
Evidential effects and mismatch resolution

Mittwoch
08.03.2017
16:30 – 17:00
B4 1, 0.06

Victoria Escandell-Vidal

UNED

vicky@flog.uned.es

Consider the Spanish examples in (1) and (2):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>(1a) María es joven.
María <i>be(ser).PRS.3SG</i> young
'María is young.'</p> | <p>(1b) María está joven.
María <i>be(estar).PRS.3SG</i> young
'María is young [I saw her.]'</p> |
| <p>(2a) Juan va a venir mañana.
Juan <i>go.come.PRS.3SG</i> tomorrow.
'Juan will come tomorrow.'</p> | <p>(2b) Juan venía mañana.
Juan <i>come.PST.3SG</i> tomorrow.
'Juan will come tomorrow.
[Someone said so]'</p> |

The states-of-affairs conveyed in (1) and (2) are basically the same; however, the b. examples have an additional interpretive feature: (1b) is systematically understood as conveying that the speaker is the direct source for the assertion, whereas in (2b) the content has to be obligatorily attributed to someone else. In neither of the two cases is there any overt indicator responsible for the evidential reading.

The aim of this talk is to argue that this additional evidential content arises as the result of a pragmatic process of mismatch resolution. In both cases, an acquisition-of-information event has to be inferred to avoid the conflict in aspectual and temporal anchoring. The mismatch obtains under very specific conditions and is solved in a fully predictable way.

The analysis of these phenomena has implications for the design and properties of grammar, and provides new insights on the relations between linguistic form and interpretation.

References: • Davis, Ch. et al. (2007): The pragmatic values of evidential sentences. *SALT* 17, 71-88.
• de Swart, H. (2011): Mismatches and coercion. In C. Maienborn et al. (eds.). *Semantics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 574-596.