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1 The essence of evidentials

Every language has a way of saying how one knows what one is talking about, and what one thinks about what one knows. In some languages, one always has to specify the information source on which it is based — whether the speaker saw the event, or heard it, or inferred it based on visual evidence or on common sense, or was told about it by someone else. This is the essence of evidentiality, or grammatical marking of information source — an exciting category loved by linguists, journalists and the general public.¹

In many languages, evidentiality is a grammatical category in its own right. Its scope is typically a clause, or a sentence. It then tends to be marked on the verb. Sometimes a noun phrase can have its own information source, different from that of a clause. This is 'non-propositional' evidentiality.

It is not uncommon for a linguistic term to have a counterpart in the real world. The idea of 'time' in the real world translates into 'tense' when expressed in a language. 'Time' is what our watch shows and what often passes too quickly; 'tense' is a grammaticalized set of forms we have to use in a particular language. Not every time distinction acquires grammatical expression in the language: the possibilities for time are infinite, and for tense they are rather limited. Similarly, an 'imperative' is a category in the language, while a command is a parameter in the real world. Along similar lines, 'evidentiality' is a linguistic category whose real-life counterpart is information source.

¹ As Frans Boas (1938: 133) put it, 'while for us definiteness, number, and time are obligatory aspects, we find in another language location near the speaker or somewhere else, source of information — whether seen, heard, or inferred — as obligatory aspects'.

Evidentials stand apart from other categories in a number of ways. Evidentials in questions may reflect the information source of the 'questioner' (as in Hinuq: see Forker 2014), or that of the answerer (as in Tsafiki, Quechua, Tariana and Tucano: Aikhenvald 2004: 245-6). An evidential can be questioned, as in Wanka Quechua (Floyd 1999: 132). An evidential may be within the scope of negation, as in Akha, a Tibeto-Burman language (Hansson 1994: 6). A clause can contain two evidentials: one may elaborate the source of the other, or refer to another source by another person (see Aikhenvald 2012a: 259-62, for examples from Amazonian languages).

Semantic parameters grammaticalized in languages with evidentiality cover physical senses, several types of inference and of report. The recurrent meanings are in Scheme 1:

**Scheme 1 Recurrent meanings in evidential systems**

I. **VISUAL** covers evidence acquired through seeing.
II. **SENSORY** covers evidence through hearing, and is typically extended to smell and taste, and sometimes also touch.
III. **INFERENCE** based on visible or tangible evidence or result.
IV. **ASSUMPTION** based on evidence other than visible results: this may include logical reasoning, conjecture or common sense.
V. **REPORTED**, for reported information with no reference to who it was reported by.
VI. **QUOTATIVE**, for reported information with an overt reference to the quoted source.

Further parameters may involve general knowledge, different kinds of assumption and reasoning, and degrees of verbal report — secondhand and thirdhand. Some languages have a special evidential just for 'general knowledge'.

Languages with evidentials fall into a number of subtypes, depending on how many information sources require distinct grammatical marking. So, for instance, languages with a
two-term evidentiality system may have one form for parameters I and II, and the other term for III-V, as does Jarawara: this is a system A1.

Or they may have one term for V, and not express any other source: this is a system A3, as exemplified by Nheêngatú and Estonian in the examples below. In three-term systems, one term can cover I, or I and II, another term can cover III and IV, and a further term could cover V, as in Shilluk: this is an example of system B1. Smaller evidential systems have more semantic complexity in their terms, since each term may subsume numerous semantic parameters. A taxonomy of the attested types of evidentiality systems is in Box 1.

**Box 1. A taxonomy of evidentiality systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems with two choices are referred to with the letter A and a number, as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. Firsthand and Non-firsthand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. Non-firsthand versus 'everything else'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. Reported (or 'hearsay') versus 'everything else'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. Non-Visual sensory evidence and Reported (or hearsay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Auditory (acquired through hearing) versus 'everything else'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems with three choices are referred to with the letter B and a number, as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Direct (or visual), Inferred, Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Visual, Non-visual sensory, Inferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Visual, Non-visual sensory, Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Non-visual sensory, Inferred, Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Reported, Quotative and everything else</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems with four choices are referred to with the letter C and a number, as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Visual, Non-visual sensory, Inferred, Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Direct (or visual), Inferred, Assumed, Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Direct, Inferred, Reported, Quotative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only kind of system with five choices in more than one language is referred to as D1: 

| D1. Visual, Non-visual sensory, Inferred, Assumed and Reported |

Naturally, evidentiality interrelates with other categories, both verbal and nominal. A language may have fewer evidentials in commands than in statements: that is, evidentiality may correlate with mood, or sentence type. Evidentiality may be expressed in the past tense and in the present tense, but not in the future. Evidentials may occur together with just a
selection of modalities. The meaning of a non-visual or reported evidential may acquire overtones of surprise — known as 'mirative' meanings — if used with first person speaker.\(^2\)

Links between evidentiality and other categories can be of \textit{Synchronic} and of \textit{Diachronic} nature. Synchronic links can be classified along the following lines.

\textbf{Firstly}, the expression of evidentiality can be fused with another category — see §2.

\textbf{Secondly}, the choice of evidentiality values may depend on choices made within another category. For instance, fewer evidentiality values are usually expressed in non-declarative sentences — see §3.

\textbf{Thirdly}, exponents of evidentiality may have special meanings in the context of other categories. So, a reported evidential may acquire an overtone of politeness in a command. Evidentials may have additional, non-evidential meanings shared with other categories — see §4.

A further, more formal, kind of interaction between evidentials and other clausal (or verbal) categories can be reflected in the slot which evidentials occupy in the verbal word, and their paradigmatic relations with other categories. In many languages (e.g. Yukaghir, Archi, Samoyedic, and Wakashan) evidentials occupy the same slot in the verbal word as do exponents of mood and are mutually exclusive with this (more examples and references are in Aikhenvald 2004: 241-2). There are thus no evidentiality distinctions in non-declarative moods. In Yanam, a Yanomami language (Gomez 1990: 96-8) evidentials appear to occupy the same slot as do aspect markers; this is the reason why they appear to be mutually exclusive.

Non-evidential categories may develop meanings related to information source. A conditional form may be used for non-firsthand information, and a nominalization can acquire overtones of something one has not witnessed. Such uses of categories other than evidentials

\(^2\) See Aikhenvald (2014; 2011b) for further references on evidentials and related issues.
with evidential overtones are called 'evidentiality strategies'. These may historically give rise to evidentials, creating diachronic links with evidentiality — see §5.

