INDIRECT EVIDENTIALS AND TAM: MORE ARGUMENTS FOR THE SENTIENCE DOMAIN PROJECTION

Monica Alexandrina Irimia (University of York), monica_alexandrina@yahoo.com

Speas and Tenny (2003) have argued for the existence of a special syntactic layer above the CP node (see also Hill 2014), labelled the *Sentience Domain*. This syntactic domain encompasses (at least) two projections, the *Speech Act Projection* and the *Sentience Projection* (1), illuminating some non-trivial aspects in the syntactic encoding of the pragmatic force and sentience.

(1) a. *Speech Act Projection* [$_{SAP}$ Speaker SA [$_{SA*}$ (utterance content) [$_{SA*}$ SA (hearer)]]]
b. *Sentience Projection* [$_{EVALP}$ Seat of Knowledge EVAL [$_{EVIDP*}$ Evidence [$_{EVIDP*}$ Evid S]]]]

This paper provides further arguments for the syntactic projection of the Sentience Domain. More specifically, it shows that it can derive in a straightforward manner some otherwise puzzling properties of indirect evidentiality (IEv) in (Romance) languages where this class establishes *morphological syncretism* with other T(ense) A(spect) M(ood) categories (Chafe and Nichols 1986, Izvorski 1997, Palmer 1986, Comrie 1978, Tomić 2003, Chung 2012, Aikhenvald 2004, Iatridou et al. 2003, etc.). **The data.** Cross-linguistically common (Comrie 1978, Izvorski 1997, a.o.,), the IEv – TAM syncretism is particularly salient in Romance, where counterfactual (CF.) conditional (COND.) and future (FUT.) morphology have been shown to also permit IEv readings (Coşeriu 1977, Squartini 2001, Ippolito 2002, 2013, Giorgi and Pianesi 2004, Delfitto 2004, Hill 2011, Irimia 2010, etc.). The syncretism is seen in (2) with the Italian COND:

(2) Il presidente ***avrebbe*** ***lasciato*** Roma ieri, ... *Italian*
The president COND.3.SG leave.PST.PRT Rome yesterday.
CF: 'The president *would have left* Rome yesterday, ….. (if he had had the time).'
IEv: 'The president *left* Rome yesterday (apparently/according to hearsay).' (Squartini 2001)

Within and outside Romance both descriptive and formal accounts have pointed out crucial differences between IEVs and their TAM homophones (see Izvorksi 1997 for IEVs from the *present perfect*, a.o.,), which point toward syntactic differentiations. However, the nature of IEV vs. TAM delimitations is still poorly understood. This paper proposes that this syncretism can be disambiguated syntactically, building on three main assumptions: **i**) Speas' (2010) implementation of IEVs. as categories of the indicative; **ii)** analyses that use real Tense heads merged above modal heads (Ippolito 2002, 2013, Arregui 2009, etc.); **iii**) canonical decompositions (formalized semantically in Izvoski 1997, following crucial insights in Comrie 1976) of IEv as a category which encompasses two types of features: *distancing* (speaker has not witnessed an eventuality directly) and *inclusion* to the deictic center (speaker gets to know about the eventuality via its results or indirect evidence). We show that what sets the IEV apart is the presence of deictic features at a syntactic layer [Eval] above the modal projection(s). In Romance languages these deictic features are computed as temporal specifications which are set to strict PRESENT (speaker's deictic center) and therefore block forward-shifting and temporal 'mismatches'.

The account. I. Speas (2010) has put forward an apparently surprising assumption: IEVs do not specify a type of quantification - they simply give the speaker more information about the relevant accessible situations (the nature of the evidence the assertion is built on), and therefore they should be seen as categories of the *indicative* (see also Jakobson 1957). Across Romance this creates an apparent tension with the morphology which is overtly and systematically *modal* (as seen in 2, 3, 8). However, less explored diagnostics do detect their '*indicative*' behavior. For example, IEv built with 'COND' morphology can be embedded under *if* (this possibility also distinguishes them from general epistemics, as also shown by another test in 8). However, when the COND morphology in the antecedent is interpreted as IEv (as opposed to a CF), the consequent can only contain *indicative* morphology. The example in (3) from another Romance variety, namely Romanian (as the morphology is less ambiguous than in other Romance varieties) clearly illustrates this. The CF reading of COND on the other hand requires COND morphology in the consequent (4):

(3) Dacă *ar* *fi* *plecat* ieri/*mâine , așa cum se spune,
If COND/IEV.3 be leave.PERF yesterday/*tomorrow, as how SE say.3.SG
atunci ***e*** deştept. *Romanian*
then be.INDIC.PRES.3.SG smart.M.SG
IEv only - 'If it is true that he *left* yesterday (as they say), then he's smart.'

