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The Corpus

- Three subcorpora
- Reported Speech constructions: 659 tokens
- SOLL: 200 tokens
  - 100 culled manually from 1 tabloid, 2 broadsheets, 3 regional publications
  - 100 extracted via COSMAS
- WILL: 200 tokens
  - 10 culled manually
  - 190 extracted via COSMAS
The Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>B/12-09/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>Als Trauerrednerin bei Begräbnissen soll sich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugation</td>
<td>3/SG/PRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Verb</td>
<td>PERF erschleichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Context</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Comp</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Type</td>
<td>DECL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Marking</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>Ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>3/SG/-DEF/+A/+H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/R Context</td>
<td>S: 0 // R: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>FNP/12-09/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>Es gebe Zweifel, warum der ehema-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugation</td>
<td>3/SG/PRES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Verb</td>
<td>PERF bemerken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Context</td>
<td>MC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Comp</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Type</td>
<td>DECL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Marking</td>
<td>Subj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Type</td>
<td>C SG/-DEF +A/+H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>3 SOURCE (Ein damaliger Mitarbeiter des...)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/R Context</td>
<td>S: 0, NEG, (Zweifel) // R: IRp, , . ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Same subject matter as FAZ examples.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Terminology

• SOLL = evidential uses of *sollen*
  - Generalisation over different constructional realisations
  - In casu *soll*- + INF/PERF INF

• WILL = "evidential-like" uses of *wollen*
  - Generalisation over different constructional realisations
  - In casu *will/woll*- + INF/PERF INF
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

- Evidentiality gets different interpretations: definitions become indicative

- Aikhenvald (2003: 1): evidentiality is “understood as stating the existence of a source of evidence for some information; this includes stating that there is some evidence, and also specifying what type of evidence there is”
  - However: evidence?
  - However: type of evidence? (e.g. Dendale & Tasmowski 2001: 340, Diewald & Smirnova 2010: 2, Kwon 2012: 35)
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

- Divergence usually in two directions:
  - 1. WHY is the source of evidence stated?
  - 2. WHAT qualifies as an element that indicates source of evidence?

- Both questions will be thematised with German data (SOLL and WILL)
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

1. Nach 17 Jahren Ehe lässt sich Formel-1-Star Gerhard Berger (53) von seiner Frau Ana (45) scheiden. Gegenüber BILD verriet Berger nun: „Ich bin in einer neuen Beziehung!“ Bergers Neue soll Helene heißen, aus Kufstein kommen und 18 Jahre jünger sein ... (kS5)

'Berger's new flame is said to be called Helene, to be from Kufstein and to be 18 years younger'

2. Trauer und Fassungslosigkeit herrschen in der Gemeinde Kruft (Kreis Mayen-Koblenz): Dort soll ein Mann seine 43-jährige Frau und die beiden sieben und neun Jahre alten Söhne getötet haben. (kS196)

'There a man is said to have killed his 43-year-old wife and both their sons, aged seven and nine'

3. Der Jugendliche soll zudem mitgeteilt haben, das Kind ins Bettchen gelegt und dann später leblos gefunden zu haben. (kS12)

'The youth is also reported to have said that he put the child to bed and then later found it lifeless'
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

4. Dass er so grob mit dem Säugling umgegangen sein soll, kann sie sich nicht erklären. (kS122)

'That he is reported to have been so coarse with the infant, she cannot explain'

5. Der amerikanische Fernsehsender Fox News veröffentlichte jetzt das Transkript eines Gesprächs, das der verzweifelte Häftling mit einem Journalisten geführt haben soll. (kS37)

'The American television channel Fox News now published the transcript of a conversation that the desperate prisoner is said to have had with a journalist'

- 1: soll + INF (39/200, 19.5%)
- Rest: soll + PERF INF (161/200, 80.5%)
- 1, 2, 3: Main clause (165/200, 82.5%)
- 4: Subclause (12/200, 6%)
- 5: Relative clause (23/200, 11.5%)
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

Dort soll ein Mann seine 43-jährige Frau und die beiden sieben und neun Jahre alten Söhne getötet haben.

