How reportative-like elements become emotive expressives

Lingzi Zhuang
University of Toronto Mississauga
lingzi.zhuang@utoronto.ca

Cross-linguistically, many elements with reportative-like semantics attest formally (near-)identical counterparts that express speaker-oriented emotive attitudes (Bulgarian *-l*, Cantonese *wo3*, Cheyenne *neho~hoo'o*, Mexican Spanish *dizque*, Turkish *-mIş*, Shanghai Wu *yikaon*). This study proposes that many instances of this **reportative-emotive expressive affinity** result from a *diachronic* process of conventionalizing Conversational Implicatures (CIs; Traugott & Dasher 2001). Specifically: (i) reportative-like elements, in lexically encoding only a *third-party*'s epistemic attitude towards the at-issue proposition *p* (AnderBois 2014), attest a principled tendency to generate CIs about the matrix SPKR's attitude towards *p*. (ii) Over time, such SPKR-attitude-CIs can be reanalyzed as the new lexical semantics of the same elements. Key empirical evidence for this process is drawn from novel studies on the Shanghai Wu mirative *yikaon* (from *yi kaon* '3SG say', a 3rd-party speech-report parenthetical) and on the Turkish derisive *-mIş*$_{\text{DERIS}}$ (from the reportative interpretation of evidential *-mIş*$_{\text{EVID}}$).

I further argue that both key components (i) & (ii) of this reanalysis process are motivated by well-defined pragmatic principles. Specifically: the tendency for reportative-like elements to generate SPKR-oriented attitude CIs (i) is due to the EPISTEMIC TRANSPARENCY principle (1), a sub-case of the Maxim of Quality. Reportative-evidentialized updates are crucially epistemically *non*-transparent.

(1)   EPISTEMIC TRANSPARENCY: In cooperative discourse (Stalnaker 1978, 2002), make, and assume others make, at-issue updates that are transparently grounded in publicized epistemic commitments *of one's own*.

In naturalistic, perspective-rich discourse, non-transparent updates anchored in third-party epistemic sources are hard for the ADDR to accurately resolve. Therefore, reanalysis (ii) is driven by the need to ALLEVIATE SOURCE RESOLUTION, an instance of Avoid Pragmatic Overload (Eckardt 2009). I illustrate this source-resolution pragmatic overload with a corpus example from Shanghai Wu.

Finally, I show that this account makes at least two correct typological predictions: diversity of the newly-lexicalized attitudinal flavour, and various levels of extension to non-SPKR-oriented / non-declarative uses.

References: • AnderBois, S. (2014). On the Exceptional Status of Reportative Evidentials. In: *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 24, pp 234–254. • Eckardt, R. (2009). APO: Avoid Pragmatic Overload. In: *Current Trends in Diachronic Semantics and Pragmatics*, pp. 21–41. • Stalnaker, R. (1978). Assertion. Leiden: Brill. — (2002). Common Ground. In: *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25.5/6, pp. 701–721 • Traugott, E. C. and Dasher, R. B. (2001). Regularity in Semantic Change, pp. 21–41.