

---

**A Catalan Case Study of Indirect Evidence Marking**  
**Montserrat González**  
**Universitat Pompeu Fabra**

**GED-GrEP Seminar**  
**2 December 2011**

---

***MODEVIG - Modalidad epistémica, evidencialidad y gramaticalidad. Análisis contrastivo interlingüístico e intralingüístico en el discurso y la interacción***

***Proyecto MICINN FFI2011-25755***

---

# Evidentiality and epistemicity

- **Evidentiality:**

expression of the source and on the kind of evidence that the speaker has at his disposal in relation to the truth of the propositional content of an utterance.

- **Epistemicity (epistemic modality):**

speaker's degree of certainty and commitment to the truth of the propositional content of an utterance.

---

---

# Relationship Evidentiality - Epistemicity

**Relationship semantic domains:** *disjunction, inclusion, overlapping*  
(Dendale and Tasmowski 2001:340-342)

- **Traditional approach:** inclusion and overlapping (Givón 1982; Chafe and Nichols 1986; Palmer 1986; Willett 1988; Bybee 1985; Plungian 2001, inter alia)
  - **Evidential marking:** speaker's or writer's stance in relation to source of information.
  - Often treated as a type of epistemic modality: the speaker estimates the chances that an utterance has of being true and expresses his/her degree of commitment to the truth of its propositional content.
  - Speakers often make judgments on the basis of an evidence (perceptual, reported or inferred).
-

---

## Catalan markers that cue stance and attitude towards knowledge and beliefs

### (1) lexical and modal verbs:

*Suposo que ho fa perquè li agrada*

I guess he does it because he likes it

*Ho deu fer perquè li agrada*

He must do it because he likes it

### (2) Adverbial forms (working as parenthetical):

*Probablement, ho fa perquè li agrada / Ho fa, probablement, perquè li agrada / Ho fa perquè li agrada, probablement.*

Probably, he does it because he likes it / ...

---

---

## Catalan markers that cue stance and attitude towards knowledge and beliefs

### (3) Adjectives:

*Clar, ho fa perquè li agrada* (working as pragmatic marker)

Well/Of course, he does it because he likes it

*És obvi/clar que ho fa perquè li agrada* (=Obviament, ho fa ....)

It is obvious that he does it because he likes it (=Obviously, he does it...)

### (4) **Hedges** - Chafe (1986:270): “epistemological expressions that linguistically code our experiences.” [...] “low codability” (*about, sort of, kind of*) [...] to qualify nouns, verbs, adjective, or whole predications:

... *i començo a sentir /sento com unes veus que em diuen que no ho faci.*

... and I start sort of hearing some voices that tell me not to do it.

... *i uns dos dies més tard em va trucar a casa.*

... and about two days later he called me at home.

---

# Evidentiality and epistemicity

## Lately:

- (a) Distinct systems. Source-of-evidence marking does not involve speaker's attitude marking.
  - (b) Not only grammatical and morphosyntactic parameters should be taken into account.
  - (c) Pragmatic / context-bound phenomena and interactions should be considered (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998; De Haan 2001, 2005; Nuyts 2005; Aikhenvald 2004; Mushin 2001; Fitneva 2001).
- 
- “**Evidentiality asserts the evidence, while epistemic modality evaluates the evidence**” (De Haan 2005: 379)
  
  - “while **evidentiality qualifies the source** that justifies the assertion of a proposition, **modality qualifies the genuine belief** of the speaker about the truth of the proposition.” (Pietrandrea 2005:33)
-

---

# Indirect Evidence

**Willett (1988: 57):** *direct vs indirect* modes of knowledge

- **Direct:** through senses
- **Indirect:** hearsay and inference

**Plungian (2001: 354):**

- **Direct** evidence
- **Indirect** evidence:
  - *Reflected* (inferentials and presumptives)
  - *Mediated* (quotatives)

(1a) *It looks like* it's going to rain.

(1b) *It looks like* I'll have to completely rewrite this chapter.

**Mushin (2001:26):** The status of inference is ambiguous: the speaker can make use of an inferential when he 'sees' traces of the evidence but the speaker can also make a deduction from facts based on reasoning, without seeing any trace. In both cases of *reflected evidence* the speaker is confident in the truth value of the information conveyed because his deduction is factual.

---

---

## Indirect marking in Catalan: evidential and epistemic readings

(1) ***Es veu que ha nevat molt a Girona. S'han quedat sense llum.***  
Presumably/Apparently, there has been lots of snow in Girona.  
Lights have gone off.

- Evidential use of perceptual (visual) verb form (grammaticalized)
- Indirect, reportive source of information (seen, heard, read,..)
- No interpretation of facts
- The speaker can confirm the evidence (external objective sources)
- The proposition cannot be cancelled/challenged:

(1') ?? *Es veu que ha nevat molt a Girona. S'han quedat sense llum. Però potser m'equivoco.*

?? Presumably/Apparently, there ..... But maybe I'm wrong.