Der Jugendliche soll zudem mitgeteilt haben, das Kind ins Bettchen gelegt und dann später leblos gefunden zu haben.

• In each case: SOLL marks P as hearsay, stemming from unknown 3rd-party source, secondary verbal information
• SOLL adheres to the definition: source and kind of information
• No doubt this is what it does: no deontic, volitional or epistemic (cf. later) reading here
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

- Compared to languages with legitimate reportive evidentials: no overt *semantic* differences (see next slide)

- Obvious *morphosyntactic* differences (see later)

- **Genre** differences: SOLL (and WILL) restricted to written (journalistic) register

- Even there: exceedingly rare
  - E.g. +- 7 *pages of Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* = 113 reported speech tokens
  - E.g. 6 *newspapers* = 100 SOLL, 10 WILL
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

- **Qiang (Tibeto-Burman),** Aikhenvald (2004: 45)
  
  "He went to Chengdu (I heard)"

- **Retuarã (Central Tucanoan),** ibid. (49)
  
  "I am going to get lemons", he is reported to say to them"

- **German**
  
  "Das Tafelsilber wird verscherbelt“, **soll** Dehm unter anderem **gesagt haben** [...]. (kS80)
  
  "The tableware will be sold off", Dehm is reported to have said, amongst other things
1. SOLL as a reportive evidential

- SOLL corresponds to the definition, akin to "established" reportives

- Yet not normally regarded as an "evidential" (i.e. an element that marks source (and kind) of information)
  - E.g. Aikhenvald (2004) and Lazard (2001)
  - E.g. Diewald & Smirnova (2010)
  - But e.g.: Schenner (2010)

- Reason: flawed category definition of evidentiality that excludes phenomena (like SOLL) that fit with it
2. The category of evidentiality
2. The category of evidentiality

- Standard belief (there are others): evidentiality is a **grammatical category**

- Vehemently argued for by e.g. Alexandra Aikhenvald and Gilbert Lazard

- Both fall victim to the same fallacy
2. The category of evidentiality

- Aikhenvald (2004)
  - 6: “Linguistic evidentiality is a grammatical system (and often one morphological paradigm). In languages with grammatical evidentiality, marking how one knows something is a must. Leaving this out results in a grammatically awkward ‘incomplete’ sentence […].”
  - 11: "Grammar is taken to deal with closed systems, which can be realized through bound morphemes, clitics, and words which belong to full grammatical word classes, such as prepositions, preverbs, or particles."
2. The category of evidentiality

- Aikhenvald (2004)
  - 10: "Saying that English parentheticals are ‘evidentials’ is akin to saying that time words like ‘yesterday’ or ‘today’ are tense markers. These expressions are [...] only tangential [...]. This implies a confusion between what is grammaticalized and what is lexical in a language.

- *Yesterday* is not a tense marker, but its core lies in marking temporality – as with tense markers

- Aikhenvald: grammatical expression of a "substance" (tense) = that substance itself (temporality); evidentiality as sth that codes, not as sth to be coded

- Why should morphosyntax be at all relevant to distinguish between semantically similar phenomena?
2. The category of evidentiality

• Aikhenvald (2004)
  - 10: "Saying that English parentheticals are ‘evidentials’ is akin to saying that time words like ‘yesterday’ or ‘today’ are tense markers. These expressions are [...] only tangential [...]. This implies a confusion between what is grammaticalized and what is lexical in a language.

• Understanding evidentiality = understanding lex. vs. gramm. = "both-and" rather than "either-or"

• German modals very much on the fence (e.g. Langacker: not grounding predications)

• Anderson (1986: 275): 'grammatical system' may be extended to encompass auxiliaries and other free syntactic forms
2. The category of evidentiality

- Aikhenvald (2004)
  - 3: “Evidentiality is a linguistic category whose primary meaning is source of information. [...] To be considered as an evidential, a morpheme has to have ‘source of information’ as its core meaning; that is, the unmarked, or default interpretation”.

