is evaluated. (de Haan 2005; Garrett 2001; Speas and Tenny 2004; Tenny 2006; Waldie In prep.)

d. Evidentials tell us **how a proposition relates to a particular situation** (Speas 2010; Waldie In prep.)

e. Evidentials contribute **not-at-issue content**. (Murray 2010; Waldie In prep.)

(7) **Guiding idea**: evidentiality is a relation between three factors (Waldie In prep.)

```
prejacent proposition
        •
          •
       PERSPECTIVAL STATUS
          •
       MANNER OF SUPPORT
          •
       ORIGO
          •
       PERCEPTUAL GROUNDING
       • situation
```

- **R<origo, proposition>** perspectival status
- **R<origo, situation>** perceptual grounding
- **R<proposition, situation>** manner of support (cf. Speas (2010))

- **not discussed here** (cf. Waldie In prep.)
  - direct/indirect evidence by-product of **manner of support & perceptual grounding**
  - **manner of support** accounts for the parallels between evidentials & epistemic modals
• today’s focus: perspectival status, namely the relation between the ORIGO & p
  • examine the semantic, syntactic, and morphological correlates of perspectival status

2. Evidentials contribute a conversational update of presenting (“putting forth”)

2.1 Some background assumptions

(8) there is a universal set of clause-types (cf. Portner (2004))
  • the set of clause-types is closed; syntactically, this corresponds to C-typing systems
  • each clause-type has a conventional denotation
  • each clause-type conventionally updates a discourse component
  • each clause-type has a conventional sentential force

(9) \text{Origo}_{\text{DEF}}
  the sentient individual from whose perspective a proposition is evaluated

(cf. (Agha 1993; Garrett 2001; Waldie In prep.); deictic centre (Fillmore 1975; Fillmore 1997); perspective holder (Kölbel 2002; Kölbel 2003; Muehlbauer 2008); judge argument (Lasersohn 2005; Stephenson 2007) sentence role (Tenny 2006)) validator (Stirling 1993)

• with declarative clause-types, the ORIGO is the speaker
  with interrogative clause-types, the ORIGO is the hearer
• evidentials are sensitive to the value of the ORIGO (Garrett 2001)

(10) a. \textit{This is Johan.} \hspace{1cm} \text{ORIGO} = \text{speaker}
b. \textit{Is this Johan?} \hspace{1cm} \text{ORIGO} = \text{hearer}

(11) \text{Common Ground}_{\text{DEF}}
  at-issue propositions to which discourse participants have made commitments

(12) \text{Origo Ground}_{\text{DEF}}
  not-at-issue propositions about which the ORIGO has information

2.2 The proposal

(13) \textit{Presentative hypothesis}
  evidentials are origo-centered expressives with presentative force (cf. Déchaine (2007))
a. Clause-types: \{\textit{Expressive, Declarative, Interrogative, Imperative}\}
b. Discourse components: \{\textit{Origo Ground, Common Ground, Question Set, To-Do List Fn.}\}
c. Sentential force: \{\textit{Presenting}_O, Asserting, Asking, Requiring}_A \}

(14) \textit{CONVENTIONAL FORM-FORCE PAIRINGS} (adapted from Portner 2004:238)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denotation</th>
<th>Discourse Component</th>
<th>Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>not-at-issue propositions (p^n)</td>
<td>Origo Ground: set of not-at-issue propositions</td>
<td>Presenting_O ORGO \cup {p^n}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaratives</td>
<td>at-issue propositions (p)</td>
<td>Common Ground: set of at-issue propositions</td>
<td>Asserting CG \cup {p}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td>set of propositions (q)</td>
<td>Question Set: set of sets of propositions</td>
<td>Asking QS \cup {q}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>property (P)</td>
<td>To-Do List Function: function from individuals to sets of properties</td>
<td>Requiring_A TDL(A) \cup {P}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• morpho-syntax contributes: languages use different strategies to mark sentential force
  • LEXICAL          open-class: Verbs, Adverbs (e.g. English)
  • GRAMMATICAL      closed-class: dedicated morphemes (e.g. Quechua, Tibetan)
  • SYNTACTIC        clause-type: dedicated root clause (e.g. Plains Cree)

• Predictions of the presentative hypothesis
  • as expressives, evidential features...
    • associate with the C-layer          Clause type
    • contribute not-at-issue content     Denotation
    • update the Origo Ground            Discourse Component
    • associate with Presentative force  Sentential force

• because they bear an ORIGO index, evidentials overlap with
    • indexicals   when Origo = 1st/2nd person
    • logophors    when Origo = Speaker = Matrix Subject

• How the story will unfold...
  §3 Evidentials are a distinct clause-type with presentative force
  §4 Distinguishing the origo ground from the common ground in Plains Cree
    • the root clause diagnostic
    • the chain-of-transmission diagnostic
    • the mirative diagnostic
  §5 Tracking origo shifts: Nuu-chah-nulth
    • the stacking diagnostic
    • the embedding diagnostic
  §6 Conclusion: form and structure matter (too)

3. Evidentials are a distinct clause-type with presentative force
• distinguishing presentation from assertion:
  • in presenting $p$, speaker puts forth $p$ without committing to the truth of $p$
  • in asserting $p$, speaker presents $p$, and commits to the truth of $p$