2 The expression of evidentiality: autonomous versus fused

Evidentiality — that is, the grammatical marking of information source — can be expressed by its own marker, that is AUTONOMOUSLY. Or it can be FUSED with another category. We start with clausal evidentiality in §2.1. Then, in §2.2, we look at non-propositional evidentiality.

2.1 Clausal evidentiality

Nhèengatú or Língua Geral, a Tupí-Guaraní lingua franca of north-west Amazonia, is a straightforward example of autonomous evidentiality (Floyd 2005). The language has an A3 system, that is, just one reported evidential. Suppose you saw Aldevan go fishing. After that, Aldevan's aunt Marcilha arrives at the house and asks where he has gone. You then reply, *u-sú u-piniatika* (3sg-go 3sg-fish) 'He went fishing'. Then a friend comes to visit and asks Marcilha where Aldevan has gone. She replies, using a reported evidential *paá* — she did not see the man go (evidential markers are in bold throughout this section).

(1) u-sú u-piniatika paá

3sg-go 3sg-fish REPORTED

'He went fishing (they say/I was told)'

Jarawara, an Arawá language from Brazil, has a firsthand and a non-firsthand information source whose expression is fused with the past tense (system A1). A typical conversation in Jarawara is as follows. One speaker asks the other:
(2) jomee tiwa na-tafi-no awa?
dog(masc) 2sgO CAUS-wake-IMM.PAST.noneyewitness.masc seem.masc
'Did the dog wake you up?'

He uses the non-firsthand evidential in his question: he didn't himself see or hear the dog; perhaps he was just told about this. The other speaker — who had indeed been woken by the dog and thus saw it or heard it or both — answers using the firsthand evidential fused with immediate past:

(3) owa na-tafi-are-ka
1sgO CAUS-wake-IMM.PAST.eyewitness.masc-DECL.masc
'It did waken me' (I saw it or heard it)

A similar example comes from Hinuq, a North-East Caucasian language from Daghestan. Here, the firsthand evidential covers any personally acquired information (I-II), and the non-firsthand one ranges from III to V (Forker 2014):

(4) diizo obu-y yi-ya-i6
1sg.GENITIVE father-ERGATIVE IV.class:MASC-spend-PAST:WITNESSED
uq’ino qu tebu
4 20 years
'My father got to be 80 years old'

The speaker knew his father personally.

(5) hailo rek'u-y yi-ya-no
that.OBLIQUE man.OBLIQUE-ERGATIVE IV.class:MASC-spend-PAST:WITNESSED
bison=no qu tebu
100=and 20 years
'That man got to be 120 years old'
The speaker did not know the man personally — the information could have come from inference, assumption or verbal report (hearsay).

Evidentials in Jarawara and in Hinuq are distinguished in the past tense only, and the expression of evidentiality is fused with tense. This is the case in many languages with evidentials: source of information is easier to gather for what has already occurred.

Evidentials can acquire autonomous realization in a system of any size. Ersu, a Tibeto-Burman language, marks three information sources (Zhang 2014), in a B1 system. If information is acquired directly, that is, through seeing, hearing, feeling, or smelling, the verb is formally unmarked. There is a special marker (=pà: see (36)) for inferred and assumed information, and a reported evidential form used if the speaker's statement is based on something someone else had told them.

In contrast, in Shilluk, a Nilotic language with a semantically similar system, the markers of directly acquired information is fused with past tense, and inferred information is fused with perfect aspect; only the reported is expressed autonomously.

We expect an autonomous expression of evidentiality in languages with analytic profile, and agglutinative morphology, e.g. Nheêngatú, Baniwa, Kamaiurá. Fused expression of evidentiality is a feature of more synthetic languages with fusional tendencies, including Caucasian, Arawá, and some Arawak languages. Which of the evidential specifications is more likely to acquire an autonomous, and which one a fused expression, is a matter for further study. The existing correlations can be in part accounted for by the tendencies in grammaticalization and historical development of evidentials. Fused evidentiality tends to arise if the evidential develops out of an evidential strategy. If evidential arises out of an independent lexeme via grammaticalization, the marking is likely to be autonomous. If evidential arises out of an independent lexeme via grammaticalization, the marking is likely to be autonomous. The reportative in Hinuq = (e)ƛ̃ may have originated from the verb eƛ̃i- ‘say’.
The reported evidential *dzē* in Ersu grammaticalized from *dzi* 'speak,say'; Ayoreo

(Zamucoan: Bertinetto 2009) -*chi* 'reported evidential' may have come from a verb of speech.

Fused expression of evidentiality creates the basis for dependencies between the grammatical systems of tense, aspect, mood (or sentence type) with evidentials — see §3.

### 2.2 Non-propositional evidentiality

Evidentiality can be expressed non-propositionally — that is, with a noun phrase as its scope. Cross-linguistically, this appears to be a rarity. In Jarawara (Dixon 2004, and p.c.) different information sources can be marked in one sentence, one on the verb and one on a noun phrase. They are expressed using the same system of evidentiality markers fused with tense (as shown in (2)-(3) above). A speaker was talking about what had happened to him and his companions, using far past tense (referring to what had happened more than two years ago): they had seen a place which had been reported to be another group's old village:

(6) [[mee tabori botee]-**mete-moneha**]<sub>NP,O</sub> otaa<sub>A</sub> awa-hamaro ama-ke

3nsg home:f old -FPnf-REPf nsg.exc see-FPeF EXTENT-DECLf

'We were seeing in the far past what was reported to be their old camp from far past'

The speaker used the far past (to reflect that it was some time ago) and a firsthand (or 'eyewitness') evidential (to reflect that he had been there and had seen everything himself). And he used the non-firsthand version of far past tense plus the reported evidential suffix with the name of the location — 'reportedly' known to have been another group's old village. This is why the 'old village' is marked with reported evidential.

If I were to attempt translating this word for word, I would come up with a tortured and clumsy sentence, like what one reads in English newspapers now and again — *The*
reported killer was allegedly seen to be captured by the police. But unlike English, the Jarawara sentence is natural and compact. The same set of tense-cum-evidentiality markers is used to express information source at a clause, and at a noun phrase level.

In a few languages, information source is marked only at the NP level. These appear to always include a term with visual, or firsthand reference. The expression tends to be fused with another category.

Dyirbal, an Australian language (Dixon 2014), has a three-term system of noun markers which combine reference to visibility and spatial distance of the noun:

- *bala*- 'referent is visible and THERE (that is, not near speaker)';
- *yala*- 'referent is visible and HERE (near speaker)'; and
- *gala*- 'referent is not visible'.