- If 'source of info' as its primary meaning, what does it matter if bound? Semantic criterion (that something have evidential meaning) precedes grammatical one (that it be part of a closed class, be bound,...)

- When is a meaning primary? Aikhenvald (2004: 153): "establishing the core meaning [...] may be a daunting task". Squartini (2008: 920): "evidentiality can be conceived as a part of the primary meaning of a form that also encompasses other semantic domains"
2. The category of evidentiality

• Aikhenvald (2004)
  - 3: “Evidentiality is a linguistic category whose **primary meaning is source of information**. [...] To be considered as an evidential, a morpheme has to have ‘source of information’ as its core meaning; that is, the **unmarked, or default interpretation**”.

  • SOLL: *soll* + PERF INF (almost) categorically evidential (cf. Narrog 2005: 384, 385)
    - Older corpus research: 98/100 tokens reportive
  • SOLL: Dendale & Tasmowski (2001: 345): evidential values may derive from more primary meanings, cf. Diewald (1999): reportive SOLL derived naturally from its particular deontic (and pre-modal) origins
  • Again: coding requirement put on evidentiality
2. The category of evidentiality

- Lazard (2001: 360ff.)
  - Two criteria: 1. grammar, not lexicon 2. "primary meaning, not only as a pragmatic inference"
  - "The evidential may be said to be grammaticalized in a language when, in the grammatical system of this language, there are specific forms (*signifiant*) whose semantic-pragmatic content (*signifié*) is basically a reference to the source of the information conveyed by the discourse"
    - So SOLL is a grammaticalised evidential: a specific form (*soll* + PERF INF) whose content is a reference to the source of information
    - That there is some limited variation is just an indication SOLL is still grammaticalizing
2. The category of evidentiality

- Lazard (2001: 363)
  - “[i]n Persian, the evidential paradigm consists of a set of verb forms derived from the perfect, whose common signifié includes special meanings not conveyed by other verbs forms [...]; this is, indeed, the reason for positing the existence of the category. These meanings, however, are not all evidential”

- German: no other paradigm of verb forms than the modal paradigm expresses reportive(-like) (SOLL, WILL) and inferential (müßen) readings
  - Cf. also scheinen

- These verbs are also defined by their oppositions (ibid.: 364)
2. The category of evidentiality

- Grammatical view used to deny German evidentials, but can also be used to include them
- Regardless: we are having the wrong discussion
  - Wasting time investigating whether the evidential function is primary, whether the marker is grammatical,…
  - Instead of investigating the evidential function proper
- Still: how to come to terms with a construction like SOLL?
2. The category of evidentiality

- Aikhenvald (2004): evidentials vs. "evidential strategies"
  - "extensions of grammatical categories and forms to cover evidential-like meanings"
  - 106ff: Includes non-indicative moods, modalities, and future
    - German present subjunctive cited as example, but is not actually evidential! (is quotative)
  - What about SOLL? Aikhenvald (2004: 150)
    - [...] the modal verb sollen ‘must’ may indicate that the speaker is reporting the information they acquired from someone else [...]. [...] But is this an evidentiality strategy? The answer to this question depends on the status of modal verbs in the language – whether they are indeed a closed class, and whether they form special grammatical constructions in which they acquire additional meanings.
2. The category of evidentiality

- Diewald & Smirnova (2010: 41ff.)
  - Evidentials vs. evidential strategies (= 'evidential periphrases' and 'peripheral evidential constructions')
  - Major difference: former are more grammaticalised than the latter
  - What about SOLL?
    - Not treated in the book, but werden, scheinen, drohen and versprechen are considered evidentials

- The application of these classifications rests on the same false involvement of coding
2. The category of evidentiality

