

# Against “TAM-E” – from a semantic perspective

Tabea Reiner

[tabea.reiner@lmu.de](mailto:tabea.reiner@lmu.de)

ICEM'18  
20 September 2018

# OUTLINE

## Against “TAM-E”



1. Background
2. Is evidentiality part of modality?
3. If not: is it on a par with TAM?
4. Conclusion

## TAM or TAM-E or even TAME?

- Traditionally: TAM
- In recent years:



(TAME)



TAME	Talk About Medical Experiences Medical
TAME	Tamed Miscellaneous » Unclassified
TAME	Tense Aspect Mood Evidentiality Miscellaneous » Unclassified
TAME	Transport Analysis Modelling and Economics Academic & Science » Economics
TAME	Technical Analysis Made Easy Miscellaneous » Unclassified

## TAM or TAM-E or even TAME?

- Traditionally: TAM
- In recent years: TAM-E, (TAME), TAME
- Why?

**Morphological** exponence!

- But **semantically**?
  - Popular argument: delete the “E”, since E(videntiality) is part of M(odality) from a semantic point of view!
  - Following slides: thoughts on this argument

## Is evidentiality part of modality (semantically)?

- PRO:
  1. Source of information = **kind of** source of information, invariably associated with different degrees of **certainty**
  2. Expressions of E and M often fused → seem to be close also semantically
- CON:
  1. Connection (reliability, Wiemer 2018:99–102) does not belong to semantics, but to pragmatics
  2. Fused realization of categories  $\nRightarrow$  “fused” semantics of categories, cf. person and number (Murray 2017:2–3)

+ ‘Kind of source of information’ does occur as the primary meaning of morphemes (Aikhenvald 2004:3)!

Example:

(1)

Context: You are blindfolded. I ask you to tell me which of these three cups the stone is in. You feel around and feel the stone.

*nilh lákw7a lts7a*

FOC SNV here

'sensory non-visual'

'It's in this one.' (Consultant mimes putting hand on the stone)

Infelicitous English translation: # It **must** be in this one.

(Matthewson 2012:96, also cf. Wiemer 2018:98)

## Is evidentiality part of modality? [continued]

- Alternative: E and M might make up **one super-category**, covering a continuous region in a semantic map (Boye 2010).
- However, then E and M are specific categories (values) and as such certainly distinct.

## Is E on a par with TAM (semantically)?

- Depends on your definitions...
- Here: following and extending Klein 1994

Iatridou 2000:247–249,  
 Maienborn 2003:158,  
 Murray 2017:5,  
 Reiner 2018, ch. 3

tense

TU	Time of Utterance
TSit	Time of Situation
TT	Topic Time

aspect

mood

WSp	World of the Speaker
TW	Topic World

time for which a claim is made

world for which a claim is made

- **TAM** all involve a claim, more precisely: they **restrict the claim**
- **E** 'kind of source of information' **does not** (unless to TW, but...)



## Is E on a par with TAM (semantically)? [continued]

Demonstration for German *Konjunktiv I* with the criterion of challengeability (Murray 2017:11–17):

(2) Sie hab-e die Juwelen gestohlen.  
she has-REP the jewels stolen  
'She has stolen the jewels, according to source.'

**T** Nein, das ist nicht wahr; sie wird die Juwelen (erst noch) stehlen.

**A** Nein, das ist nicht wahr; sie ist immer noch dabei.

**M** Nein, das ist nicht wahr; das ist eine Falschmeldung.

**E** #Nein, das ist nicht wahr; das hast du nicht gehört.

## Is E on a par with TAM (semantically)? [continued]

But **problematic** for German *Konjunktiv II*:

- (3) Sie hätte die Juwelen gestohlen.  
 she has.REP.DISBEL the jewels stolen  
 'She has stolen the jewels, according to source, but I disagree.'
- T** Nein, das ist nicht wahr; sie wird die Juwelen (erst noch) stehlen.  
**A** Nein, das ist nicht wahr; sie ist immer noch dabei.  
**M** **#**Nein, das ist nicht wahr; sie hat die Juwelen wirklich gestohlen.  
**E** **#**Nein, das ist nicht wahr; das hast du nicht gehört.