These distinctions are reminiscent of a cross-linguistically rather common evidential system, with a basic opposition between 'firsthand' and 'non-firsthand' information source (A1). The 'non-visible' marker covers something that is not seen but heard, or only known from its noise; something previously visible but now just audible; something neither visible nor audible; or something remembered from the past and not currently visible.

Somewhat more complex systems of non-propositional evidentiality whose scope is just the noun phrase have been described for Mataco-Mataguayan languages of Argentina and Paraguay. The markers combine reference to information source and to distance. Chorote distinguishes the following markers: visually perceived; distant (or dead/consumed); not visible now but visible before; invisible or unknown (used in myth) (Carol 2011). The information-source markers in Maká, from the same family, cover the following meanings: close (can be reached by hand); close (cannot be reached by hand); far and visible; far and non-visible; absent, seen before; absent, never seen before (Gerzenstein 1994: 166).
Santali (Munda: Neukom 2001: 42-4) has a special series of demonstrative pronouns referring to what is seen, or to what is heard. Both distinguish six degrees of distance combined with emphasis. The semantic extensions of these demonstratives are parallel to those in evidentiality systems: the visual demonstrative can refer to what is visible, while the auditive one may also refer to smell, taste and feeling (Neukom 2001: 42). (Note that a two-term audible versus inaudible demonstrative system has not been found in any language.)

Perceptual meanings are encoded within the case system in Tsou, a Formosan language (Pan 2010, based on Tung 1964). Once again, the expression is fused with distance. The 'nominative' and the 'oblique' case markers combine information on how distant the object is from the speaker and the addressee, and whether the object was seen by both speaker and hearer, or just by the speaker, or not seen at all (but is nearby and can be heard, or is known to both). In (7), the speaker cannot see the child, but its cries can be heard:

(7) m-o mongsi co oko
   AFFIX-REALIS cry(ACTOR.VOICE) NOMINATIVE:NOT.SEEN.HEARD child
   'The child is crying'

None of these languages have any grammatical marking of information source of a clause.

Nominal evidential markers in Maaka, a Chadic language, indicate information source of a topicalised noun phrase (Storch and Coly 2014). Here the expression of information source is fused with that of the discourse-pragmatic status of a noun. They encode visually acquired information, assumed information and information acquired through 'joint perception' by the speaker and the addressee. In (8), the speaker has already seen the butterfly, to which the addressee's attention is directed. The 'butterfly from Mecca' is marked with the visual evidential:
(8) món [pòrpèr níém mákkà] ≠mù
          see.IMPV butterfly RELATIVISER Mecca-VISUAL
          'See the butterfly from Mecca!' 

In (9), the child was seen by both the speaker and the addressee; the suffix -diyà marks this 'joint perception':

(9) [làa nàmáa] ≠diyà sày minè-póðí-ní
      child this-JOINT:VISUAL must 1pl-remove:TELIC-OBJECT:3sg:MASC
gè-gòrkù-wà
      LOCATIVE-village-DEFINITE
      'This child [whom we can both see], we must chase him from the village'

The nominal evidential -kà refers to speaker's assumption and intuition about an object (on which they have no firsthand information). In (10), the speaker assumes that the addressee will go to that very market:

(10) ?àa-kè-góm  gè-gòmà-à-kà (...) 
        CONDITIONAL-2sg:MASC-go LOCATIVE-market-DEFINITE-ASSUMPTION
        If you go to that very market....

The two clausal evidentials in Maaka are the quotative nà and the reported kònò. An NP can be within the scope of the reported evidential, while the quotative cannot. If the whole clause is within the scope of the reported evidential, it appears at the beginning of the clause:

(11) kònò dòoshé minéè-góm ?àshàakà
          REP tomorrow 1pl:FUT-go <NAME>
          'Rumour has it that tomorrow we will go to the Ashaka cement factory'
If the evidential has an NP as its scope, it follows that NP, as in (12):

(12) sò-ndée bà [liímó-wà]NP kònò bà láà-n-tò
    3sg:MASC-come:NARR WITH camel-DEF REP WITH child-LINK-POSS:3sg:FEM

'He came with the reported camel and with its calf'

In (12), the information about the camel comes from speech report, or 'hearsay'. In each case, the noun phrase marked with an evidential has to be definite and also the topic.

The Southern Nambiquara dialect complex has a remarkably complex set of nominal tense markers fused with information source; nouns are also specified for whether they are definite, or not, and represent given or new information (raised numbers stand for tones). Here are some examples, for wa³lin³-su³-a² (manioc-CL:BONE.LIKE-DEF) 'the manioc root':

(13) wa³lin³-su³-a³-na²
    manioc-CLASSIFIER:BONE.LIKE-DEFINITE,CURRENT

'This manioc root which we both see before us now'

(14) wa³lin³-su³-nu¹-ta²
    manioc-CLASSIFIER:BONE.LIKE-INFERENTIAL,DEFINITE,UNMARKED

'The manioc root that must have been at some time past, as inferred by me (but not by you)'

The verbal categories of tense, aspect, evidentiality and given information are different, in form and in meanings (Lowe 1999: 275). Each is expressed autonomously.

Southern Nambiquara and Maaka are the only languages we know of with different systems of evidentiality expressed on a clausal, and on an NP level. This is reminiscent of how tense can be expressed independently within an NP, and within a clause (see Nordlinger and Sadler 2004). In most cases discussed here, NP-level realization of evidentiality is
3 Dependencies between evidentiality and other grammatical categories

The choices available in the evidentiality system may correlate with choices made in (a) the tense system, (b) the aspect system, (c) sentence types, (d) polarity, (e) types of clauses, (f) modality and (g) person and number. These correlations create dependencies between grammatical systems.

A. EVIDENTIALITY DEPENDS ON TENSE: TENSE > EVIDENTIALITY

The maximum number of evidential specifications is found in past tenses. In Hiniuq, Tatar, Jarawara and Matses evidentiality is only distinguished in past tenses. The choices made in the tense system thus determine the choices made in the system of evidentials.

There may be fewer evidential distinctions in non-past tenses than in past tenses. Tuyuca, an East Tucanoan (Barnes 1984) has five evidentiality choices — visual; non-visual; apparent; second-hand or reported; and assumed — in the past tense. In present tense there are just four choices (no 'second-hand evidential') while no evidentiality specification can be made in future tense. Tucano (Ramirez 1997: 120) distinguishes four evidentials — visual, non-visual, inferred and reported — in the recent past and in the remote past tenses. Only visual and non-visual distinctions are made in the present tense, and none in the future. In Tariana (see (15) - (19)) five evidentiality distinctions (visual, non-visual, inferred, assumed...
and reported) are made in the past tenses, and only three (visual, non-visual and reported) in
the present tense.