- Solution: elaborated by Boye & Harder (2009)
  - “[b]uilding the difference between semantics and pragmatics or lexicon and grammar into the definition of a category goes against the assumption in cognitive linguistics that the functional-conceptual substance domain, which is independent of linguistic structure, is basic”
  - Define 'category' without intervention of structural criteria as a "substance domain" or notional category on par with temporality, aspectuality, modality,…
  - Can be encoded lexically, grammatically or remain unencoded, and is itself a "language universal" (Cornillie 2009: 45)
2. The category of evidentiality

• Langacker's content vs. construal
  - Construal: a specific way of linguistically portraying a situation
  - Content: involves domains, i.e. "any kind of conception or realm of experience" that serves as "the content to be construed" (Langacker 2008: 44)
    • Crucially, domains "exist independently of any particular expression and are non-linguistic, but are conceptual resources that can be used for linguistic purposes" (ibid.: 53)

• Evidentiality is a content, a domain
  - Retuarã –re is like SOLL because they both encode the same "slice" of the substance domain
  - SOLL is therefore properly evidential itself
2. The category of evidentiality

• Caveat: Kwon (2012: 35-36) tests for evidentiality

• 1. Negating mode of access expressed

  ?Er soll den Dieb gesehen haben, aber ich habe das von niemandem erfahren  
  *He is said to have seen the thief, but I have heard no one say this*

• 2. Non-first to first person

  Ich soll das gesagt haben? Um Gottes Willen. Das ist noch ein Beispiel für Desinformation. (Google)  
  *I'm said to have said that? Dear God. There's an example of disinformation*
3. WILL as something strange
3. WILL as something strange

- More ways in German to mark "referred information": reported speech constructions (RS)

Riexinger *sagte*: „*Wir* verkörpern schon einen Aufbruch.“ (kRS84)
'R. said: "We do represent a revolution" '

'Him I asked how things were-PRES.SUBJ. with the malice of the cape buffalo'

Die Opposition *warf* der Koalition *vor*, nicht zu sparen, sondern nur „auf der Konjunkturwelle zu surfen“. (kRS10)
'The opposition accused the coalition of not saving, but only "surfing on the economic wave" '
3. WILL as something strange

- More ways in German to mark "referred information": reported speech constructions (RS)

Allerdings handelt es sich bei seinen Alltagswerken, so räumte der 78-Jährige [...] ein, meistens um SMS. (kRS432)

'His day-to-day work, admitted the 78-year-old, does however mainly deal with text messages'

Sie sollten die "chinesische Souveränität" über die Inseln sichern, hieß es. (kRS108)

'They were to secure the "Chinese sovereignty" over the islands, it was said'

Ein "Plan B" sei überhaupt nicht nötig, behauptet die Regierung siegesicher. (kRS538)

'A "Plan B" is-PRES.SUBJ. certainly not necessary, claimed the government confident of victory'
3. WILL as something strange

- Not a type of evidentiality, though treated at length by e.g. Aikhenvald (2004)
- Certainly an overlap in language possible (e.g. in German), but can be distinguished, e.g.
  - 1. **RS does not follow the definition** of evidentiality: neither source/type of evidence, nor evidence at all
    - Mark P as "non-actual" and attribute it to another source who takes focus
    - No inherent source, e.g. in German person, number, definiteness,... and always supplied by context
    - Not informing own statement, giving someone else's, so not dealing with evidence
    - So markers of RS "evidentially neutral"
3. WILL as something strange

- Certainly an overlap in language possible (e.g. in German), but can be distinguished, e.g.
  