(4) Dacă *ar* *fi* *plecat* ieri/mâine, atunci ***ar fi fos***t deştept.
CF only - 'If he had left yesterday/tomorrow, then he would have been smart.'

The contrast between (3) and (4) hence illustrates that the structure of IEv is more complex than what meets the eye. **II.** Examples (3) and (4) also show that the IEV use is distinct from CF in yet another respect – although the sentence in (4) contains a CF about the past FUT adverbials are possible (the problem of 'mismatched' temporal adverbials in CF – see recent discussions in Iatridou 2000, Ippolito 2002, 2013, Arregui 2003, etc.). The IEV blocks this interaction (3), although epistemics do permit it (see the pan-Romance imperfect). An illuminating structural account for the permissibility of *future* adverbials with overt *past tense* morphology in CF is provided in Ippolito (2003, 2006, 2013). Noticing that CF uses *past tense* morphology cross-linguistically (the English gloss in 4, see also James 1976, Iatridou 2000, Comrie 1976, etc.,), Ippolito (2002, 2006, 2013) proposes the structure in (6) for a CF. Structurally, this translates into a PAST tense head (manipulating the accessibility relations) merged above the modal head (WOLL). Therefore FUT adverbials are still possible:

(5) If he left tomorrow, he would be happy. (6) PAST (WOLL (he leave tomorrow)))(he happy))

As the IEv does not contain a layer of PAST merged *above* the modal, FUT adverbials are predicted to be *impossible* (they would give rise to temporal clash). IEv should thus have the structure in (7), as also seen in Condoravdi (2001):

(7) IEv: WOLL (PAST (he leave tomorrow) (he smart)))

However, we claim that the structure in (7) cannot be sufficient. If no further temporal layer is merged above the modal, non-past IEv are predicted to behave like run-of-the mill non-past epistemics whose characteristic property is *forward-shifting* with eventive predicates (Condoravdi 2001, Stowell 2004, etc.). This is clearly seen in English (He may write *tomorrow*; He will come *tomorrow*). This type of future-orientation is generally assumed to be contributed by the features of the modal (Kratzer 2001). Crucially, IEv do not easily tolerate forward shifting. This is seen with the Romanian present IEv in (8) which illustrates an inferential IEv built from the FUT modal. In spite of the overt FUT modal morphology, FUT adverbials are not possible and this sentence cannot have a FUT meaning. This pattern in fact confirms exceptionless observations by typologists that evidentials cannot be about the future (various contributions in Chafe and Nichols 1986, a.o.,).

(8) **O** fi dormind acum/*mâine. *Romanian*
FUT./INFER3.SG be sleep.GER. now/tomorrow.
'I infer that s/he might be sleeping right now.'

III. We are therefore left with a non-trivial question. If IEv have *indicative* behavior and do not tolerate 'forward shifting', why do we see systematic *modal* morphology cross-linguistically? As already mentioned, our solution to this tension makes crucial use of the Speas and Tenny's *Sentience Domain*. The intuition is that the IEv contains a PRESENT temporal layer above the modal. The ingredients are as follows: First, what is spelled out as the modal is simply the contribution of *the modal base* (encoding the source). We hypothesize that in some (IE) languages the only way to lexicalize sources of information in the verbal domain is through modal morphology - as modals always contain a modal base. Secondly, (hearsay) IEV are special in that they encode relationships between the event being reported and the event through which the speaker came to know what is being reported (Jakobson (1957), Nikolaeva (1999)). We assume here that the latter is encoded in the Evid head (it appears thus that IEv require both a feature in the utterance content and a Speech Act feature in some languages). These relationships are established at the speaker's deictic center (Eval, 9), whose features are realized as a *strict* PRES (in Romance languages, and beyond). This high PRES (which thus cannot occur under the scope of a yet higher tense – see Stowell 1995) blocks the presence of future adverbials, derives the 'indicative' behavior of IEv, therefore explaining why it cannot be about the future.

(9) [$_{\text{EVALP}}$ Seat of Knowledge EVAL = PRESENT [$_{\text{EVIDP*}}$ Evidence [$_{\text{EVIDP*}}$ Evid S]]]]

Given this syntactic decomposition, an answer to the robust syncretism IEv – TAM can be formulated – the homophony simply signals configurations which have in common the presence of a temporal layer *above* the modal node. We also assume that the specifier of SAP is an expletive in IEv (see Speas and Tenny 2003 for speculations in the same direction), thus accounting for the (obligatory) presence of impersonal evidential particles as in (3).