This is intuitively plausible: an information source refers to something already
preceived and interpreted. This is especially so if we have to deal with inference, and
nonfirsthand information, and perhaps also verbal report.

B1. EVIDENTIALITY DEPENDS ON ASPECT: ASPECT > EVIDENTIALITY

The choice of evidentials may depend on the choice made in the aspect system. Evidential
distinctions made in perfective aspect in Kurtöp, a Tibeto-Burman language from Bhutan,
cover personal knowledge versus lack thereof, and shared versus non-shared knowledge
(Hyslop 2014). Only 'expectation of knowledge' is distinguished within the imperfective
aspect. Evidentiality is expressed only within perfective aspect in Tibetan (DeLancey 1986:
210-11), and Georgian (Comrie 1976: 110). In many cases, analysts vary as to whether to
interpret an evidentially marked form as that of tense, or that of aspect (see, for instance,
Molochieva 2010: 88-90, on Chechen).

B2. ASPECT DEPENDS ON EVIDENTIALITY: EVIDENTIALITY > ASPECT

In the opposite direction, a choice made in another system may depend on the choice made in
the evidentiality system. The choices available in a combined Tense/Aspect system may
depend on the choice that is made in the Evidentiality system. In Kashaya (Oswalt 1986: 37),
aspectual distinctions (perfective versus imperfective) are not expressed in auditory and
inferential evidentials. Other evidentials (visual, quotative and 'performative') have these
distinctions. Bulgarian has a grammatical system combining Tense, Aspect and Evidentiality;
this has nine choices available in non-reported but just five in reported evidentiality; so, for
instance, present and imperfect fall together, as do perfect and past perfect, and future perfect
and past future perfect (Scatton 1984: 319, 330-1; see also Jakobson 1971 and Friedman 1986).

C. EVIDENTIALITY AND MODALITY: MODALITY > EVIDENTIALITY

Various modalities — conditional, dubitative and so on — may allow fewer evidential specifications than the indicative. In many languages — including Matses (Fleck (2007) — information source is 'irrelevant' for statements about the future which may be considered on a par with modality. In some languages, as in Quechua (Adelaar 1977: 98-9) all evidentials can occur together with modality markers. In Estonian reported evidential does not occur with the conditional modality. The non-firsthand evidential in Abkhaz does not occur with potential and debitive, nor with the conditional, optative and intentional (Chirikba 2003: 252-4). In Tariana and !Xun (König 2013) evidentials do not occur with any modality.

D. EVIDENTIALITY AND CLAUSE TYPES: CLAUSE TYPE > EVIDENTIALITY

Evidentials are typically not expressed in non-main clauses (including complement clauses, relative clauses, and temporal subordinate clauses). This is the case in Matses, Tariana, Tucano, Cavineña and HINUQ.

E. EVIDENTIALITY DEPENDS ON SENTENCE TYPE: SENTENCE TYPE > EVIDENTIALITY

Just like most other grammatical categories, evidentials interrelate with mood, or sentence type (that is, declarative, interrogative, imperative, and also exclamative). The maximum number of evidential specifications tends to be distinguished in declarative main clauses. Exclamative clauses in Tariana and Tucano have no evidentials. In Shilluk, the choice is restricted to only firsthand evidential (Miller and Gilley 2007: 197).
Tariana, an Arawak language from north-west Amazonia, has a large evidentiality system where evidentiality is partly fused with tense:

(15) Nu-nami  karaka  di-merita-\textcolor{red}{naka}
     1sg-father's.younger.brother  chicken    3sgnf-fry-PRESENT.VISUAL
'\textcolor{red}{My younger uncle is frying chicken}' (I see him)

(16) Nu-nami  karaka  di-merita-\textcolor{red}{mha}
     1sg-father's.younger.brother  chicken    3sgnf-fry-PRESENT.NONVISUAL
'\textcolor{red}{My younger uncle is frying chicken}' (I smell the fried chicken, but cannot see this)

(17) Nu-nami  karaka  di-merita-\textcolor{red}{nhi-ka}
     1sg-father's.younger.brother  chicken    3sgnf-fry-INFERRERED-RECENT.PAST
'\textcolor{red}{My younger uncle has fried chicken}' (I see bits of grease stuck on his hands and he smells of fried chicken)

(18) Nu-nami  karaka  di-merita-\textcolor{red}{si-ka}
     1sg-father's.younger.brother  chicken    3sgnf-fry-ASSUMED-RECENT.PAST
'\textcolor{red}{My younger uncle has fried chicken}' (I assume so: he gets so much money he can afford it, and he looks like he has had a nice meal)

(19) Nu-nami  karaka  di-merita-\textcolor{red}{pida-ka}
     1sg-father's.younger.brother  chicken    3sgnf-fry-REPORTED-RECENT.PAST.
'\textcolor{red}{My younger uncle has fried chicken}' (I was told recently)

The most frequent evidential in commands is reported (meaning 'do what someone else told you to!': see Aikhenvald 2010). Tariana and many neighbouring Tucanoan languages are no exception (see Aikhenvald 2008 on the expression of commands in these languages). An example of such a 'secondhand' command, from Tariana, is at (20):
In a few languages, fewer evidential choices are available in interrogative clauses than in statements. In Mamaindê evidentials are restricted to declaratives only (Eberhard 2009: 471-6). Shipibo-Konibo has four evidentials (visual, non-visual, assumed and reported). Only the assumed evidential -mein is used in questions (Valenzuela 2003: 47-9). In Bora (Weber and Thiesen 2012) only the reported evidential occurs in questions, while visual and non-visual do not. In contrast, in Eastern Pomo and in Tariana all evidentials, except the reported, occur in questions. (The meanings of evidentials in questions may differ from those in statements: see Aikhenvald 2014, for details).