  2. Deictic differences

- In general, RS-markers (esp. pres. subj.) shift the deictic centre ("origo") to another source (cf. Diewald 1991, 1999: "Versetzungsdeixis"), who becomes the vantage point from which to see the information

- Diewald & Smirnova (2010): quotatives (vs. reportives)
  
  - Reportives: e.g. SOLL, -re; no shift, all belong within one category, that of evidentiality
  
  - Quotatives: RS; shifting is done trans-categorically (tense, mood, person), hence not evidential
3. WILL as something strange

- In German, these differences become grammatically apparent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotatives = Quotes = “Someone said something”</th>
<th>Reportives = Reports = “Something is said”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referring speaker “channels” or mediates another speaker’s perspective</td>
<td>Referring speaker presents some information from his perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communicative distancing</td>
<td>• Communicative imposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Accuracy Requirement”</td>
<td>• No “Accuracy Requirement”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Syntax, deixis, word order, vocabulary, stance, ... are directly reflective of surrogate ground, “without modification”</td>
<td>• No construing of a surrogate ground involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content clause = finite main clause</td>
<td>Content clause = non-finite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content clause = grounded in surrogate ground</td>
<td>Content clause = grounded in actual ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Though actual ground is always necessarily present too (more “offstage”)</td>
<td>• Though another mental space is evoked, but it is not responsible for grounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear delineation of “referred” and “non-referred” material in two propositions</td>
<td>No delineation of “referred” material, just one proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear overt indication of source</td>
<td>No indication of source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source = definite individual</td>
<td>Only some characterisation of the content by means of vague reference to some “source”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May include description of surrogate ground situation</td>
<td>Marking is “deictic”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Source, setting (time and place), register, content, form,...</td>
<td>• (Mood), modal verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marking is “non-deictic” or “shifted deixis”</td>
<td>• Only indicate a relationship between the referring speaker and the proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quotation marks, speech verbs</td>
<td>• Indicates relationship between referring speaker and proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Indicate relationship between subject and predicate</td>
<td>• AND indicates relationship between subject/source and proposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shift in pronominal and modal reference, tense, ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Present subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. WILL as something strange

• Another quirky way of marking ref. info : WILL

In Peking brodelt die Gerüchteküche. Die einen wollen wissen, der neue starke Mann laboriere an einer Rückenverletzung, andere verbreiten, er habe einen leichten Herzinfarkt erlitten. (kW6)

’In Peking there are rumours all over the place. Some people claim [lit. want] to know, the strong man is suffering from a back injury, others disseminate he has had a mild heart attack’

Die Grünen wollen nur „Alten Wein in jüngeren Schläuchen“ geschmeckt haben, was jetzt etwas uncharmant […] ist. (kW8)

’The Green Party claims to have tasted only "old wine in younger skins", which is a little uncharming’

Doris B. will Werner K. mit dem hölzernen Stiel einer Holzaxt nur gestreift haben und zweimal mit ihrer Sandale ins Gesicht getreten haben. (kW158)

’D.B. claims to have only scraped W.K. with the wooden shaft of a wood axe and to have kicked him in the face twice with her sandals’
3. WILL as something strange

- Another quirky way of marking ref. info : WILL

Eine Angestellte will **gesehen haben**, wie Pflichtverteidiger Fritz Steller im Januar diesen Koffer mit der Waffe geöffnet habe (kW25)

'An employee claims to have seen how counsel F.S. opened this briefcase with the gun in January'

"Mein kleiner Bruder wurde mal wieder von Ihrem Sohn verprügelt", will die Zeugin zur Mutter **gesagt haben**. (kW11)

' "My little brother was again beaten up by your son", the witness claims to have said to the mother'

Aber die Reederei will von der syrischen Opposition **erfahren haben**, dass die "Atlantic Cruiser" Waffen an Bord genommen hat [...]. (kW124)

'But the shipping company claims to have learnt from the Syrian opposition that the "Atlantic Cruiser" had taken weapons on board'
3. WILL as something strange

- WILL has been cited as "evidential" (e.g. Narroog 2005)

- It has similarities to SOLL/reportives
  - Prefer PERF INF/non-finite content clause (198/200)
  - Deictic anchoring in the current speaker, i.e. the current speaker "does" something with the info, rather than simply giving it

- It also has similarities to RS/quotatives
  - Obligatory reference to a source (100%)
  - Appear in "RS-rich" environments and co-occur with RS-marking (pres. subj., quotation marks) (42%)
  - Tendency to appear in "complex" construction (23.5%)
3. WILL as something strange

