

Contents

Prologue.....	5
Figures.....	13
Tables	15
Abbreviations.....	18
1 Linguistic terms.....	18
2 Language names	18
3 Glosses	18
1 Introduction	21
2 Evidentiality in Slavic and elsewhere	37
2.1 Restricting the domain	38
2.1.1 A general remark on semantic decomposition and onomasiological classification	41
2.1.2 A note on the classification of linguistic units by morphosyntactic properties	42
2.1.3 Criteria for inventorizing evidential units	44
2.1.4 Types of propositional markers	53
2.2 The relation to epistemic modality.....	56
2.2.1 General survey of positions.....	56
2.2.2 Epistemics in a broad view and methodological criticism: a reply to Polish formal semantics	71
2.2.2.1 Knowledge as the key concept.....	71
2.2.2.2 Danielewiczowa's (2012) criticism	77
2.2.2.3 Summary	87
2.2.3 Epistemic agnosticism and reliability.....	88
2.2.4 Approaches from a Kratzerian perspective	93
2.2.4.1 The basic ingredients of decomposition	94
2.2.4.2 The specific behaviour of reportives	96

2.2.4.3 Fluctuation in the assessment of the epistemic–evidential relationship	99
2.2.4.4 Restrictions on the evidence type for inferences.....	102
2.2.5 Concluding remarks on approaches	105
2.3 Propositions, states-of-affairs, and illocutions.....	107
2.3.1 The basis of the distinctions	107
2.3.2 Scope over illocutions?	109
2.3.3 Different scopes for evidential markers?.....	111
2.4 Scope.....	114
2.4.1 Explicit and implicit semantic scope	114
2.4.2 Variable insertion of scopes and holistic readings	115
2.4.3 Modal and evidential concord	118
2.5 Taxonomies, networks, and maps.....	128
2.6 Subclassification.....	138
2.6.1 Inferentials: subclassification and delimitation from epistemic meaning.....	139
2.6.1.1 Jakovleva (1994): <i>xarakternaja</i> vs. <i>nexarakternaja informacija</i>	139
2.6.1.1.1 Ioanesjan’s criticism	145
2.6.1.1.2 Amendments by Bulygina and Šmelev	149
2.6.1.2 Squartini (2008): <i>circumstantial</i> s vs. <i>generic</i> s.....	149
2.6.1.3 Problems with inferences not based on perception	151
2.6.2 Extensions into remembrance: <i>remembrals</i>	152
2.6.3 Extensions into hearsay	156
2.6.4 Subdivisions in the field of hearsay	156
2.7 Evidential marking in Slavic.....	157
2.7.1 Raising and SEEM/LOOK-verbs	159
2.7.1.1 On SEEM-verbs in North Slavic	160
2.7.1.2 Iconic relationship between semantics and syntax.....	165
2.7.1.3 SoA–proposition contrasts and epistemic modification.....	166
2.7.1.4 The speaker as default cognizer	168
2.7.1.5 Raising in Bulgarian?	169

2.7.2 Particles vs. sentence adverbs	171
2.8 How to get at lists of lexical units?	175
2.9 Profiles of the markers selected for the survey	180
2.9.1 Russian	183
2.9.1.1 Reportive markers	183
2.9.1.2 Perception-based inferences	184
2.9.1.3 Deductive inferences	186
2.9.2 Polish	187
2.9.2.1 Reportive markers	187
2.9.2.2 Preference for perception-based inferences	188
2.9.2.3 Inferential markers without a preference for perception-based inferences	189
2.9.3 Slovak	191
2.9.3.1 Reportive markers	191
2.9.3.2 Perception-based inferences	191
2.9.3.3 Deductive inferences	192
2.9.4 Croatian	193
2.9.4.1 Reportive markers	193
2.9.4.2 "New quotatives"?	196
2.9.4.3 Preference for perception-based inferences	197
2.9.4.4 General inferential markers without reportive extensions ...	197
2.9.5 Serbian	197
2.9.6 Bulgarian	198
2.9.6.1 Reportive markers	198
2.9.6.2 General inferential markers, preference for circumstantial evidence	198
2.9.6.3 Markers of circumstantial and deductive inference	199
2.9.6.4 Markers of deductive inference	199
2.9.7 General remark concerning South Slavic	199
3 Experimental and quantitative studies in linguistics	201
3.1 On judgments	202
3.1.1 Intuitions	204