3.1 Evidentials are a distinct clause-type with presentative force
• form-force mapping: each clause-type has a conventional force (cf. Portner 2004)
  • evidential has presentative force; declarative has assertive force; interrogative has asking force; imperative has requiring force

• English presentative force is lexically encoded with evaluative predicates (cf. (Kölbel 2002; Kölbel 2003; Lasersohn 2005; Stephenson 2007))

(15)  English conventional form-force pairing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>OG $\cup {p^n}$</th>
<th>CG $\cup {p}$</th>
<th>QS $\cup {q}$</th>
<th>TDL(A) $\cup {P}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>I am hungry.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>Lucy watched the football game.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>Did you see the football game?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>Close the door!</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Claim 1**: Plains Cree has a zero-marked evidential clauses with presentative force

(16) **PLAINS CREE CONVENTIONAL FORM-FORCE PAIRING**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>ni-\text{wâtepamâw} atim</em></td>
<td>OG $\cup {p^n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-see(VTA INDEP 1\text{&gt;}3) dog</td>
<td>'I see a dog' [speaker has direct unmediated experience of the event]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>é-\text{wâtepamât} atim-wa</em></td>
<td>CG $\cup {p}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c-see(VTA CONJ 3\text{&gt;}3') dog-OBV</td>
<td>'... S/he saw a dog'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>ki-\text{wâtepamâw} cî atim</em></td>
<td>QS $\cup {q}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-see(VTA INDEP 1\text{&gt;}3) q dog</td>
<td>'Did you see a dog?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>pêš-ihk-ok</em></td>
<td>TDL(A) $\cup {P}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bring-2PL\text{&gt;}3-PL[IMP]</td>
<td>'Bring them!' (W1973:81b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• **Claim 2**: Nuu-chan-nulth (Wakashan) origo shifts are syntactically conditioned
  • 3 evidential morphemes are part of C-typing system
  • 4 evidential morphemes are not part of C-typing system (see §5)

(17) **NUU-CHAH-NULTH CONVENTIONAL FORM-FORCE PAIRING**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>mil-\text{aa-wa}Piš</em></td>
<td>OG $\cup {p^n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rain-CONT-3,QUOT</td>
<td>'It's raining, according to what I've been told' [ORIGO = speaker]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td><em>mil-\text{aa-}hač</em></td>
<td>rain-CONT-3,INDIR,INTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Is it raining, according to what you've been told?' [ORIGO = hearer]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>mil-\text{aa-q}ača</em></td>
<td>rain-CONT-3,DUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'It must be raining' [ORIGO = speaker]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>hîl-\text{aa}yîl-\text{Piš}</em>)</td>
<td>CG $\cup {p}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be.there-upstairs-3,IND</td>
<td>'He's upstairs' (W355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td><em>hîl-\text{aa}yîl-\text{h}</em>)</td>
<td>QS $\cup {q}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be.there-upstairs-3,INT</td>
<td>'Is he upstairs?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td><em>tuxw-ši-\text{ʔ}i</em></td>
<td>TDL(A) $\cup {P}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>jump-MOM-2SG,IMP</td>
<td>'Jump!' (FW463, W2001:37(70))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Connecting the origo ground to the common ground

(18) Presented set, asserting and putting forth (Portner 2006)

a. Initial Presented Set

\[ W \]

\[ ps \]

sets of propositions of which participants are mutually aware (to present \( p \) is to add it to \( ps \))

b. Common Ground

\[ W \]

\[ ps, cg(ps) \]

propositions to which participants have made additional commitments

c. Putting forth

i. \( cg \) is superset of \( put \)

\[ W \]

\[ ps, cg(ps), put(ps) \]

propositions about which participants have added information

ii. \( cg \) & \( put \) are disjoint sets

\[ W \]

\[ ps, cg(ps), put(ps) \]

propositions about which participants have added information

- \( ORIGO \) GROUND = set of propositions put forward by the \( ORIGO \) = \( put(ps) \)
- \( put(ps) \) may be a subset of the common ground
  - this is the analysis that Portner (2006) adopts for Quechua evidentials
  - predicts (some) unmarked clauses “default” to the common ground, i.e. are assertive
- \( put(ps) \) may be disjoint from the common ground
  - Portner admits this is a logical possibility, but doesn’t pursue it
  - predicts (some) unmarked clauses “default” to the origo ground, i.e. are presentative
  - hunch: this is what Plains Cree does
3.3 Motivating the distinction between presentation and assertion

- Faller (2002) analyzes Quechua reportative -si as having presentative force
  - ILLICITUTIONARY FORCE: speaker presents p by putting forth p for consideration
  - SINCERITY CONDITION: s_2 asserts p, and s_2 is neither the hearer nor current speaker

