

This paper is devoted to *evidential shifting*. In root declarative clauses, evidentials are always speaker-oriented. Under attitude predicates, evidentials may sometimes become oriented towards the attitude holder. Significantly expanding on ideas of [Sauerland and Schenner \(2007\)](#), I argue that this phenomenon is just a garden variety of indexical shift. I show that current theories of evidentiality fall short at explaining the cross-linguistic variation in the evidential shifting. I demonstrate robust, yet previously unnoticed parallels in the behaviour of (shifted) evidentials and (shifted) indexicals in declaratives. Then I briefly examine evidentials and other perspective-sensitive phenomena in questions, where indexicals and evidentials are known to behave differently with respect to shifting. My point is that this difference is due to some idiosyncrasy of indexicals in this particular environment, therefore it does not undermine my claim about evidentials and indexicals elsewhere.

1. The empirical landscape. Under attitude predicates, the interpretation of evidentials differs from language to language. In some languages, evidentials never change their perspective when embedded, e.g. Bulgarian ([Sauerland and Schenner 2007](#)) or Georgian. In other languages, the shift is obligatory, e.g. Korean ([Lee 2013](#)) or Tibetan ([Garrett 2001](#)). In yet other languages, the shift is optional, e.g. German *sollen* ([Schenner 2010](#)) or Turkish ([Şener 2011](#), 89-92) below:

- (1) Seda [Ayşe'nin saç-ı kızıl-mış] de-di.
 Seda Ayşe.GEN hair-POSS red-IND.EV.PST say-DIR.EV.PST
 'Seda said that Ayşe has red hair'; p = 'Ayşe has red hair'.
 (i), non-shifted: The speaker was told or infers p .
 (ii), shifted: Seda was told or infers p .

2. Evidential shift \neq scope. Current theories of evidentiality ([Faller 2006](#); [Matthewson 2008](#)) often reduce different shifting patterns to the relative scope of the evidential and the attitude predicate. This is not empirically adequate. As one example, lack of evidential shifting may be viewed as a result of scope freezing: evidential always takes the widest scope. Thus multi-dimensional theories ([Koev 2011](#); [Murray 2010](#)) analyse evidentials in parallel with Pottsian supplements as contributing not-at-issue content (in the sense of [Tonhauser 2013](#)). Wide scope is then attributed to the projection of the evidential contribution from under the attitude predicate. But wide scope of evidentials cannot be due only to their supplemental status since other supplements don't have to be exclusively wide-scope ([Schlenker 2013](#)).

3. Parallels between evidentials and indexicals. Evidence is always relative to someone, and evidentials are inherently context-dependent in the same way indexicals are: just like with *I*, the same sentence containing an evidential in the root declarative clause ultimately means different things uttered by different speakers (cf. similar observations in [Murray 2012](#)). There are multiple properties shared by evidentials and indexicals as opposed to other context-sensitive phenomena such as modals and predicates of personal taste (PPT) and altogether, these facts call for a unified analysis of indexicals and evidentials.

3.1. The typology of evidential shift looks very much like the typology of indexical shift. In some languages indexicals do not shift under attitude verbs, e.g. in French and English. In some languages the shift is obligatory, e.g. Tamil ([Sundaresan 2012](#)) and Uyghur ([Shklovsky and Sudo](#) forth.). In some other languages indexical shift is optional, e.g. in Amharic ([Schlenker 1999](#)), Nez Perce ([Deal 2013](#)) or Turkish ([Özyildiz 2013](#)) below:

- (2) Doktor [hasta-ıan-di-m] de-di (i), non-shifted: I = the speaker
 doctor sick-PASS-PST-1SG say-PST.3SG (ii), shifted: I = the doctor
 'The doctor said that I got sick.'

Modals and PPT, on the other hand, behave differently and, for what we know, obligatorily shift when embedded ([Hacquard 2010](#); [Stephenson 2007](#) on modals, [Pearson 2013](#) on PPT).

3.2. Shifty evidentials are often correlated with shifty evidentials within a language: Korean (ind.: [Park 2014](#), ev.: [Lee 2013](#)), Japanese (ind.: [Sudo 2012](#), ev.: Yasutada Sudo, p.c.), Turkish (ind.: [Özyildiz 2013](#), ev.: [Şener 2011](#)), Zazaki (ind.: [Anand 2006](#), ev.: [Gajewski 2005](#)).

3.3. Epistemics and PPT are sensitive to the centre of perspective and can shift in the presence of certain attitude constructions like *according to* as in *According to the Government, we might become independent of fossil fuels*, where the speaker is not endorsing the modal claim. On the other hand, evidentials and indexicals in declarative clauses only shift in the complements of attitude predicates. An attitude construction is not enough, exemplified by Turkish below (under attitude verbs both evidentials and indexicals can shift):

- (3) Arkadas-im-a gore, sinav-dan kal-miş-im
 friend-1SG.POSS-DAT according, exam-ABL stay-IND.EV.PST-1SG
 ‘According to my friend, I{ the speaker, *my friend} failed the exam’; p = ‘I failed the exam’.
 (i), non-shifted evidential: I was told or infer p .
 *(ii), shifted evidential: My friend was told or infers p .