F. EVIDENTIALITY DEPENDS ON POLARITY (NEGATION): POLARITY > EVIDENTIALITY

In some languages there are fewer evidentiality choices in negative clauses than in positive ones; that is, certain Evidentiality contrasts may be neutralised in the negative, just as certain Tense and Aspect choices are, in some languages. In Mýky, an isolate from Brazilian Amazonia (Monserrat and Dixon 2003), no evidentials at all can be distinguished if the clause is negative. Fewer evidentiality distinctions are available in negative than in positive clauses in Kalmyk (Skribnik and Seesing 2014: §8). In the Luchuan dialect of Ryukyan (Arakaki 2013: 159), the direct evidential is not used in nonpast tense in negative clauses. This is an instance of a more complex dependency POLARITY/TENSE > EVIDENTIALITY.

G. EVIDENTIALITY AND PERSON/NUMBER: EVIDENTIALITY > PERSON/NUMBER

The choice available for person and number of the participant may depend on the choices made in the evidentiality system. In Estonian, three persons and two numbers are expressed in non-reported evidentials, e.g.
These are not expressed in reported evidentiality, e.g.

(22) mina/sina/tema tule-vat
    I/you/he/she/etc. come-REPORTED PRESENT
    'I/you/he/she etc. are reportedly coming'

Along similar lines, in Trio, a Carib language, the non-witnessed past marked with a confix ti-...-se and does not express person, number or grammatical function of the subject (Carlin 2004: 340-7). This dependency, EVIDENTIALITY > PERSON/NUMBER, has to do with evidential forms arising out of essentially nominalized ('non-finite') forms (see §5).

In Kashaya, the 'performative' evidential is used only with first person. Its meaning is described as follows: 'speaker knows of what he speaks because he is performing the act himself or has just performed it' (Oswalt 1986: 34-42). Other evidentials (visual, auditory, inferential and quotative) are used with all persons. This is an example of a dependency in the opposite direction, PERSON > EVIDENTIALITY.

The dependencies established here can be summarised as follows (the direction of the arrow reflects direction of a dependency):
That evidentiality should depend on polarity, or the contrast between positive and negative, goes together with the general principle — that polarity, as a clausal category, is at the top of the hierarchy of grammatical categories (Aikhenvald and Dixon 2011: 197). The dependencies between evidentiality and clause type, and evidentiality and sentence type, can be accounted for by the fact that evidentiality which shows such correlations is a clause-based (or even a sentence-based) category. A number of further dependencies stem from a diachronic development of evidentials — see §5 (where we will explain the bold face in Scheme 2). In §4.2, we turn to non-evidential meanings expressed through evidentials.

4 Meanings of evidentials, and other grammatical categories

Exponents of evidentiality may have special meanings in the context of other categories. In §4.1, we focus on evidentiality and person, evidentiality and expectation of knowledge (or 'mirativity'), and evidentiality and politeness.

4.1 Special meanings of evidentials in the context of other grammatical categories

4.1.1 Evidentiality and person

Using a non-visual, a nonfirsthand, or a reported evidential to talk about oneself may seem counter-intuitive. This is where we encounter special meanings of these evidentials. A non-
visual evidential may refer to something I cannot quite see, and am not quite sure about. A Mamaindê man had just taken a second wife, but is not quite certain if he had done the right thing, and so uses the non-visual evidential in talking about this (Eberhard 2009: 466). When used with a first person subject, the non-visual, non-firsthand evidentials and reported evidentials in systems of various types may acquire additional meanings to do with lack of intention, control, awareness and volition on the part of the speaker.

In Cavineña, the reported evidential with first person subject implies that 'I' was not consciously aware of what happened to me. In (23), the speaker relates how, as a young boy, he fell from a mango tree. After the fall, he was lying unconscious on the ground, still holding a mango in his hand. What he says about himself is based on what he was told later (Guillaume 2008: 646-7):

(23) Ina-jaka-ya=ama=pa e-ra manga
    grab-stop-IMPERFECTIVE=NEG=REPORTED 1sg-ERGATIVE mango
    'I didn't want to let go of the mango, they said'

If I am talking about myself, I can use non-visual evidential if whatever happened was out of my control. Suppose I broke a plate by accident — it slipped out of my hands. I will then say, in Tariana (a similar example in Tucano is in Ramirez (1997, Vol. 1: 133):

(24) karapi nu-thuka-mahka
    plate 1sg-break-RECENT.PAST.NONVISUAL
    'I broke a plate by accident' (lit. I non-visual broke the plate)
This is referred to — in the literature on evidentials — as 'first person effect': when I talk about myself, evidentials have somewhat different overtones from those in other persons' contexts. If I was drunk or unconscious, and do not really remember what I did, I can even use a reported evidential to talk about myself: 'I spent the night drinking-reported' takes away all the responsibility from my being drunk all night. In Hiuq (Forke 2014), the unwitnessed evidential used with the first person subject implies speaker's lack of control over what happened to them, or simply lack of memory. The reported evidential may occur with first person subject, with similar meanings — of 'lack of control or an unintended, unconscious participation'. In Saara, a Formosan language, the reported evidential with first person has a similar semantic effect (Pan 2014). The 'first person effect' is directly linked to the category of 'expectation of knowledge', or mirativity.

Furthermore, a visual, firsthand, or direct evidential with first-person speaker may be used in a somewhat different way from that with other persons. In a few Tibeto-Burman languages, including Denjongke (Yliniemi forthcoming), it can be omitted, while other evidentials will be obligatory.

4.1.2 Evidentials and the 'expectation of knowledge'

The complex category of mirativity refers to 'sudden discovery, unprepared mind, surprise (by the speaker, the addressee, or a third person' (see Aikhenvald 2012b, DeLancey 2012). Numerous languages have a special mirative marker (these include Lisu, YongNing Na, Galo, Kham, Denjongke, and many other Tibeto-Burman languages, and also Tariana and Kalmyk). A non-firsthand or a non-visual evidential may have mirative overtones.

The Jarawara story from which (25) is taken is told in far past firsthand. It is a personal reminiscence by the narrator about how he and his companions had gone up a
strange river and come across a patch of forest full of game animals. Their surprise is expressed through using the immediate past non-firsthand marking (Dixon 2003: 172):

(25) \( \text{bani}_S \text{ mee wina-tee-hani} \)

animal(m) 3non.sg live-HABITUAL-IMM.P.NONEYEWITNESS.f

'There were surprisingly many animals'

(26) describes the surprise experienced by Okomobi, the village chief — who thought he was being given a cup of cane whisky but it turned out to be water:

(26) Okomobi faha hi-fa-hani ama-ke

Okomobi water O-drink-IMM.PAST.NONEYEWITNESS extent-DECL.FEMININE

'Okomobi (to his surprise) drank water'

The surprise Okomobi experienced is coded through non-firsthand evidential.