- ...but Faller analyzes the two other Quechua evidentials as having assertive force
  - SINCERITY CONDITION for conjectural: speaker believes that p is an epistemic possibility
    and that this belief is based on his/her reasoning
  - SINCERITY CONDITION for visual evidential: there is some speaker (s_2) who asserts p, and
    this speaker is neither the hearer nor current speaker
  - “unmarked evidential” = “unmarked assertion”: the speaker believes p to be true; evidential force arises via implicature (more on this below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(19)</th>
<th>a. <strong>Para-sha-n-si</strong></th>
<th>p = ‘It is raining’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rain-PROG-3-REPORT</td>
<td>ILL = PRESENT(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = ‘It is raining’</td>
<td>SINC = {∃s_2[Assert(s_2,p) &amp; s_2 X {h, s}]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EV = speaker was told that p</td>
<td>(Faller 2002: 3, (2c); 199 (165); 263 (229))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. <strong>Para-sha-n-chá</strong></th>
<th>p = ‘It might/must be raining’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rain-PROG-3-CONJ</td>
<td>ILL = ASSERTS (◊p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = ‘It is raining’</td>
<td>SINC = {Bel(s, ◊p, Rea(s,Bel(s, ◊p))}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV = speaker conjectures that p</td>
<td>STRENGTH = -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faller 2002: 3, (2c); 184 (146); 263 (229))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. <strong>Para-sha-n-mi</strong></th>
<th>p = ‘It is raining’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rain-PROG-3-VIS.EVID</td>
<td>ILL = ASSERTS (p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = ‘It is raining’</td>
<td>SINC = {Bel(s,p), Bpg(s, Bel(s,p))}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV = speaker sees that p</td>
<td>STRENGTH = +1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faller 2002: 3, (2a); 164 (127); 263 (229))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. <strong>Para-sha-n</strong></th>
<th>p = ‘It is raining’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rain-PROG-3-VIS.EVID</td>
<td>ILL = ASSERT(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = ‘It is raining’</td>
<td>SINC = {Bel(s,p)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV = speaker sees that p</td>
<td>STRENGTH = 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Faller 2002: 122, (88d)); 162 (125))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What’s the empirical basis for the presentative/assertive contrast in Quechua?
  - evidentials with presentative force (reportative -si) can be denied
  - evidentials with assertive force (CONJ -cha & VIS.EVID -mi, unmarked) can’t be denied
    (cf. Moore’s paradox: “It is paradoxical to perform an illocutionary act and to deny simultaneously one of its sincerity conditions.” Vanderveken 1990: 118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(20)</th>
<th>a. <strong>REPORTATIVE -si</strong></th>
<th>p = ‘It is raining, but I don’t believe it’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para-sha-n-si,</td>
<td>but not believe-1-NEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ichaqa mana crei-ni-chu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rain-PROG-3-REPORT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = ‘It is raining, but I don’t believe it’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EV = speaker is/was told that it is raining’</td>
<td>(Faller 2002:194 (158))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cf. Reportedly, it’s raining, but I don’t believe it)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. **CONJECTURAL -cha**
   
   "Llave-qa muchila-y-pi-chá ka-sha-n, ichaqa mana-n aqhay-pi-chu"
   
   #Llave-top backpack-1-LOC-CONJ be-PROG-3 but not-VIS.EVID there-LOC-NEG
   
   "The keys may be/are possibly/probably in my backpack, but they are not there’ (Faller 2002:178 (138))

   c. **VISUAL EVIDENTIAL -mi**
   
   "Para-sha-n-mi ichaqa mana crei-ni-chu.
   
   rain-PROG-3-VIS.EVID but not believe-1-NEG
   
   "It’s raining, but I don’t believe it’ (Faller 2002:163 (126b))
   
   (cf. #It looks like it’s raining, but I don’t believe it)

   d. **UNMARKED**
   
   "Para-sha-n ichaqa mana crei-ni-chu.
   
   rain-PROG-3 but not believe-1-NEG
   
   "It’s raining, but I don’t believe it’ (Faller 2002:160 (120))

4. Distinguishing the origo ground from the common ground: Plains Cree

   • **Claim 1**: Plains Cree has a zero-marked evidential clauses with presentative force
     - evidential force of unmarked root clauses in independent mode (update origo ground)
     - assertive force of unmarked root clauses in conjunct mode (update common ground)
     - root clauses that combine with overt evidential behave like stacked evidentials
     - interlocutors closely monitor the ORIGO GROUND (Appendix B)

4.1 Background information on Plains Cree

   • Blain & Déchaine (2007a) analysis does not include unmarked clauses; today is an attempt to rectify that

   
   | (21) | a. ni-wâpamâ-w atim | DIRECT EVIDENTIAL |
   |      | 1-see(VTA INDEP 1>3) dog |              |
   |      | 'I see a dog' [speaker has direct unmediated experience of the event] |              |

   b. "ê-wî-atoskâtam-ân," itwêw
   
   c-fut-work.for-1SG(VTI CONJ) say.3(INDEP)
   
   ‘"I’ll do that’, he said.’ (cf. B&D2007:1a)

   c. ê-wâpamâ-t êsa atim
   
   c-see(VTA CONJ 3>3’) REP dog
   
   ‘Reportedly, s/he saw a dog’

   d. ê-wâpamâ-t ëtokwê atim
   
   c-see(VTA CONJ 3>3’) DUBIT dog
   
   ‘S/he must have seen a dog’

   • diagnostics confirm Plains Cree independent mode = direct evid. w/ PRESENTATIVE force
     §4.2 root clause diagnostic
     §4.3 chain-of-transmission diagnostic
     §4.4 reportative diagnostic
4.2 The root clause diagnostic