- Unlike quotatives
  - No deictic shift
  - No reconstruction of a preceding speech act

- Unlike reportives
  - No indication of a set source and type of information
  - Rather attribution of information to another source (which therefore must be named)

- **WILL is neither evidential, nor quotative**
  - "Quoportive" as it combines traits of Q and R?
  - "Undifferentiated referral" as it marks referred information in a non-Q/non-R way?
4. *sollen* and *wollen* as deictic, but not epistemic, modals
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- Epistemic modality: Nuyts (2001b: 21)
  - “evaluation of the chances that a certain hypothetical state of affairs under consideration (or some aspect of it) will occur, is occurring or has occurred in a possible world”

- Plungian (2001: 354)
  - Evidentiality and modality overlap in epistemicity, because the fact that “a question of probability arises, indicates that the speaker has no direct knowledge of P”
  - Evidential supplement may always be seen in an epistemic marker, but "the opposite does not always hold" (cf. also Nuyts 2001: 386)
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- Some argue for a (partial) overlap

- Some argue for a clean break

- My proposal (based on SOLL and WILL data)
  - Evidentiality and epistemic modality are different things, but can be subsumed under one superordinate category (cf. Boye 2012)
  - Such a classification can account for their obvious overlaps in some languages (and why German can use modals as evidentials)
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- From the corpus it is clear that SOLL is in no way epistemic
- Epistemically coloured
  Joachim Dzieciol beispielsweise soll zwischen 1976 und 82 immerhin zwölf Zweitliga-Tore für Herford und Solingen geschossen haben. Wird wohl so sein. (kS158)
  'That’s probably true'

- Clearly true/confirmed
  Sicher ist, dass dieser 25-jährige Mann auf dem Parkplatz mit dem Messer nach einem Türsteher gestochen haben soll - allerdings ohne zu treffen. So berichteten es Zeugen. (kS117)
  'It is certain, that' + 'According to witnesses'

- Clearly false
  Zu behaupten, dass sich bisher nur eine Kundin über ihren defekten Anschluss bei dem Anbieter beschwert haben soll, ist eine absolute Frechheit und eine Lüge in unseren Augen! Täglich versuchen wir, Informationen bezüglich der Störung zu erhalten, werden aber immer darauf hingewiesen, eine E-Mail an die Beschwerdezentrale zu senden. (kS138)
  'is a lie in our eyes'
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- SOLL can itself therefore only be **neutral**
  - Neutral contexts (with no stance-marking of any kind): $153/200 = 76.5\%$
  - Occasionally also overtly neutral

Es ist noch unklar, woran der 68-Jährige starb. Er soll Kopfverletzungen **gehabt haben**. Ein Zusammenhang mit dem Feuer soll es nicht **geben**. (kS121)

'**It is still unclear**'

- Actual numbers higher still ("stance" not only epistemic, e.g. **angeblich**)
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4. Deictic but not epistemic

- **WILL** is often said to have an overtone of doubt (X claims P, but I don't believe that P), yet (cf. Mortelmans & Vanderbiesen 2011):

- Positive attitude
  Nun zitiert das US-Technikblog "Cult of Mac" einen vertrauenswürdigen Informanten, der ein funktionierendes Gerät _gesehen haben will_. (kW70)
  'A reliable informant'

- Negative attitude
  "Dafür, dass er so viel _getrunken haben will_, konnte er aber noch ganz gut geradeaus laufen", sagte ein Polizist gestern. (kW50)
  _Claims to have drunk a lot, but could walk remarkably straight_

- Clearly false
  Der Mediziner [...] **will** auf Stellplatz 22 ein Auto _gesehen haben_. [...] Auf dem besagten Parkplatz _können aber gar kein Auto gestanden haben_, erläuterte der Gutachter anhand von Fotos. (kW103)
  _Claims to have seen a car, but this is impossible_
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- Clearly true/confirmed
  Einige Minuten nach 2 Uhr **will** er gemeinsam mit einem Kollegen einen Sozialraum **betreten haben**. Zwischenzeitig sei er nur mal rausgegangen, um eine Zigarette zu rauchen. **Zeugen bestätigten die Aussagen bereits zu Prozessbeginn.** (kW97)
  *Claims something that is confirmed by witnesses*

