

This is a checklist of points to address when working on evidentiality systems, from Aikhenvald 2004 *Evidentiality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press (pp. 385-390). Chapter numbers refer to the book itself (available upon request).

CHECKLIST OF POINTS: EVIDENTIALITY SYSTEMS

The aim of this guide is to provide field linguists working on a previously undescribed or insufficiently documented languages with orientation as to the questions which should be asked in order to establish a complete picture of how evidential systems and/or evidential strategies are organized in the language.¹ Ideally, a grammar ought to deal with as many as possible of the topics listed below. Questions relevant for establishing and analysing evidentials are divided into nine broad areas. After each question, a brief explanation is given; relevant chapters of this book are indicated in parentheses.

I. Organisation of evidential system (see Chapter 2)

1. Is evidentiality in the language an obligatory grammatical category? Or does the language have an evidentiality strategy? Or a combination of these?
2. If the language has obligatory evidentiality, how many terms are there in the system? What type of system (A, B, C, D or E) is there? Could you give as full a description as possible, providing good examples from texts or conversations (not just from elicitation)?

II. Expression of evidentials (see Chapter 3)

1. What are the grammatical means employed for expressing evidentiality?

¹ It is based on the author's own field experience in different parts of the world, student supervision in Brazil and Australia, reading of grammars and talking to other linguists about their field experiences.

2. Is there a functionally unmarked term in the system? Is one term formally unmarked, or less marked than others?
3. Can an evidential be omitted? Does the system have an evidentially neutral option?
4. Does the language have evidentials as one grammatical system? Or are evidentiality distinctions 'scattered' in various parts of the grammar? Is there more than one subsystem of evidentials?
5. Can an evidential occur more than once in a clause?
6. Can more than one information source be marked within a clause? If so, does it reflect different perception by multiple recipients, or do the two sources confirm and complement each other? (See the range of possibilities in Table 3.3.)
7. Can an evidential be within the scope of negation? Can an evidential be questioned? Can the time-reference of an evidential be distinct from that of the clause's predicate? That is, can the reference to the time of the utterance be different from the reference to the time when the information was acquired from a particular source? Comment on the truth value of an evidential as compared to that of the predicate.

III. Evidential extensions of non-evidential categories, or evidentiality strategies (Chapter 4)

1. Are there any non-evidential categories which acquire an additional meaning to refer to the source of information? Do any of the following acquire any evidential overtones: non-indicative moods and modalities; past tenses, resultatives and perfects; passives; nominalizations (including participles and infinitives) as heads of predicates and as part of complex predicates; complementation strategies and person marking? Are any perceptual meanings expressed in demonstratives, and if yes, how do they correlate with perceptual

meanings in evidentials? Does the language have any modal expressions (for instance, modal verbs) with evidential extensions?

2. Does the language have more than one evidential strategy? If so, what are the semantic differences between these?
3. How does the language mark reported speech? Is there a special indirect speech construction? If the language also has a reported evidential, how does this compare with reported speech strategies? Do direct quotations have any epistemic overtones?

IV. Semantics (Chapters 5 and 6)

1. What are the semantic parameters at work in the evidential system of the language? How do the parameters in §2.5 apply to the language (also see Tables 2.1, 5.2-4). If the language has an 'eyewitness' term, does this cover visual and non-visual sensory information? If there is a corresponding 'non-eyewitness' term, does this subsume reported and inferred information sources? What sorts of inference can be expressed (e.g. inference based on reasoning, inference based on observable results)? Is the 'reported' term used for secondhand and thirdhand? Is there a special quotative evidential?
2. Do any of the evidential terms have epistemic or hypothetical extensions? Does the 'reported' term have any connotation of 'unreliable' information?
3. Does any evidential term have a mirative extension? If so, is this extension independent of person and of verb class, or not? If the language has evidentiality strategies, do these also have any mirative overtones?

V. Evidentiality and person (Chapter 7)

1. Does using an evidential presuppose a first-person perceiver of information?

2. Do any of the evidential terms have a 'first person' effect (see Table 7.1)?
3. Are there any restrictions on using any evidential with first person?
4. Any comment on semantics of evidentials with non-first person?
5. If the language has a conjunct/disjunct distinction (see section 2.2.5 of the Position Paper), how does it correlate with evidentiality?
6. How are evidentials used with verbs of internal state (feelings, emotions, physical conditions) depending on the person? Are evidentials in the language used as implicit person markers?

VI. Evidentiality and other grammatical categories (Chapter 8)

1. How are evidentials used in questions? Does the use of an evidential in a question presuppose the questioner's assumption about the answerer's source of information? Or does it presuppose the questioner's information source? Is there any evidential that implies information source of a third party? Are fewer evidentials used in questions than in indicative clauses?
2. How are evidentials used in commands (if used at all)?
3. Are evidentials used in dependent clauses of any type? What other clause types are evidential used in, and how do these relate to the evidentials in statements?
4. How are evidentials used in negative clauses? Are there fewer evidential specifications in negative clauses than in positive clauses?
5. If there are nonindicative modalities (e.g. conditional, dubitative, frustrative), what evidentials are used there (if any at all)?
6. Are there any restrictions on the cooccurrence of evidentials with any tenses or aspects? Are there evidentiality distinctions in future tense?

7. Are there any dependencies between evidentials and other categories (such as politeness, grammatical relations, gender and others)?

VIII. Evidentiality in discourse and lexicon (Chapter 10)

1. Are there any preferences for the use of evidentials in particular discourse genres (e.g. historical narratives or folklore)?
2. Can evidentials be manipulated as a stylistic device (e.g. to make the narrative more vivid)?
3. If there are competing information sources, which one is preferably marked with an evidential?
4. Are evidentials employed in any lexicalised speech formulae?
5. Are there different rules for evidentials depending on the semantic type of the verb used (e.g. verbs of feeling or of internal state)?
6. Does the tentative hierarchy of evidential choices formulated in Diagram 10.3 apply to the language?

IX. Origin of evidentials (Chapter 9)

1. What can you say about the origin of evidentials in the language? Did they develop from grammaticalized verbs, or as the result of grammaticalization of an evidentiality strategy, or from some other source (e.g. copula construction, lexical verb or noun)?
2. Is evidentiality inherited from a proto-language, or is it diffused from neighboring languages?
Or a mixture of the two?
3. Is there any evidence of calquing evidentials into contact languages? Do you have any examples of miscommunication due to misuse of evidentials?

X. Evidentials, and cultural attitudes and conventions (Chapter 11)

1. Do you have any examples of metalinguistic appraisal of evidentials by native speakers of the language? Are speakers of the language aware of the array of evidentials and, if this is the case, the lack of it in contact language(s)? Do the speakers rephrase evidentials with corresponding lexical items for the purposes of clarification?
2. How do evidentials correlate with conventionalized attitudes to information? For instance, does one have to use 'visual' evidential to talk about shamanic revelations? Are dreams told using 'visual' or another evidential? How are European innovations treated – can the visual evidential be used to describe what one had seen on TV? How do speakers retell what they have read, or heard on the radio? Or over the telephone? And so on.
3. Can any speculations be made concerning the correlations between evidentials and cultural profiles?

I am aware that not all of the questions here are be applicable to every language. And there may be additional issues not included here. It is hoped, however, that this preliminary set of points to cover will provide a basis for in-depth empirical studies of evidentials worldwide.