

## What kind of non-at-issue operator is the Quechua Reportative?

Submission to Main Session; formal semantic approaches to evidentiality

A central question in the formal semantics literature on evidentials is what type of meaning they contribute. While some evidentials can contribute at-issue content (Schenner 2008), many others have been analysed as non-at-issue (Izvorski 1997; Author 2002; Matthewson et al. 2007; McCready and Ogata 2008; Murray 2010). However, what *kind* of non-at-issue meaning evidentials contribute is not clear. Some have been analyzed as presuppositional (Izvorski 1997; Matthewson et al. 2007), some as illocutionary (Author 2002, Murray 2010), and some as conventional implicatures (McCready 2010). I review the empirical implications of these accounts and assess the Quechua Reportative evidential =*si*/=*s*, illustrated in (1), against them.<sup>1</sup> I conclude that the illocutionary analysis fits this particular evidential best.

- (1) Marya=**qa** quy-ta=**s** miku-ra-n.  
Marya=TOP guinea.pig-ACC=REP eat-PST-3

AI: 'Marya ate a guinea pig.'

EV: speaker was told that Marya ate a guinea pig.

The presuppositional analysis cannot account for =*si* because its evidential meaning does not project as expected. If it were a presupposition, (2) and (3) would have the same evidential meaning as (1). However, in (2), rather than projecting through negation, the negation becomes incorporated into the proposition that the evidential applies to. In (3), the Reportative is either interpreted relative to the hearer or it takes the entire question act in its scope.

- (2) Marya=**qa** mana=**si** quy-ta miku-ra-n=**chu**.  
Marya=TOP not=REP guinea.pig-ACC eat-PST-3=NEG

AI: 'Marya did not eat a guinea pig.'

EV: speaker was told that Marya did not eat a guinea pig

- (3) Ima-ta=**s** Marya=**qa** miku-ra-n?  
what-ACC=REP Marya=TOP eat-PST-3

AI: 'What did Marya eat?'

EV1: hearer expected to base answer on reportative evidence

EV2: speaker is asking on someone else's behalf

In Potts' (2005) account, conventional implicatures and at-issue content do not interact with each other. Consequently, the at-issue content of a declarative containing a conventional implicature is asserted. However, (1) does not assert that Marya ate a guinea pig, as the speaker need not be committed to the truth of this proposition and may even believe it to be false (Author 2002).

---

<sup>1</sup>For sake of exposition, I present the at-issue meaning (AI) and the evidential (EV) on separate lines.

Both interpretations of (3) support the illocutionary analysis. Illocutionary modifiers are known to participate in the interrogative flip illustrated by EV1, and the fact that =*si* can take an entire question act in its scope, EV2, requires it to operate on the illocutionary level. The illocutionary analysis, where =*si* takes the at-issue meaning as its argument, can also account for the fact that =*si* gives rise to a *de re/de dicto* ambiguity: the speaker of (1) may have a particular guinea pig in mind (*de re*) or not, in which case the guinea pig's existence may only have been assumed by the original speaker (*de dicto*). It is unclear how the presuppositional and conventional implicature analyses would account for this.

## References

- Author. 2002. Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua. Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University.
- Izvorski, Roumyana. 1997. The present perfect as an epistemic modal. In *Salt VII*, ed. A. Lawson and E. Cho. Cornell: CLC Publications.
- Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, and Hotze Rullmann. 2007. Evidentials as epistemic modals: evidence from St'át'imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7:201–254.
- McCready, Eric. 2010. Varieties of conventional implicature. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 3:1–57. Doi: 10.3765/sp.3.8.
- McCready, Eric, and Norry Ogata. 2008. Evidentiality, modality and probability. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30:147–206.
- Murray, Sarah. 2010. Evidentiality and the structure of speech acts. Doctoral Dissertation, Rutgers University.
- Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schenner, Mathias. 2008. Double face evidentials in German: Reportative 'sollen' and 'wollen' in embedded contexts. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 12*, ed. Atle Grønn, 552–566. Oslo: University of Oslo.