- Plains Cree has two syntactically & semantically distinct root-clauses (Cook 2008): independent mode vs. conjunct mode clauses

(22) Plains Cree verbal morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDEPENDENT MODE</th>
<th>CONJUNCT MODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. INDEPENDENT MODE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni-ki-</td>
<td>-AGR_PERS/NUM</td>
<td>-AGR_NUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. CONJUNCT MODE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>-AGR_PERS/NUM</td>
<td>-AGR_NUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é-kâ-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(23) Plains Cree Independent mode vs. conjunct mode (based on Cook 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDEPENDENT MODE</th>
<th>CONJUNCT MODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. can be root clause</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. can be subordinated</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. support A'-binding</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. support bound variable anaphora</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. indexed to the speech situation (&quot;me, here, now&quot;)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1 Matrix versus subordinate clause

- independent mode can be root clause, but can’t be subordinate clause
- conjunct mode can be root clause AND subordinate clause

(24) a. [CP kimiwan ]

rain.3 (VII INDEP)
'It’s raining’

b. [CP é-kimiwah-k ]

c-rain-3 (VII CONJ)
'It’s raining’

(25) a. *ni-wihtamawâ-w [CP ni-cihkêyihtê-n ]

1-tell-3(VTA INDEP) 1-happy-SAP(VTI INDEP)
[INTENDED: ‘I told him/her I’m happy’]

b. ni-wihtamawâ-w [CP é-cihkêyihtam-ân ]

1-tell-3(VTA INDEP) c-happy-1 (VTI CONJ)
‘I told him/her I’m happy’ (Cook 2008:58, (7))

4.2.2 A'-binding and bound variable anaphora

- independent mode doesn’t support A'-binding OR bound variable anaphor
- conjunct mode supports A'-binding AND bound variable anaphora

(26) a. *awîna ana ocêmê-w John-a A'-BINDING

who DEM.NA kiss-3(VTA INDEP)) John-OBV
INTENDED: ‘Who is it that kissed John’

b. awîna ana ká-oçêmâ-t John-a
who DEM.NA C-kiss-3(VTA CONJ) John-OBV
‘Who is it that kissed John’ (Blain 1997:68)

(27) BOUND VARIABLE ANAPHORA
a. *niya ni-wâpamâ-w atim [CP ni-nitonâ-w], mâka môya Jeff
1.EMPH 1-see-3 (VTA INDEP) dog 1-look.for-3(VTA INDEP) but NEG Jeff
[INTENDED: ‘I saw the dog I was looking for, but Jeff didn’t see the dog he was looking for’] (Cook 2008:79, (41b))

b. niya ni-wâpamâ-w atim [CP kâ-nitona-k], mâka môya Jeff
1.EMPH 1-see-3 (VTA INDEP) dog C-look.for-1>3(VTA CONJ) but NEG Jeff
‘I saw the dog I was looking for, but Jeff didn’t see the dog he was looking for’
(Cook 2008:79, (41a))

4.2.3 Indexed to speech situation

(28) INDEXING THE SPEECH SITUATION IN PLAINS CREE (“me, here, now”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INDEPENDENT MODE (indexical clause)</th>
<th>ê-CONJUNCT MODE (anaphoric clause)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. must anchor to speech time</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. must anchor to speech place</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. must anchor to speaker</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• speaker is conscious participant</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• speaker is unconscious participant</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• speaker is participant (co-present)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• speaker is not participant (not co-present)</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(29) ANCHORING TO SPEECH TIME

a. ni-pêhtawâ-w nişimis wayawihtamihk ê-mêtawêt
1-hear-3 (VTA INDEP) 1-sibling outside-LOC C-play-3 (VAI CONJ)
= (i) ‘I hear my little brother playing outside’
≠ (ii) ‘I heard my little brother playing outside’
COMMENT: …like I’m on the phone with you, and he’s making noise, and I’m telling you about it (Cook 2008:95, (7b))

b. *ê-pêhtawa-k nişimis wayawihtamihk ê-mêtawêt
1-hear-1>3 (VTA CONJ) 1-sibling outside-LOC C-play-3 (VAI CONJ)
= (i) ‘I hear my little brother playing outside’
= (ii) ‘I heard my little brother playing outside’
COMMENT: This one could mean any time; it could mean before, or it could mean I’m hearing him now (Cook 2008:95, (71a))
(30) a.i  itóhtê-\textit{w} ékotê
  go-3pl (\textit{VAI INDEP}) there
  'S/he went over there' (cf. Cook 2008:75, (33a)

  a.ii *\textit{ita} itóhtê-\textit{w}
      LOC go-3pl (\textit{VAI INDEP})
      [INTENDED: where s/he went']

  b.i  \textit{ê-}itóhtê-t ékotê
      c-go-3 (\textit{VAI CONJ}) there
      'S/he went over there'

  b.ii ita kâ-itóhtê-t
      LOC c-go-3 (\textit{VAI CONJ})
      where s/he went'