In Khwarshi, a north-east Caucasian language, the past unwitnessed form can be used with first person subject. This refers 'to a situation where the speaker is not conscious or the speaker suddenly realizes something as a surprise' (Khalilova 2009: 229), as in (27):

(27) \( \text{do o-uh-un o-eē-un-ay-ko} \)

1sg.ABS I-die-PFV.CVB I-be-PAST.UNWITNESSED-NEG-INTENSIFIER

(Malla-rasan got up from the place where he was, thinking that he had died and then said) 'Apparently I had not died!'

A combination of first person and non-firsthand evidential, or first person and narrative enclitic (reported evidential) produces overtones of surprise to the speaker in Hinuq (Forker 2014, example 5).
A term in a larger evidential system can have a mirative extension. The Northern Nambiquara language Mamaindê (spoken in Brazil) has six evidentials: marking what one saw (visual); what one did not see but heard or smelt or tasted (non-visual); what one inferred based on visual traces or assumption; what belongs to 'general knowledge'; what one knows as secondhand report and what one knows as thirdhand report. The inferred evidential has mirative extensions, or 'the additional function of expressing surprise' (Eberhard 2009: 466-7). An outsider returned to the village after many years of absence and has not forgotten the language. The inferred evidential is used in its 'mirative' function:

(28) wa-sen-na-sa-le?i-tu
2sg-speak-1pl-NOUN.CLASS:SOUND-PAST-FINAL.NOMINAL.SUFFIX
mamâinsa-a-haï?ki
Mamaindê-GENITIVE-language
set-thahta-nu-sa-le?i-tu
speak-O1p.PL-2nd.subject-NOUN.CLASS:SOUND-PAST.FINAL.NOMINAL.SUFFIX
nakajuannûn-?na-je?-le-Ø-n?-sihîn-wa
forget-2nd.object-EMPHATIC-1PAST-3rd.subject-NEG-PAST/INFERRED-DECL
'Your old speech, the Mamaindê language with which you used to speak to us, you clearly have not forgotten it'

Here, the speaker's surprise comes as a result of 'deferred realization'. This is a post-factum inference made on the basis of something that the speaker had previously witnessed but only later could interpret, and realise what it had meant. 'Surprise' and deferred realization are independent from the way in which the information was acquired.

Several interconnected semantic paths may give rise to a mirative reading of evidentials. The first path is shown under Scheme 3.
Scheme 3 Mirative extension of an evidential (Path I)

(1) lack of firsthand information → speaker's non-participation and lack of control
→ unprepared mind and new knowledge → mirative reading

This path explains a frequent link between non-firsthand specification, on the one hand, and new information and 'unprepared mind' on the other. We have seen in the examples above that mirative overtones are often interconnected with the speaker's lack of control and lack of awareness of what's going on. The 'lack of control' and lack of awareness is a characteristic effect of the use of first person with non-firsthand evidentials in small systems. This is why mirative extensions occur in first person contexts.

Another, related path, involves 'deferred' realization — whereby the speaker gives a post-factum interpretation to what they may have observed in some way.

Scheme 4 Mirative extension of an evidential: deferred realization (Path II)

(II) deferred realization: speaker sees or learns the result but interprets it post factum
→ the newly understood result is unexpected and thus surprising

Deferred realization is an integral part of mirative meanings in all systems where mirativity is associated with inference. It involves distancing oneself from the actual event — which takes us to the next point.

4.1.3 Evidentials and politeness

Evidentials in commands develop correlations with imperative-specific meanings of 'degree' of command. A reported evidential (which is the only one that typically appears in commands) may be used to express a 'softer', or a 'politer' command. In Cavineña, a Tacana
language from Bolivia, the second position reportative clitic =pa can be used to 'soften' a command (it can also be used just to report someone else's order: Guillaume 2008: 185, 646):

\[(29) \quad \text{Jeti}=\text{kwe}=\text{pa}! \quad \text{Ba-diru-kwe}=\text{pa}!
\]
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{come-IMPV.SG=REPORTED} & \text{see-GO.PERF-IMPV.SG=REPORTED} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
'(Daddy) come over, he says! Go see him, he says!' \\
\end{tabular}

Similar overtones of the reported evidentials in commands were described for Warlpiri and Arrernte, Australian languages (Laughren 1982: 138; Wilkins 1989: 393). In (30), from Mparntwe Arrernte, the reported evidential kwele is used to 'soften' a command:

\[(30) \quad \text{Arrantherre} \quad \text{kwele} \quad \text{ntert-irr-Ø-aye}!
\]
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\text{2plS} & \text{REPORTED} \\
\text{quiet-INCH-IMPV-EMPHATIC} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
'You mob are supposed to be quiet' (lit. Someone else has said that you mob have to shut up!)
\end{tabular}

This overtone of evidentials has so far been reported only for small evidential systems. In larger systems (such as Shipibo-Konibo with four evidentials: Valenzuela 2003: 42, and East Tucanoan languages and Tariana: see (20)), where the reported evidentials are only used to express a command on behalf of someone else.

I hypothesize that the imperative-specific extension of evidentials to exponents of 'politeness' could be associated with an overtone of 'distancing'. A speaker chooses to avoid a direct command which would be face-threatening for them, and also for the addressee (in the sense of Brown and Levinson 1987). Other strategies of 'distancing' as a way of softening a command may involve using continuous aspect, irrealis, 'delayed' imperative, or second plural form (where a singular addressee is implied: see Aikhenvald 2010: 212-223).
4.2 Non-evidential meanings through evidentials

Evidentials can have meanings associated with non-evidential categories. A reported evidential in small systems (type A3) often has epistemic extensions, to do with something one does not really believe. (31), from Estonian, may mean 'he is reportedly coming', or 'he is said to come, but I don't really believe it and don't vouch for it':

(31) tema tule-vat
    he/she come-REPORTED
    'He is reportedly coming' (but I don't believe it, or don't vouch for it)

Whether or not a reported evidential implies doubt can depend on the position of the evidential within a clause. The reported evidential nana in Tsou (Tsouic, Formosan, Austronesian) indicates that information was acquired through hearsay or a speech report if the marker appears before the verb of speech (Yang 2000: 72-3), as in (32). The speech report is in square brackets.