3.1.1.1	Remarks on Chomskyan ‘introspective data’	206
3.1.1.2	Judgments and metaknowledge	208
3.1.1.3	Validity and judgment–use mismatches.....	211
3.1.1.4	Acceptability and frequency	212
3.1.1.5	Frequency and entrenchment.....	215
3.1.1.6	Non-quantified observations	216
3.1.1.6.1	Obliquely marked agent in the Latvian passive.....	217
3.1.1.6.2	Communicatively downgraded SEEM and LOOK in Serbian and Croatian.....	217
3.1.1.6.3	Polish counterfactual <i>było</i> + INF	219
3.1.1.6.4	Polish optative <i>żeby</i> + <i>-ł</i>	220
3.1.1.6.5	Complementizer choice after CTPs indicating weak epistemic support	221
3.1.1.6.5.1	Polish <i>że</i> vs. <i>żeby</i> : acceptability	221
3.1.1.6.5.2	Russian <i>čto</i> vs. <i>čtoby</i> : range of interpretations	226
3.1.1.6.6	Subsuming remark.....	229
3.1.2	Grammaticality vs. acceptability.....	229
3.1.3	Truth values, felicity conditions, and (probably) more.....	239
3.1.4	Summary	244
3.2	Methods and measurement.....	245
3.2.1	Quantitative vs. qualitative methods	248
3.2.2	Corpus-based vs. experimental data.....	250
3.2.2.1	Backus/Mos (2011): Productivity of possibility-expressions in Dutch.....	253
3.2.2.2	Reshöft (2011): Motion events in L2-acquisition	254
3.2.2.3	Adli (2004; 2011): Positions of subjects and <i>wh</i> -words in Spanish	254
3.2.2.4	Divjak (2008): Different frequency measures for Polish clausal complementation	255
3.2.2.5	Featherston (2005b): Generalizations on formal syntax	256
3.2.2.6	Beebe/Clark Cummings (1996): Speech acts across cultures	256
3.2.3	Questionnaire designs	257
3.2.3.1	Likert-scales and semantic differential scales.....	260
3.2.3.2	Bipolar and unipolar orientation of scales.....	261

3.2.3.3 Magnitude Estimation	262
3.2.3.4 Graphic rating scales	265
3.2.3.5 Thermometer judgments	265
3.2.4 Graded judgments and introspection as antipodes?	266
3.2.5 The Decathlon model	269
3.2.6 Summary	271
3.3 Domains of application, in particular propositional modifiers	272
3.4 Recapitulation	276
4 The questionnaire study	281
4.1 Guiding questions behind the design	281
4.2 The experimental design: pre-test and tuning	284
4.3 The final questionnaire survey	285
4.3.1 Informants and schedule	286
4.3.2 Methodological considerations on the composition of the questionnaire	286
4.4 The questionnaire study: analyses and results	289
4.4.1 Task 1: Hedgehog pictures	291
4.4.1.1 Subtask 1.1 (Production)	294
4.4.1.1.1 Results per language	294
4.4.1.1.2 Comparison across the six languages	301
4.4.1.2 Subtask 1.2 (Evaluation)	305
4.4.2 Task 2: Functional distribution of heterosemic units	308
4.4.2.1 Remarks on specific units and syntactic contexts	313
4.4.2.2 Correlations between syntactic contexts and temporal relations	315
4.4.2.3 Heterosemic units among each other	327
4.4.2.4 A global picture	333
4.4.2.5 Perceived difference of meaning?	334
4.4.2.6 Conclusions on the heterosemy test	337
4.4.3 Task 3: Cartoons (snowman, mushrooms)	338
4.4.3.1 Procedure	339
4.4.3.2 Analysis	341

4.4.4 Task 4: Scope of reportive and inferential markers.....	345
4.4.4.1 Procedure	347
4.4.4.2 Language-specific adaptations.....	349
4.4.4.3 Analysis of output.....	353
4.4.4.3.1 Step 1.....	353
4.4.4.3.2 Step 2.....	354
4.4.4.3.3 Step 3.....	356
4.4.4.3.4 Step 4.....	360
4.4.4.3.5 Concluding remarks	362
4.4.5 Task 5: Squartini-framed insertion of inferentials	363
4.4.5.1 Procedure	364
4.4.5.2 Analysis	366
4.4.6 Task 6: Retelling a report (newspaper article).....	375
4.4.6.1 Procedure	376
4.4.6.2 Results	376
4.4.6.3 Particular markers and trustworthiness.....	379
4.4.6.4 Additional remarks.....	381
4.4.7 Manipulation of corpus examples.....	383
4.5 Summary: resumption and overarching results.....	386
5 Recapitulation and outlook	393
References.....	402
Electronic corpora and other data bases	423
Appendices.....	424
Appendix 1.1.....	424
Appendix 2.....	435
Appendix 10.....	441
Subject index.....	442