3.4. Evidentials and shifted indexicals tend to have a highly restricted distribution in embedded contexts. In thirteen indexical-shifting languages (see [Sundaresan 2012](#) for an overview) shifted indexicals are almost exclusively licensed under speech verbs except for Turkic languages. A similar (though not identical) situation holds for evidentials. How unusual is such restrictedness in embedded contexts? Epistemics are not licensed under every attitude predicate either but never to the extent that they are confined to the complements of speech verbs ([Anand and Hacquard 2013](#)). PPT can appear everywhere.

4. Evidential shift in questions. Unlike indexical shift, evidential shift is not confined to the complements of attitude predicates. Questions is another environment where evidentials shift systematically across languages (e.g. Bulgarian, Cheyenne, Cuzco Quechua, German, Korean), being interpreted from the addressee’s perspective. Due to this apparent dissimilarity, evidentials have been thought to be special ([Murray 2010](#); [Lim 2010](#)). [Murray \(2012\)](#) argues that evidentials instantiate a new type of indexicals, anaphoric indexicals, that are able to pick up their referent from some other salient event as in questions. This approach wrongly predicts, however, that in a language with shifty indexicals—such that can pick up their referent from the reported context—e.g. Korean, indexicals can also shift in questions.

I argue that shifting in questions is actually natural, and is to be expected from shifty elements. Across languages many things that are speaker-oriented in declaratives may become addressee-oriented in questions: epistemics as in *What might be better than a bike ride?*, PPT as in *Is this beautiful?*, parentheticals, adverbials such as *honestly*, definite descriptions, implicit arguments, and certain logophors (e.g. Japanese *zibun*, [McCready 2007](#)). The default for context-sensitive elements is to shift. What needs to be explained is the curious inability on indexicals to shift in questions. An explanation lies beyond the scope of this paper and I leave it for future research.

5. Conclusions. First, I established that evidential shift cannot be derived from scoping alone. Second, I have argued that evidential and indexical shift share a number of non-trivial properties. Finally, I have shown that in case of their apparent dissimilarity regarding shifting in questions, the lack of shifting for indexicals is unusual and calls for some separate explanation. Summing up, I argue that evidential shift under attitude predicates should be analysed along the same lines as indexical shift. Unlike the other current views on evidentiality, my proposal helps to explain the distribution of evidentials in embedded contexts and reduces something we know little about to something we know more about.

References

- Anand, P. (2006). *De de se*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
 Anand, P. and V. Hacquard (2013). Epistemics and attitudes. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 6(8).
 Şener, N. (2011). *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Turkish*. Ph. D. thesis, UConn.
 Deal, A. R. (2013). Nez Perce embedded indexicals. In *Proceedings of SULA 7*.
 Fallner, M. (2006). Evidentiality above and below speech acts. In *Functions of Language*.
 Gajewski, J. (2005). Evidentiality in Zazaki. Ms.
 Garrett, E. J. (2001). *Evidentiality and Assertion in Tibetan*. Ph. D. thesis, UCLA.
 Hacquard, V. (2010). On the event relativity of modal auxiliaries. *NLS* 18(1).
 Koev, T. (2011). Evidentiality and temporal distance learning. In *Proceedings of SALT XXI*.
 Lee, J. (2013). Temporal constraints on the meaning of evidentiality. *NLS* 21.
 Lim, D. S. (2010). *Evidentials as interrogatives: a case study from Korean*. Ph. D. thesis, USC.
 Matthewson, L. e. a. (2008). Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St’át’imcets. In *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 7*.
 McCready, E. (2007). Context shifting in questions and elsewhere. In *Proceedings of SUB 11*.
 Murray, S. (2010). *Evidentiality and the Structure of Speech Acts*. Ph. D. thesis, Rutgers.
 Murray, S. (2012). The indexical component of evidentiality. At a workshop “Meaning as Use: Indexicality and Expressives” during NASSLLI 2012.
 Özyıldız, D. (2013). When I is not me: A preliminary case study of shifted indexicals in Turkish. Ms. ENS.
 Park, Y. (2014). Person and adverbial indexicals in Korean: A plea for two different monsters. Talk presented at WCCFL 32.
 Pearson, H. (2013). *The sense of self: topics in the semantics of textide se expressions*. Ph. D. thesis, Harvard.
 Sauerland, U. and M. Schenner (2007). Embedded evidentials in Bulgarian. In *Proceedings of SUB 11*.
 Schenner, M. (2010). Embedded evidentials in German. In *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*.
 Schlenker, P. (1999). *Propositional attitudes and indexicality: a cross-categorical approach*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
 Schlenker, P. (2013). Supplements without bidimensionality. Ms.
 Shklovsky, K. and Y. Sudo (2014). The syntax of monsters. *LI* 45(3).
 Stephenson, T. (2007). *Towards a Theory of Subjective Meaning*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT.
 Sudo, Y. (2012). *On the semantics of phi-features on pronouns*. Ph. D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Sundaresan, S. (2012). *Context and (Co)reference in the syntax and its interfaces*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Stuttgart and University of Tromsø.
 Tonhauser, J. e. (2013). Towards a taxonomy of projective content. *Language* 89(1), 66–109.