---



## Indirect marking in Catalan: evidential and epistemic readings

(2) *Deu haver nevat molt a Girona. S'han quedat sense llum.*

There must have been lots of snow in Girona. Lights have gone off

- Indirect / inferential epistemological stance
- Speaker is not certain about weather conditions; he speculates and makes an evaluation.
- Speaker infers the information based on deduction and reasoning (if all the city's lights have gone off, the weather conditions must be terrible). There's some sort of evidence (common ground knowledge: winter time, cold, rain and snow everywhere in the northeast) but the speaker cannot confirm it.
- The proposition can be cancelled/challenged:

(2') *Deu haver nevat molt a Girona. S'han quedat sense llum. Però potser m'equivoco.*

There must have been lots of snow in Girona. [...] But maybe I'm wrong.

---

# *Veure and deure* : evidential and epistemic readings

De Haan (2001:195-6):

**Direct** [+DIR] : **firsthand** [+1ST]

**Indirect** [-DIR] : **secondhand** [-1ST]

Classification of evidential categories with [DIR] as basic feature:

- Sensory: [+DIR]
- Inferential: [+DIR]
- Quotative: [-DIR]

Classification of evidential categories with [1ST] as basic feature:

- Sensory: [+1ST]
- Inferential: [-1ST]
- Quotative: [-1ST]

Hierarchy (the most salient source): Sensory > Inferential > Quotative

---

# *Veure* and *deure* : evidential and epistemic readings

- Inferential epistemological stance coding based on external evidence and on the speaker's own capacity for reasoning (Mushin 2001; Nuyts 2005).
- Inference: hybrid category [+DIR] and [-1ST]  
Speaker witnesses traces/consequences, but after the action/fact has taken place.

Link between direct & indirect evidence. Inference based on:

- (a) observable results (direct evidence)  
[touching the clothes on the line] *Deu haver plogut molt aquesta nit. La roba de l'estenedor està xopa.*  
It must have rained heavily last night. The clothes on the line are soaked.
- (a) a mental construct (reasoning)  
*Deu estar molt contenta. Li han concedit la beca.*  
She must be very happy. She's got the scholarship.

## *Veure* and *deure* : evidential and epistemic readings

De Haan (2001, 2005):

- two readings of Dutch modal *moeten* (must)
- interface in the pragmatic domain (inferential, attitudinal).

(3) *De film moet uitstekend zijn*  
the film must:3RD:PRES excellent be:INF

- always [-1ST] but two interpretations: one [-DIR] - *quotative*- and another [+DIR] –*inferential*.
- *Es veu que* and *deu +inf* : two indirect evidential forms that share inferential traits but which differ in terms of stance and perspective taken by the speaker/conceptualizer.

## *Veure* and *deure* : evidential and epistemic readings

(4) *La película*                      *deu*                      *ser*                      *excel·lent*  
the film                      must:3RD:PRES                      be:INF                      excellent

(4)=(3)

- [+DIR] [-1ST] : the speaker makes a deduction; knows the director's work; follows reviewers' comments; makes an evaluation of facts based on reasoning and previous or acquired knowledge (reading, seeing other movies,...)
- [-DIR] [-1ST] : the evaluation/judgment is not drawn from direct witnessing of the action.
- **Epistemic marker:** the speaker does not report source of knowledge, just evaluation of facts.

(5) *Es veu*                      *que*                      *la*                      *película*                      *és*                      *excel·lent*  
It is said:3RD:IMP                      that                      the                      film                      is                      excellent

- [-DIR] : the speaker provides evidence for a piece of information that was neither perceived nor acquired directly in any way.
- [-1ST] : the speaker was probably told that the movie was excellent and reports the bare information to his interlocutor; the evidence is secondhand.
- **Evidential marker:** there is neither evaluation of the evidence nor commitment to the truth-value of the utterance, just assessment of facts.

# Distinctive underlying feature: [+/-DIR]

Proposal of the basic evidential features of Catalan *deure* and *veure*:

- *Deure*:
  - [+DIR] [-DIR]
  - [-1ST]
- *Veure*:
  - [-DIR]
  - [-1ST]

Distinctive underlying feature of the two forms: direct-nondirect division.

(6) *La mare no és a casa. Deu haver anat a comprar. [conec la seva rutina]*  
Mum is not at home. She must have gone shopping. [I know her routine]

(7) *La mare no és a casa. Es veu que ha anat a comprar. [m'ho ha dit el pare]*  
Mum is not at home. Apparently, she has gone shopping. [dad told me]

## Epistemic function: *moeten, must, deure*

De Haan (2001): Epistemic function of a modal verb (*moeten, must, deure*): possibility to insert a clause after the utterance, indicating degree of agreement or disagreement (7').