(31) a. \textit{ni-}nêstosi-\textit{n}
      1-tired-SAP (\textit{VAI IND})
      'I'm tired.' (i.e. ME, HERE, NOW)

  b. \#\textit{ê-}nêstosi-yân
      c-tired-1 (\textit{VAI IND})
      ≠ 'I'm tired.'
      = 'I was tired at that time.'
      \textsc{Comment}: It's referring to \textit{when} you were tired. It seems like if you were talking about it, and not being tired. ' (Cook 2007, (1))

(32) a. \#\textit{ni-}wantipskinê-\textit{n}
      1- lose.consciousness-SAP (\textit{VTI IND})
      UNCONSCIOUS PARTICIPANT

  b. \textit{ê-}wantipskinam-\textit{ân}
      c-lose.consciousness-1 (\textit{VTI CONJ})
      'I lost consciousness.' (Cook 2007, (4))

(33) a. \textsc{Context}: speaker tripped over a chair, and fell to the floor

      \textit{ni-pahksini-\textit{n}}
      1-fall-SAP (\textit{VAI IND})
      (UN)CONSCIOUS
      'I fell.' (speaker conscious participant)

  b. \textsc{Context}: speaker blacked out and fell, woke up on the floor with a cut.

      \textit{ê-pahksini-\textit{yân}}
      c-fall-1 (\textit{VAI CNJ})
      'I fell.' ' (speaker unconscious participant)
      (cf. Blain & Déchaine (2006) on accessibility to consciousness)
(34) a. **miyomâciho-w** Anna  
   feel.well-3(VAI IND) Anna  
   'Anna’s feeling well.' (speaker co-present)  
   **COMMENT:** seems like you’re getting that from seeing her and looking at her

b. **ê-miyomâciho-t** Anna  
   c-feel.well-3(VAI CONJ 3) Anna  
   'Anna’s feeling well.' (speaker not co-present)  
   **COMMENT:** ê-miyomâcihot is more like you’re hearing about it (Cook 2007, (8))

4.3 The chain-of-transmission diagnostic

- Plains Cree monitors 1st-hand, 2nd-hand, 3rd-hand reports (Willett 1988) via
  - clause-typing of root clause (INDEPENDENT vs. CONJUNCT mode)
  - referent-typing (PROXIMATE vs. OBVIATIVE)
  - reportative evidential

(35) a. **[Speaker heard the dream spirit say it]**  
   1ST-HAND  
   êkosi itwê-w ana pawâkan  
   thus say -3(VAI INDEP) DEM.PROX dream.spirit.PROX  
   'That’s what the dream spirit said’ (M2008:340 (58a); volunteered S4)

b. **[Speaker heard about this from someone who witnessed it]**  
   2ND-HAND  
   êkosi ê-itwê -t ana pawâkan  
   thus C-say-3(VAI CONJ) DEM.PROX dream.spirit.PROX  
   'That’s what the dream spirit said’ (M2008:340 (58b); volunteered S4)

c. **[Speaker heard about this from someone who did not witness it]**  
   3RD-HAND  
   êkosi ê-itwê-yi-t anihi pawâkan-a  
   thus C-say-OBV-3(VAI CONJ) DEM.OBV dream.spirit-OBV  
   'That’s what the dream spirit said’ (M2008:340 (58c); volunteered S4)

d. **[Speaker heard about this from someone who did not witness it and speaker does not remember the event]**  
   ...iskwêw-a ê-wihtamaw-iyi-t ésa, ê-ahkosi-yi-t  
   woman-OBV C-tell.VTA-OBV-3>1(CONJ) REP C-sick-OBV-3  
   ...apparently, the woman told me that she was sick’ (M2009:235 (101); volS2)

(36) 1st/2nd/3rd hand information (cf. (Muehlbauer 2008; 2009))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd-hand</th>
<th>p is presented to origo by y_OBV who was presented p by x_PROX who experienced p directly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd-hand</td>
<td>p is presented to origo by x_PROX who experienced p directly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 The reportative diagnostic

4.4.1 Reportative (often) presents obviative information source

(37)  a.  \( \text{wîsta ésà é-kí-kakêš-im-iko} \text{ ékoni anihí} \text{ ókimåhkân-an-a} \)

3. also Rep C-past-counsel-INV-3 RESUM DEM.OBV chief-OBV

'[...; he, too, had been counseled by that chief]’

[lit. ‘reportedly, he, too, the chief had counseled him’]

(Muehlbauer 2009:248, 123(iii), EM 1997:§44)

b.  \( \text{é-kí-whtamâko-t} \text{ ésâ niyâk aya,} \text{ é-kí-wâpahtam-iyi-t} \)

C-past-tell-3(VTA CONJ) Rep future CONN C-PAST-see-OBV-3(VTI CONJ)

‘...he had been told by him about the future, he had seen it...’

[lit. ‘reportedly he had told his about the future, he had sent it...’]

