

Spatial deixis and evidentiality: The case of Xiaoshan, a dialect of the Wu language*

Chenjie Ye

Abstract: This article suggests that Xiaoshan has evidentials fused with existential expressions or aspectual markers: $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$. The evidential meaning of these forms arises from spatial deixis concerning the speaker’s and hearer’s perceptual fields. $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is a form expressing the eventuality described inside the speaker’s perceptual field and is usually interpreted as a direct evidential. Both $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ express the eventuality described outside the speaker’s perceptual field, giving rise to an interpretation of indirect evidence, but $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ has other limits on its usage: the speaker cannot be at the place where the eventuality takes place, and the eventuality is outside the hearer’s perceptual field. Though the evidential system in Xiaoshan is secondary, it is typologically similar to other typical evidential systems in many ways.

Keywords: Xiaoshan dialect, evidentiality, spatial deixis, existential expressions, aspectual marker

1 Introduction

We investigate a secondary evidential system in Xiaoshan, a dialect of the Wu language, and argue that this evidential system arises indirectly from spatial deixis. The spatial deixis mentioned here is different from commonly used deictic terms, such as proximal and distal, based on physical distance; it is a system concerning the perceptual field of the speaker and hearer, mainly based on psychological factors. In this system, there are three different forms, $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$, whose different usages have been accounted for according to a physical distance-based deictic difference in previous research (Ōnisi 1999: 150–151; also refer to Tao 1996 and Wang 1998 for

* This research was supported by JST SPRING, Grant Number JPMJSP2110. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 70th Annual Conference of The Chinese Linguistic Society of Japan (November 2020) and the 114th meeting of The Language Descriptive Workshop (July 2021). Comments from the audiences have been constructive. I especially wish to acknowledge the comments and suggestions of Dan Wang, Kunming Tan, Sunmi Kim, Syuntaro Tida, Ya-Yun Cheng, Yuki Kawabata, several anonymous reviewers, and the editors of *Kulr*. We thank all the native speakers who have participated in this research. We are also grateful to Jake Iannacone for proofreading as a native English speaker. All remaining errors and omissions are ours.

a similar system in the Shaoxing dialect).¹ According to these studies, $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is a proximal form, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ is a generic form (either proximal or distal), and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ is a distal form. Some examples from the Xiaoshan dialect are given in (1a), (1b) and (1c).^{2,3}

- (1) a. 渠 来带 萧山
 $hi^{23} le^{23}ta^{44} ei^{44}s\tilde{e}^{44}$.
 3SG EXIST Xiaoshan
 ‘He is in Xiaoshan (and I am also in Xiaoshan).’
- b. 渠 来东 萧山
 $hi^{23} le^{23}toŋ^{44} ei^{44}s\tilde{e}^{44}$.
 3SG EXIST Xiaoshan
 ‘He is in Xiaoshan (and I may or may not be in Xiaoshan).’
- c. 渠 来亨 萧山
 $hi^{23} le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44} ei^{44}s\tilde{e}^{44}$.
 3SG EXIST Xiaoshan
 ‘He is in Xiaoshan (and I am not in Xiaoshan).’

Existence expressions are also utilised as aspect markers, usually considered as a result of grammaticalisation (Qian 1997: 103). In Xiaoshan, they are used before the verb as progressive aspect markers, as shown in (2a), (2b) and (2c).

¹ Although we do not consider $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ able to be further analysed into two different morphemes synchronically, it is said that le^{23} comes from a verb used to express the position and ta^{44} , $toŋ^{44}$, $h\tilde{a}^{44}$ comes from nouns expressing directions. These constructions undergo grammaticalisation to fuse as single morphemes expressing existence and aspect (cf. Qian 1997).

² Like other Wu dialects, Xiaoshan has a complicated tone sandhi system. Since tonal change is unrelated to this article, we only indicate the original tone on every syllable. For more discussion on tone sandhi in Xiaoshan, see Ōnisi (1999). As for the glosses of $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$, we only indicate the ordinary function of these morphemes (to express existence or aspect) and do not gloss the difference between them since the difference is to be explained in this article.

³ The examples from Xiaoshan are mainly created by the author, a native speaker of the Xiaoshan dialect, and were all checked for accuracy by ten other native speakers (from different regions and ages) of Xiaoshan. Otherwise, the information of the source is mentioned in the context. ‘#’ indicates semantic or pragmatic inadequacy in the examples. In this article, the Chinese characters used for Xiaoshan are mainly based on Ōnisi (1999); some morphemes’ Chinese characters are still unknown at the present stage, so we exhibit them as ‘□’. The following abbreviations are used in the examples: 1/2/3=1st/2nd/3rd person; CLF=classifier; CONT=continuous; EXIST=existential; INT=interrogative; NEG=negative; PL=plural; POSTP=postposition; PROG=progressive; SG=singular.

- (2) a. 渠 来带 吃 饭
ɦi²³ le²³ta⁴⁴ ʔie²⁵vẽ²³.
 3SG PROG eat meal
 ‘He is eating a meal (somewhere physically close to me).’
- b. 渠 来东 吃 饭
ɦi²³ le²³toŋ⁴⁴ ʔie²⁵vẽ²³.
 3SG PROG eat meal
 ‘He is eating a meal (somewhere either close to or far from me physically).’
- c. 渠 来亨 吃 饭
ɦi²³ le²³hã⁴⁴ ʔie²⁵vẽ²³.
 3SG PROG eat meal
 ‘He is eating a meal (somewhere physically far from me).’