(7') *La mare no és a casa. Deu haver anat a comprar. [I d'això n'estic segura]*  
Mum is not at home. She must have gone shopping. [and I'm convinced of it]

*La mare no és a casa. Deu haver anat a comprar. [però ho dubto]*  
Mum is not at home. She must have gone shopping. [but I doubt it]

\* *La mare no és a casa. Es veu que ha anat a comprar. [I d'això n'estic segura]*

Mum is not at home. Apparently, she has gone shopping. [and I'm convinced of it]

\* *La mare no és a casa. Es veu que ha anat a comprar. [però ho dubto]*  
Mum is not at home. She must have gone shopping. [but I doubt it]

# Morphosyntactic features

- Grammaticalized evidentials cannot be modified (7'\*veure)
- Information that is based on a factual source of knowledge cannot be cancelled/challenged (1').
- Fully grammaticalized evidentials cannot be within the scope of negation (De Haan 2001); evidential morphemes cannot be negated or questioned without modifying (negating or questioning) the predicate itself (Aikhenvald 2004)

- (8) ?? *¿Es veu que va plourer molt a Barcelona ahir per la nit?*  
?? Presumably/Apparently, did it rain a lot in Barcelona last night?  
*[Es veu que] no és una bona pel·lícula.*  
[Presumably/Apparently/I've been told that] it is not a good movie.



---

# *Veure* and *deure*: a deictic reading

Evidentiality is a deictic category, not an intrinsic modal one. Basic meaning of an evidential: signal the relationship between the speaker and the action being described (De Haan 2001).

Hypothesis:

- the speaker uses the two forms distinctly to state that the action took place outside or inside the speaker's deictic sphere establishing +/- distance between speaker and action:
    - (a) *es veu [que]*: + distance speaker-action (more objective epistemological stance)
    - (b) *deu [must+INF]*: - distance speaker-action (more subjective epistemological stance)
-

---

## Du Bois (2007): the *stance triangle*

In any process of interaction the speaker:

- (1) aligns himself with other subjects (intersubjectification)
  - (2) evaluates the event or object being described
  - (3) Positions himself as subject of the action
- 
- Positioning or stance expression: lexical or verbal morphemes that express time and nature of the event and status of the proposition (Palmer's TAM).
  - More or less involvement depending on whether he has been/not been a direct witness of the action.
-

---

## Subjectification, objectification and foregroundedness (Langacker 1991)

- Speaker (as subject of construal) can be on or off stage (where the action takes place).
- The degree of subjectification (on stage) or objectification (off stage) differs.
- Subjectivity is constructed when the subject “foregrounds his estimation of the relative certainty of his statement.” (Sanders 1999:473)

Epistemic inferential domain: the speaker is on stage; highly subjectified.

Degree of foregroundedness in relation to *veure* and *deure*

---

---

# Foregroundedness

Sanders (1999): degree of foregroundedness and anaphoric resolution  
Dutch *moeten* (must) and *blijken* (apparently) = *deure* and *veure*

(9a) *Piet **blijkt** Henk te haten, want hij slaat hem.*

Apparently, Piet hates Henk, because he hits him. [Piet hits Henk]

*Es veu que en Pere li té mania, a l'Albert, perquè el pega. [en Pere pega a l'Albert]*

>> anaphoric resolution: Piet is the agent of the action

(9b) *Piet **moet** Henk haten, want hij slaat hem.*

Piet must hate Henk, because he hits him. [Henk hits Piet or Piet hits Henk]

*En Pere li deu tenir mania, a l'Albert, perquè el pega. [l'Albert pega en Pere o en Pere pega a l'Albert]*

>> ambiguous interpretation: both are possible; due to high degree of subjectification and foregroundedness involved in *moeten* (*must, deure*)

---

---

# Foregroundedness

- The Degree of subjectification and foregroundedness is related to the distance taken by the speaker from the action/event.

*Deictic sphere* of action (De Haan 2005):

- If the speaker is separated from the action being described (off stage), he is outside the deictic sphere of the action.
- If the speaker is included in the description of the action (on stage), he is inside the sphere of the action.

Epistemic marking involves a stance process of subjectification in which the speaker is on stage.

Evidential marking (as source-of-knowledge) involves a process of objectification in which the speaker is off stage.

---

## Epistemic, evidential, and deictic traits of Catalan *deure* and *veure*

	<b>Deure (deu+inf)</b>	<b>Veure (es veu+que)</b>
1	epistemic marker	evidential marker
2	speculation about the action described	assessment based on some type of evidence (source of information)
3	evaluation and judgment of the evidence	action or events presented as factual
4	speaker interprets the evidence	speaker asserts that there is evidence
5	information cannot be confirmed	information can be confirmed
6	speaker inside the deictic sphere of action: less distance speaker-hearer	speaker outside deictic sphere of action: more distance speaker-hearer
7	high degree of subjectivity	low degree of subjectivity
8	strong foregroundedness to the information	weak foregroundedness to the information

---

## Further research

Explore the deictic behaviour of Catalan *deure* and *veure* in genres where information is presented as factual (newspaper articles, vicarious narratives) and in genres which require interpretation of facts (newspaper editorials, letters to the editor).

Hypothesis:

1. the use of the two forms might not correlate with the expected genre (*veure* in factual texts where more distance is required; *deure* in texts which require evaluation and interpretation of facts and less distance).
  2. Both forms will mostly be translated by English *must*, independently of evidential or epistemic uses in context (interactive, informative).
-