(Muehlbauer 2009:248, (124), EM 1997:§44)

(38) Obviation in a reportative ésà evidential span (adapted from Muehlbauer 2009:251)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>OBV</th>
<th>CLAUSE-TYPE</th>
<th>EVID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Speaker hears Dan Minde talk</td>
<td>Dan Minde</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>⊤ Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Dan MindePROX talks about ErmineskinOBV</td>
<td>Dan Minde</td>
<td>Ermineskin</td>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. ErmineskinOBV Counsels Dan MindePROX</td>
<td>Dan Minde</td>
<td>Ermineskin</td>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>ésà Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv ErmineskinOBV prophesies to Dan MindePROX</td>
<td>Dan Minde</td>
<td>Ermineskin</td>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>ésà Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. ErmineskinOBV tells Dan MindePROX of future</td>
<td>Dan Minde</td>
<td>Ermineskin</td>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>ésà Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. ErmineskinOBV speaks to Dan MindePROX</td>
<td>Dan Minde</td>
<td>Ermineskin</td>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>ésà Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. ErmineskinOBV speaks to Dan MindePROX</td>
<td>Dan Minde</td>
<td>Ermineskin</td>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>ésà Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii Speaker summarizes Ermineskin</td>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Conj, Irreal</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. Speaker direct quotes Ermineskin</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Conj, Irreal</td>
<td>Quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Speaker direct quotes Ermineskin</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Conj, Irreal</td>
<td>Quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi Ermineskin is named</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ermineskin</td>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 The reportative in root clause contexts

(39)  a.  Context: didn’t know it was raining, step outside;

OR wake up in the morning, look out the window

kimowan  ésà

rain.3(VII IND) REPORT

'It’s raining!'

Comment: this sounds kind of funny in conversation; it’s more something I would think or say to myself.

b.  Context: someone comes in and tells speaker, speaker says to hearer

é-kimowâhk  ésà

rain(CNJ VII 0) REPORT

‘Reportedly, it’s raining.’ (Cook 2007, (17a-b))

Comment: it’s raining right now

4.5 Summary: Plains Cree reveals presentative force

• Claim 1: Plains Cree has a zero-marked evidential clauses with presentative force
### Plains Cree Form-Force Pairing

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td><em>ni-wâpamâw atim</em></td>
<td>OG ∪ (p*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-see(VTA INDEP 1&gt;3) dog</td>
<td>DIRECT EVIDENTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I see a dog’ [speaker has direct unmediated experience of the event]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>“ê-wi-atoskâtam-ân,” itwêw</td>
<td>QUOTATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c-fut-work.for-1SG(VTI CONJ) say.3(INDEP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I’ll do that’, he said.’ (cf. B&amp;D2007:1a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td><em>é-wâpâmâ-t èsa atim</em></td>
<td>REPORTATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c-see(VTA CONJ 3&gt;3’) REP dog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Reportedly, s/he saw a dog’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>é-wâpâmâ-t ètokwê atim</em></td>
<td>DUBITATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c-see(VTA CONJ 3&gt;3’) DUBIT dog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘S/he must have seen a dog’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td><em>é-wâpâmât atim-wa</em></td>
<td>CG ∪ {p}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c-see(VTA CONJ 3&gt;3’) dog-OBV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘... S/he saw a dog’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td><em>ki-wâpamâw cî atim</em></td>
<td>QS ∪ {q}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-see(VTA INDEP 1&gt;3) q dog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Did you see a dog?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td><em>pês-îhk-ôk</em></td>
<td>TDL(A) ∪ {P}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bring-2PL&gt;3-PL(IMP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Bring them!’ (W1973:81b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tracking origo shifts: Nuu-chah-nulth

- **Claim 2:** Nuu-chan-nulth (Wakashan) origo shifts are syntactically conditioned

### Nuu-chah-nulth Conventional Form-Force Pairing

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>*mîl-aa-*waʔiš</td>
<td>OG ∪ (p*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rain-CONT-3.QUOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It’s raining, according to what I’ve been told’ (ORIGO = speaker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*mîl-aa-*hač</td>
<td>rain-CONT-3.INDIR.INTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Is it raining, according to what you’ve been told?’ (ORIGO = hearer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>*mîl-aa-*qača</td>
<td>rain-CONT-3.DUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘It must be raining’ (ORIGO = speaker)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>*hił-aayîl-*piś</td>
<td>CG ∪ {p}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be.there-upstairs-3.IND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘He’s upstairs’ (W355)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 The stacking diagnostic

(43) Nuu-chah-nulth syntactic domains for evidentials (from Waldie In prep.)
• Nuu-chah-nulth CP-domain evidentials have the distribution of Functional heads
  • they’re integrated into the clause-typing system
  • they enter into paradigmatic contrasts
  • they don’t co-occur with each other

• Nuu-chul-nulth IP-domain evidentials have the distribution of adverbs
  • they co-occur with each other
  • they co-occur with CP-domain evidentials

• Nuu-chah-nuulth VP-domain evidentials have the distribution of verbs
  • they co-occur with each other
  • the visual inferential
    ...doesn’t co-occur with IP-domain evidentials
    ...doesn’t co-occur with dubitative CP-domain evidentialG
  • the auditory evidential is lexically specified as having an ORIGOSPEAKER
    ...doesn’t occur with past inferential IP-domain evidential
    ...doesn’t occur with the indirect interrogative CP-domain evidential

5.3 The embedding diagnostic

(44) Nuu-chah-nulth-combinations of ORIGO assignment and evidentiality
(from Waldie, in prep.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MORPHEME</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>ORIGO</th>
<th>EVIDENTIALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ʔiʔ</td>
<td>indicative</td>
<td>SPEAKER</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-waʔiʔ</td>
<td>quotative</td>
<td>SPEAKER</td>
<td>cont.inf(o)(q)(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-h</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
<td>ADDRESSEE</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ʔaʔč</td>
<td>indirect interrogative</td>
<td>ADDRESSEE</td>
<td>report(o)(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-matak</td>
<td>inference</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>cont.inf(o)(q)(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ckʔiʔ</td>
<td>past inference</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>cont.inf(o)(q)(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naʔaat</td>
<td>auditory evidence</td>
<td>SPEAKER</td>
<td>groundingAUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• ORIGO = SPEAKER
  • ORIGO = MATRIX SUBJECT

(45) Scenario: Ken had been out of town, and one day Kay was walking by his house and saw his lights on. Later she said this to Bill.