- Clearly unconfirmed
  *Wie und warum, bleibt unklar - bei beiden hat der Alkohol die Erinnerung an den Abend **vernebelt**: Er **will** im Schlaf eine Flasche im Gesäß **gespürt** und deshalb um sich **geschlagen haben**. **Sie sagt**, er habe sie eifersüchtig gemacht, (kW195)*
  *It remains unclear + clouded memories + juxtaposition with 'Sie sagt'*
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- WILL can itself therefore only be **neutral**
  - Neutral contexts (with no stance-marking of any kind): 138/200 = 69%
  - Occasionally also overtly neutral

Fraglich blieb auch, was genau mit dem Pflanzstein passiert ist. **Ein Zeuge will gesehen haben, [...]**. **Andere Zeugen hätten beobachtet, [...]**. (kW127)

*It also remained unclear* + different claims by different witnesses

- Actual numbers higher still
- Stance often not by current speaker (likewise SOLL)
2. The category of evidentiality

- Caveat: Kwon (2012: 35) test for distinguishing epistemic modality and evidentiality

- Incompatible epistemic strength

> Er *muss* ?vielleicht/!bestimmt den Dieb gesehen haben,
> *Maybe/Certainly he must have seen the thief*

> Er soll !vielleicht/!bestimmt den Dieb gesehen haben
> *It is said that he maybe/certainly saw the thief*
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- How come SOLL and esp. WILL get epistemic readings anyway?

- Poss. 1: "Two distances"
  - Epistemic: S is distant from P in terms of accepting its probability/truth value
    - Epistemic distance calculated from the referred speaker or some point other than the current speaker ("Q", cf. Langacker)
  - (Reportive) Evidential: S is distant from P in terms of having no experience of it (which implies no judgement can be made)
    - Communicative distance calculated from the current speaker
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- Poss. 2 Reliability of information ≠ Likelihood of information being true (cf. Cornillie 2009: 59)
  - If only S has access to the evidence (subjective): not very reliable evidence
  - If access to the evidence is shared by more people (intersubjective): reliability goes up
  - Reliability of the same type of "evidence" (information) can thus vary depending on the access to that evidence
  - SOLL and WILL both deal with referred information, but its reliability differs between them
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- WILL implies subjective access to the info which implies the info is less reliable
- SOLL implies intersubjective access to the info which implies the info is more reliable
- Reliability is a part of the evaluation of likelihood, but not always vice versa
- Reliability of evaluation depends on the strength of S's commitment to P, but reliability of evidential values does not (cf. shared access, cf. also Poss. 1)
- WILL: less reliable info, impression of weaker commitment
- SOLL: more reliable info, impression of stronger commitment
4. Deictic but not epistemic

- Like epistemic modals, SOLL and WILL are deictic, as they encode the perspective of the current speaker.

- Unlike epistemic modals, they do not relate to him in terms of his assessment of or the degree of his belief in P.

- SOLL, like all evidentials, refers to the justification or source of information the current speaker has for P.

- With WILL the speaker does not provide justification, but rather characterises the information as being secondary to him by attributing it to another source (without purporting to quote that source).
4. Deictic but not epistemic
5. Conclusion
5. Conclusion

1. Evidentiality is a category defined in terms of source of information, evidence, justification
   - SOLL is a non-controversial member

2. Besides reportive evidentiality (reportives), reported speech (quotatives) likewise deals with referred information
   - Both notions are distinct, but WILL bridges the gap between them, being a hybrid

3. Like epistemic modals, SOLL and WILL are deictic, but their deictic reference is established in a fundamentally different way
If you feel I need to provide more "justification" for my "beliefs", feel free to ask!
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