(32) nehucma o-si nana [eainca to amo-su
    yesterday AUX-3sg REPORTED say OBLIQUE father-2sg
    maine'e hohucma]
    go.home tomorrow
    'I heard from other people yesterday that your father said (you) go home tomorrow'

If the marker nana occurs within the reported clause, the implication is that the speaker is not certain of the information in the speech report:

(33) o-si eUsvUta a'o [nehucma tena cu
    AUX-3sg tell AUX-3sg? yesterday FUT PERFECTIVE
    la nana bumemealU]
    HABITUAL REPORTED work.hard
Yesterday she told me that she would work hard from then on (but I am not sure about 'work hard')

Reported evidentials in larger systems (e.g. Mamaindê, Tariana, Shipibo-Konibo and others) do not have epistemic overtones.

The reported evidential in Maaka (see (11); Storch and Coly 2014: 198-9) has overtones of doubt if it is placed at the beginning of a clause. The quotative evidential nà has no such overtones.

A visual evidential may acquire a meaning to do with certainty, and 'general knowledge'. In Mamaindê, a visual evidential may be used if the speaker is certain of what they are talking about. (34) was produced after listening to someone's voice in a recording the previous day. In Eberhard's (2009: 465) words, "such a situation would typically call for a non-visual evidential", since the speaker was not there when the recorded story was told. The visual evidential emphasizes the speaker's certainty.

(34) wà-sen-na-sà nakàs-le-a-nàn-wa
2sg-speak-SUBJECT.2p-NCL:LIQUID listen-1PAST-SUBJECT.1p-PAST.VISIBLE-DECL
'I heard your speech (in intermediate past time)'

The 'joint perception' noun evidential marker in Maaka has epistemic overtones of veracity and 'truth' (see (9); Storch and Coly 2014: 196-7). The reported evidential kònò has epistemic overtones of uncertainty when it has an NP within its scope. This is the only example of an epistemic extension of a non-propositional evidential.

The reported evidential kwele in Mparntwe Arrernte is used to report what someone else has said. It can be used, by a speaker, to quote something said about themselves, indicating that the speaker has no experience of the stated fact. In (35), the addressee is 'supposed' to be my friend but is not behaving like one (Wilkins 1989: 393-4).
(35) tyewe ngkwinhe imerte kwele ayenge
friend 2sgPOSS then REPORTED 1sgS
'You are said to be my friend'

That is, an evidential can be manipulated to express criticism and untrue suppositions, going beyond information source proper.

There are hardly any examples of evidentials having epistemic extensions in languages with larger systems. These tend to have numerous other means of expressing modal epistemic meanings, as is the case in Tariana, Mamaindé, Shipibo-Konibo and many others.

In Ersu, with a B1 system, the inferential evidential has epistemic overtones in combination with future (but not otherwise). In (36), the speaker infers that the man has gone to search for their horse because he is not at home, and it is late in the afternoon when an Ersu is expected to go and look for their horses to bring them home for the night. This is the usual meaning of this evidential (Zhang 2014: 135-6):

(36) tʰə nbò tʂə duá=pà
3sg.PRESENTIAL horse search-go-INFERENCE

'He has gone to search for his horse' (inferred from his absence and the time of day)

If the inferred evidential =pá is accompanied by future marker =gə, there is an additional overtone of uncertainty, shown in (37). This overtone is not there in (36).

(37) metco su-ŋọ tʰə-pʰu=gə=pà
sky next-day:tomorrow PREFIX:AWAY-change-FUTURE-INFERENCE

'The weather is going to change tomorrow'
This can be interpreted as a special meaning of an evidential in the future context (similar to §4.1). (Similar meanings for the inferred evidential in future have been described for Shilluk: Miller and Gilley 2007: 194).

The choice of evidentials may depend on verb type. In East Tucanoan languages and in Tariana, the use of evidentials correlates with person for the verbs of feeling. You cannot 'see' how you feel — so it is appropriate to use non-visual evidential when talking about yourself this way. In (38), from Tariana, the non-visual evidential used with the verb kai 'be painful' is the only means of referring to the fact that 'I' am in pain:

(38) kai-mha
    hurt-PRESENT.NONVISUAL
    '(I, or a body part which can be pointed at) am hurting or am sick'

When you talk about how someone else feels, you judge by what you see yourself: you cannot get into their skin and feel what they feel. So, a visual evidential or an inferred is then appropriate. If I were talking about someone else, I would use a visual or an inferred evidential: kai-naka (hurt-PRES.VISUAL) can mean 'you are hurting or are sick', or 'she, he, they are hurting or are sick'. This is somewhat similar to how the non-visual evidential in Mamaindê is used to refer to internal states of the speaker (Eberhard 2009: 467). Evidentials with verbs of feeling can be considered as 'person-marking' strategies.

5 Diachronic links between evidentiality and other categories

Grammatical categories and grammatical forms may give rise to evidentials, as a consequence as their reanalysis and reinterpretation. The basis for this lies in the evidential extensions of non-evidential categories which may acquire meanings related to information source, and thus similar to evidentials; for instance, a conditional form may be used for non-firsthand information.
A. FROM AN EPISTEMIC MODALITY AND FUTURE TO AN EVIDENTIAL.

Epistemic modalities may develop overtones of uncertain and non-firsthand information, as does the conditional in French. They may then develop into non-firsthand evidentials. In Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi, an Algonquian language from Canada, conjunct dubitative forms have developed non-firsthand evidential meanings in contexts which prohibit the non-firsthand markers proper, for instance, under negation (see James, Clarke and MacKenzie 2001: 230; 254-7). Since the non-firsthand meaning 'has become conventionalised as a new meaning for dubitative suffixes in appropriate contexts', we hypothesise that an erstwhile evidential strategy is on its way towards becoming an evidential proper.

The development of a non-firsthand evidential may involve future, which — by its nature — is close to a non-indicative modality. A future clause typically includes an element of prediction concerning something unwitnessed and of subsequent lack of certainty. It can easily come to be associated with a description of events which the speaker has not witnessed personally, and which they can only talk about on the basis of an educated guess, an inference, an assumption, or hearsay. The non-firsthand evidential in Abkhaz and Circassian, two Northwest Caucasian languages, goes back to the future marker (Chirikba 2003: 262-4). The 'indirect' evidential in Hill Patwin, -boti/-beti (Whistler 1986: 69-71) comes from a combination of the auxiliary bo/be 'be (locational)' followed by the definite future suffix.