[CP waṭyuu-kuʔ-ʔiʔ Ken ]
be.home-VIS.EVID-3.IND Ken

‘It looks like Ken is at home’ (W147:243b)
(46)  a. **Scenario:** Linda saw lights on at Ken's place after he had been out of town for a few days, and she told Kay that it looked like Ken was at home. Later, Kay said this to Bill.

\[ \text{[CP } \text{wq̲t̲aa} \text{-mit}-\text{iš } \text{Linda [CP } \text{wyuu} \text{-} \text{kwuk} \text{-} \text{q } \text{Ken } \text{]} ] \]

think-PAST-3.IND Linda be.home-VIS.EVID-3.SUB Ken

'\text{Linda}_{\text{ORIGO}} \text{ thought that it looks like was at home}' (cf. W147:243a)

b. **Scenario:** Kay and Bill knew that Ken had gone to Vancouver, and was not home, but Linda told Kay that it looked like Ken was home when she walked by his house. Kay then said this to Bill.

\[ \text{[CP } \text{wawaa} \text{-mit}-\text{iš } \text{Linda [CP } \text{?in } \text{wyuu} \text{-} \text{kwuk } \text{Ken } \text{]} ] \]

say-PAST-3.IND Linda COMP be.home-VIS.EVID Ken

'\text{Linda}_{\text{ORIGO}} \text{ said that it looks like Ken is home}' (W149:246)

(47)  a. **Scenario:** Linda tried to teach her daughter how to make bread before, but her daughter said it kept failing. Linda hadn't seen her for a while, then went over and saw a bunch of loaves of bread on the counter. She told Kay that she was proud that it appeared her daughter knew how to make bread. Kay then said this to Bill.

\[ \text{[CP } \text{nuc̃ak}-\text{iš } \text{Linda [CP } \text{?in } \text{xâč} \text{-} \text{kuk} \text{- } \text{’a} \text{-} \text{uk } \text{iâ} \text{n̂a } \text{saapn}-\text{q-ii} ] ] \]

proud-PAST-3.IND Linda COMP know.how-VIS.EVID-now.POSS child bread-STEM-make

'\text{Linda}_{\text{ORIGO}} \text{ is proud that it appears her daughter knows how to make bread now}' (W152:251)

b. **Scenario:** Linda was out on a field trip with a group of students, and some of them were spending much more than they were supposed to bring with them. A couple were not spending anything, so Linda gave them some money. She told Kay about it, and later Kay told this to Bill.

\[ \text{[CP } \text{?an-a} \text{ht̲a} \text{-mit-ḥi} \text{iš } \text{Linda taana}-\text{q-ayi } \text{[CP } \text{yaq-kuk} \text{-} \text{ii } \text{χi} \text{c̃x}-\text{ʔakl̃i } \text{]} ] ] \]

COMP-do.to-PAST-3.IND Linda money-STEM-give REL-VIS.EVID-3.INDF faded-buttocks

'\text{Linda}_{\text{ORIGO}} \text{ only gave money to those that appeared broke}'
6. Conclusion: form and structure matter (too)

6.1 Methodological consequence

- recent theoretical research on evidentials has focused on the semantic and pragmatic properties of evidentials
- syntactic diagnostics allow us to develop more finely-tuned analyses of evidentials

(48) SYNTACTIC DIAGNOSTICS FOR EVIDENTIALS AND WHAT THEY DETECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>What it Detects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. root clause diagnostic</td>
<td>ego ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. indexical diagnostics</td>
<td>egophoricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. chain-of-transmission diagnostic</td>
<td>interaction of evidentiality with reference-tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. reportative diagnostic</td>
<td>distancing strategies (mirative, obviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. stacking diagnostic</td>
<td>syntactic constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. embedding diagnostic</td>
<td>origo shifts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(not discussed here; see TNE workshop)

7. word order                          | syntactic constituency                               |
8. evidential concord                   | syntactic constituency                               |
9. evidential clusters                  | discourse structure                                  |