## Is E on a par with TAM (semantically)? [continued]

And a **pseudo-problem** from German: E below T?

(4)

Übermäßiger Kartoffelgenuss **solte** angeblich zu Schwindsucht, Rachitis, Bauchgrimmen oder gar Syphilis führen.

‘The consumption of too many potatoes was said to allegedly cause consumption, rachitis, stomach ache or even syphilis.’

(Faller 2006:17, also cf. Murray 2017:33)

No – the actual configuration is [T[E[TAM]]]!

Support: embedded restrictions not challengeable

## Is E on a par with TAM (semantically)? [continued]

Compare

(4)	Übermäßiger excessive	Kartoffelgenuss consumption.of.potatoes	soll-te it.is.said-PST
	angeblich allegedly	zu to	[...] führ-en. [...] lead-INF

'The consumption of too many potatoes was said to allegedly cause [...].'

#Nein, das ist nicht wahr; Kartoffeln sind gesund.

## Is E on a par with TAM (semantically)? [continued]

(4)	Übermäßiger excessive	Kartoffelgenuss consumption.of.potatoes		<b>soll</b> it.is.said
	angeblich allegedly	zu to	[...] [...]	führ-en. lead-INF

'The consumption of too many potatoes is said to allegedly cause [...].'

**Nein, das ist nicht wahr; Kartoffeln sind gesund.**

## Conclusions

- No, evidentiality (E) is not part of modality (M).
- Still, E is **not** on a par with M (or T, or A), since evidential meaning does not restrict the claim.
- Remaining problem: M not always challengeable
- in these cases: world  $\approx$  kind of source of information?

# REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford [et al.]: Oxford University Press (Oxford Linguistics).
- Boye, Kasper. 2010. Semantic maps and the identification of cross-linguistic generic categories. *Evidentiality and its relation to epistemic modality*. *Linguistic Discovery* 8(1): 4–22.
- Dahl, Östen. 2013. Tense-aspect-mood-evidentiality (TAME) and the organization of human memory. In: Molsing, Karina V./Ibaños, Ana Maria T. (eds.): *Time and TAME in language*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars. 22–53.
- Faller, Martina. 2006. Evidentiality below and above speech acts. Ms. <https://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/GZiZjBhO/>.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 2000. The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31 (2): 231–270.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 1994. *Time in language*. London: Routledge (Germanic Linguistics).

# REFERENCES

- Maienborn, Claudia. 2003. *Die logische Form von Kopula-Sätzen* (Studia Grammatica, 56). Berlin: Akademie.
- Matthewson, Lisa. 2012. Evidence about evidentials. Where fieldwork meets theory. In: Stolterfoht, Britta/Featherston, Sam (eds.): *Empirical approaches to linguistic theory. Studies in meaning and structure*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton (Studies in Generative Grammar, 111). 85–114.
- Murray, Sarah E. 2017. *The semantics of evidentials*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Oxford Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics, 9).
- Reiner, Tabea. 2018. *Existiert ein Infinitiv Posterior im Gegenwartsdeutschen?* [Is there an infinitive of posteriority in present day German?] Munich: LMU habilitation thesis.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2018. Evidentials and epistemic modality. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (ed): *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics). 85–108.



LAST BUT NOT LEAST

спасибо 谢谢  
GRACIAS

**THANK YOU**

ありがとうございました MERCI

DANKE धन्यवाद

شُكْرًا OBRIGADO

...for your attention!

# SUPPLEMENTING SLIDE

topic

comment

$\neg$ claimed  
**NON-  
FINITENESS**

for at least  
one world WX  
MODAL  
RELATIONS

for at least  
one time TX  
TEMPORAL  
RELATIONS

claimed  
**FINITENESS**

for at least one  
world TW  
**MOOD**

for at least one  
time  
TT

in relation to  
TU  
**TENSE**

in relation to  
TSit  
**ASPECT**