B. FROM A PERFECT, PERFECTIVE, RESULTATIVE, OR A PAST TENSE TO AN EVIDENTIAL.

A perfect, a resultative, a past tense and other forms with a completive meaning can acquire an additional overtone of inferred and generally of non-firsthand information. As Friedman (2003: 209) put it, 'both Balkan Slavic languages and Albanian developed evidential strategies using native past forms, and as the contextual variant meanings became invariant the strategies became grammaticalised'. The non-firsthand evidential in Turkic, Iranian languages, and in many Finno-Ugric languages originates in anterior and perfect forms (Johanson 2003: 287 and further references in Aikhenvald 2004: 279-80). The non-firsthand evidential marker -shapan in Cree/Montagnais/Naskapi, goes back to a Proto-Algonquian perfect (James, Clarke and MacKenzie 2001: 247). Complex resultative constructions (involving perfective converbs and a copula 'be') gave rise to non-firsthand evidentials in Dargwa and Archi (Tatevosov 2001: 460-1).

The connection between perfect (or anterior) in its resultative meaning and a non-firsthand evidential is a typologically widespread tendency. The result of an action or state, or of an action or state viewed as relevant for the moment of speech is reinterpreted as having the meaning of inference based on visible traces, and other non-firsthand sources, such as assumption and hearsay. Once this range of non-firsthand meanings becomes the main meaning of the form, it can be considered an evidential.

There is some evidence for perfectives or resultatives giving rise to evidentials in larger systems. The Tuyuca non-visual present marker may have evolved from an older perfect aspect construction (Malone 1988: 132). The emergence of the inferred evidential in Tariana involved the reanalysis of the anterior aspect marker - nhi accompanied by the visual evidential. Several past tenses may develop into different evidentials. In Kamaiurá, je 'reported' and rak 'attested' have clear cognates in past tense markers in other Tupí-Guaraní
languages: the 'attested' evidential goes back to a recent past marker and the 'reported' to a remote past marker (Seki 2000: 344).

C. FROM A NOMINALIZED VERB FORM TO AN EVIDENTIAL.

Participles and other deverbal nominalizations are often used as evidentiality strategies, with the meaning of non-firsthand or reported evidential. In Nenets (Perrot 1996) the non-firsthand ('auditive') forms come from nominalizations. The non-firsthand past in Komi is based on a past participle (Leinonen 2000: 421). In Lithuanian, the reported evidentials developed out of active participles (Gronemeyer 1997: 93). A similar path has been suggested by Overall (2014), for Aguaruna, a Jivaroan language (also see the meanings of participles in Panare discussed by Payne and Payne 2007: 349-50).

Nominalized speech complements are another frequent source for evidentials. The development of an evidentiality marker out of a complementation strategy involves 'de-subordination' of an erstwhile subordinate clause. That is, a complement clause of a verb of saying acquires the status of a main clause. Then, if the verb in such a dependent clause had a special form, this form takes on the status of a reported evidential. This scenario has been reconstructed for present reported evidentials in Standard Estonian (see Harris and Campbell 1995: 99; see Wälchli 2000: 194-6 for further developments in Latvian). The original construction consisted of the main verb of speech or perception and an active participle in partitive form. Once the main verb is systematically omitted, what was a non-finite verb form occurs in a main clause. The only indication that the information comes from someone else is the present participle in partitive case. This form is now the reported evidential (illustrated in (22) and (31)).

The nominalized forms (including participles) which gave rise to evidentials did not distinguish person or number of the participant in the first place. This historical path accounts
for the lack of person — and number — distinctions in evidentials (see Scheme 2 and discussion under G in §3), and the ensuing dependency.

Diachronic links account for the following interactions between evidentials and other grammatical categories, and also for the development of fused evidentiality:

1. The development path PAST TENSE/RESULTATIVE/PERFECT/PERFECTIVE > EVIDENTIAL accounts for the mutual dependency between evidentials, aspect and tense.
2. The development path NON-INDICATIVE MODALITY > EVIDENTIAL accounts for dependencies with modalities.

These dependencies whose explanation is diachronic are in bold face in Scheme 2.

6 Evidentials in grammar: a summary

Evidentials interact with polarity, tense, aspect, modality, clause and sentence type, and occasionally person. Dependencies between tense, aspect, modality, person-number (in bold in Scheme 2) and evidentiality can be explained by their historical pathways.

Evidentials may acquire epistemic meanings and additional values as 'tokens' of person. This may create a further basis for the dependencies between these categories.

Evidentials can acquire overtones of uncontrolled action, deferred realization and 'surprise', especially in the context of first person. When used in commands, a reported evidential may have overtones of politeness: it makes a command sound less direct, allowing a speaker to 'distance' themselves from a potentially threatening direct order. That is, clausal evidentials may have an effect of 'cognitive' distance.

Perceptual meanings and meanings of information source can be expressed just within a noun-phrase. They then interrelate with noun phrase categories — including physical distance in space, pragmatic status and grammatical function (shown by case).
The synchronic relationship between evidentiality — both clausal and NP-level — and the notion of distance in space may be explained diachronically. In a number of languages (including Wintu, Sissala and Lega) evidentials come from demonstratives (see Aikhenvald 2011a). This alerts us to further links evidentials may have, and a conceptual connection between clausal and non-propositional evidentiality.

Evidentials often correlate with discourse genres and can be considered 'tokens' of genres. In many languages — including Mparntwe Arrernte, Ersu, Tariana and many more — the reported evidential is used in traditional narratives. The actual use of an evidential may depend on speaker's intention, and information structure. In !Xun, firsthand and nonfirsthand evidentials are optional and are only used if the speaker wants to focus on the information source (König 2013). In Turkic languages, focus in discourse is associated with the use of the non-firsthand evidential (Johanson 2003). In Trio, the non-witnessed past is associated with the category of 'theticity' whereby an event is taken as a whole (Carlin 2004: 247; 2011). In Abkhaz, an 'aside' comment can be cast in the non-firsthand evidential (with the story told evidentially-neutral forms) (Chirikba 2003: 247-8; and further examples in Aikhenvald 2004: 317-18). This opens up further avenues of investigation of the pragmatic basis for evidentials on all levels.
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**Abbreviations:**

A - transitive subject; ABS - absolutive; AUX - auxiliary; CAUS - causative; DECL - declarative; DEF - definite; EMPH - emphatic; f - feminine; FPeF - far past eyewitness feminine; FPNF - far past non-eyewitness feminine; FUT - future; INCH - inchoative; IMM.PAST - immediate past; IMPV - imperative; masc - masculine; NARR - narrative; NCL - noun classifier; NEG - negative; nf - non-feminine; nsg - non-singular; O - object; PERM - permissive; PFV.CVB - perfective converb; pl, PL - plural; POSS - possessive; REP - reported; REPf - reported feminine; S - intransitive subject; sg, SG - singular.