6.2 Theoretical consequences

(49) FORM-FORCE PAIRINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Denotation</th>
<th>Discourse Component</th>
<th>Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressives</td>
<td>not-at-issue propositions</td>
<td>Origo Ground: set of at-issue propositions</td>
<td>Presenting, Origo Ground: set of at-issue propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p^n)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaratives</td>
<td>at-issue propositions (p)</td>
<td>Common Ground: set of at-issue propositions</td>
<td>Asserting, Common Ground: set of at-issue propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatives</td>
<td>set of propositions (q)</td>
<td>Question Set: set of sets of propositions</td>
<td>Asking, Question Set: set of sets of propositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperatives</td>
<td>property P</td>
<td>To-Do List Function: function from individuals to sets of properties</td>
<td>Requiring, To-Do List Function: function from individuals to sets of properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If the arguments in favor of “presenting” or “putting forth” as a distinct sentential force are tenable, this has consequences for:
  - the semantics: how we model assertion, belief-states, common ground
  - the syntax: how we model clause-typing
Appendix A: English evaluative predicates are lexicalized evidentials

- evaluative predicates introduce the origo’s perspective
- propositional content of evaluative predicates of internal state is not-at-issue
  - can’t be challenged

(50) A: I am tired. OG \( \cup \{ p^n \} \)
    B: #No, you’re not!

- propositional content of non-evaluative predicates is at-issue
  - can be challenged

(51) A: Lucy watched the football game. CG \( \cup \{ p \} \)
    B: No, she didn’t!

- with unmarked clauses ORIGO = speaker
  - 2nd person subject is unfelicitous, can be repaired with evidential
    (this is a diagnostic for ego evidentiality)

(52) a. #You’re tired.
    b. You look tired. / You sound tired. / You seem tired.
       = ‘Given the sensory evidence available to me, You’re tired’

- that this is a ”2nd person effect” is confirmed by the fact that imperatives pattern in the same way

(53) a. #Quick, be tired!
    b. Quick, look tired!
       TDL(\( A \)) \( \cup \{ P \} \)
       = ‘Given the visual evidence available to me, TDL_{A} \{ tired \}

(NB: the infelicity of #Quick, be tired! can be attributed to a ban on stative imperatives Quick, be rude!)

- with interrogatives, ORIGO = addressee
  - 1st person subject is unfelicitous; but can be repaired with overt evidential marking

(54) a. #Am I tired?
    b. Do I look tired? / Do I sound tired? / Do I seem tired?
       QS \( \cup \{ q \} \)
       = ‘Given the sensory evidence available to you, QS \{ I am tired; I am not tired \}
Appendix B: Plains Cree Rules of Affirmation

- In a **PRESENTATIVE** context, the speaker presents a proposition and commits to having a source of information for it.
- If the **PRESENTATIVE** mode is the default in Plains Cree, then no truth-claim is introduced by the speaker.
- What can be endorsed or challenged is the information source of the proposition. This accords with Plains Cree “rules of affirmation” (Wolfart 2000:148) that require that the speaker either endorse the reliability of the information source or have a relation with the information source.

**(B1)** **SPEAKER’S ENDORSEMENT OF THE INFORMATION SOURCE**

a. ..., kotak ékwa nik-átotêⁿ,...

another and fut-give.account\(\text{IND VAI 1}\)

‘..., now I will tell another [factual] story,...’ (AA12-1, cited in Wolfart 2000: 147)

b. ..., êwako wiy ôma tâpwê-áćimowin,...

RESUMP 3SG this true-factual.account

‘..., and this one is a true [factual] story,...’ (AA12-1, cited in Wolfart 2000: 147)

**(B2)** **SPEAKER’S RELATION TO INFORMATION SOURCE**

a. **SPEAKER IS RELATED TO EVENT AS EYEWITNESS** (co‐presence)

...,êkota nîst è-kí-wìchìwiýêⁿ ôma kâ-átotamân kotak.

there 1.too past-be.along\(\text{CNJ VAI 1}\) this give.account\(\text{CNJ VTI 1}\) other

‘I myself was present at the time when this second story I am about to tell took place.’

(AA12-1, cited in Wolfart 2000, 148)

b. **SPEAKER IS RELATED TO EVENT AS PARTICIPANT** (co‐presence)

nikâh-koskwâpisinînân wiy âta wiya kîkway êkotê

surprised.at.sight\(\text{IND VAI 1PL}\) 3SG although 3SG thing there

‘were were amazed by what we saw there’ (AA2000:58, line 5)

c. **SPEAKER IS RELATED TO EVENT VIA LANDMARK** (cf. Wolfart on realia)

little red schoolhouse mân êkota kî-cimatêw; kâyâs ôma k-átotamân.

usually there \(\text{PAST-stand}_{\text{IND VAI 3}}\) long.ago this give.account\(\text{CNJ VAI 1}\)

‘a little red school-house stood there; what I am telling about happened long ago,’

(AA2000:122, lines 23-24)

d. **SPEAKER IS RELATED TO EVENT VIA HEARER**

êwakw âña, kiwâpamâw étítkwê mâna, Lawrence James

RESUMP that.one see\(\text{IND VTA 2-3}\) DUBIT usually L.J.

‘You have probably seen that one around, Lawrence James’ (AA2000:126, lines 32-33)

e. **SPEAKER IS RELATED TO EVENT VIA OTHER PERSON**


3SG variously behave.thus\(\text{CNJ VAI 3}\) even DUBIT hit\(\text{IND VTA 3-1}\) that book think.of\(\text{CNJ VTA 1-3}\)

‘“He behaves oddly, he might even hit me with the book,” I thought of him.’

(AA2000:124, lines 3-5)
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