These morphemes can also be used after the verb without *le²³* as continuous aspect markers, as shown in (3a), (3b) and (3c).⁴

- (3) a. 扇 门 开 带
sã³⁴ mǝŋ²³ k^he⁴⁴ ta⁴⁴.
 CLF door open CONT
 ‘The door is open (and it is physically close to me).’
- b. 扇 门 开 东
sã³⁴ mǝŋ²³ k^he⁴⁴ toŋ⁴⁴.
 CLF door open CONT
 ‘The door is open (and it is either close to or far from me physically).’
- c. 扇 门 开 亨
sã³⁴ mǝŋ²³ k^he⁴⁴ hã⁴⁴.
 CLF door open CONT
 ‘The door is open (and it is physically far from me).’

However, a difference in spatial deixis cannot explain all the distributions of these expressions,

⁴ The progressive aspect expresses that the action described is ongoing. On the other hand, the continuous aspect expresses that the result of an action is ongoing, though the action is finished (cf. Ōnisi 1999). Though *le²³* does not appear when these forms are used as continuous aspect markers, we regard existence expressions, progressive aspect markers and continuous aspect markers as the same morphemes and, if not necessary, refer to them all as *le²³ta⁴⁴*, *le²³toŋ⁴⁴* and *le²³hã⁴⁴* for convenience.

which is observed in Shaoxing by Song (2015). Look at some counterexamples in (4) and (5) from Xiaoshan, which are based on examples from Shaoxing in Song (2015: 154–155).

- (4) A husband is looking for a peeler in the kitchen, but he cannot find it, so he asks his wife who is outside the kitchen:

刨 来带/来东 啥里
*bv*³¹ #*le*²³*ta*⁴⁴/*le*²³*toŋ*⁴⁴ *ɦa*²³*li*¹³?
 peeler EXIST where
 ‘Where is the peeler?’

In (4), the husband is closer to the peeler than his wife because he is in the kitchen, where the peeler is supposed to exist, but the proximal form *le*²³*ta*⁴⁴ renders the utterance infelicitous.

- (5) A police officer is monitoring a suspect through binoculars and reports to his colleague:

渠 来带/来东 房间里
*ɦi*²³ *le*²³*ta*⁴⁴/*ɦle*²³*toŋ*⁴⁴ *vɦ*²³*kẽ*⁴⁴*li*¹³.
 3SG EXIST room POSTP
 ‘He is in the room.’

In (5), the police officer is far from the suspect, a situation where the distal or generic form is expected to be used, but the proximal form is used here.

As spatial deixis based purely on physical distance cannot explain such circumstances, some other factors must contribute to the usage of these forms.⁵ We argue that these forms convey location inside/outside the participants’ perceptual fields, not simply spatial distance. The perceptual deictic meaning indirectly gives rise to a secondary evidential meaning.

We begin with some basic concepts about evidentiality and the relation between evidentiality and spatial deixis in Section 2. Then, we will provide some background information on Xiaoshan in Section 3. Also, in Section 3, we focus on studies investigating the evidential system in Shaoxing, which is similar to that of Xiaoshan. Section 4 suggests that there are evidentials in Xiaoshan, but this system is based on a spatial deictic system. Section 5 will present some typological characteristics of evidentials in Xiaoshan. In Section 6, we conclude our findings.

⁵ It is also a problem that these studies arguing for a physical distance-based deictic proposal do not clarify what the accurate value to be counted as ‘far’ or ‘near’ is.

2 Evidentiality and deixis

Evidentiality is said to be a grammatical category concerning the information source (Aikhenvald 2004:3).⁶ Aikhenvald (2015: 241) has divided the information source into several subdomains, as shown in Table 1. Direct information sources include visual and other sensory, meaning that “the speaker has experienced the state of affairs”; indirect information sources include the other four, meaning that “the speaker knows about the state of affairs from indirect cues” or has “heard/read about the state of affairs” from somewhere (Mélac 2024).⁷ Our discussion on evidentials in Xiaoshan is based on these parameters.

Table 1: Semantic parameters grammaticalised in languages with evidentiality in Aikhenvald (2015: 241).

(I)	VISUAL covers evidence acquired through seeing;
(II)	SENSORY covers evidence through hearing, and is typically extended to smell and taste, and sometimes also touch; ⁸
(III)	INFERENCE based on visible or tangible evidence, or visible results;
(IV)	ASSUMPTION based on reasoning and conjecture (and not on visible results);
(V)	REPORTED for reported information with no reference to who it was reported by;
(VI)	QUOTATIVE for reported information with an overt reference to the quoted source.

We also follow Brugman & Macaulay’s (2015: 228) claim that evidentials’ criterial properties are marking the source of evidence and being members of grammatical systems of closed-class items. Other properties can vary across languages (Brugman & Macaulay 2015: 229–231). Table 2 is a simplified version of the table in Brugman & Macaulay (2015: 232). We will discuss if evidentials in Xiaoshan have these variant properties in Section 5.

⁶ There was a debate on whether evidentiality is an independent grammatical category from modality. Some argue that evidentiality is independent of modality (e.g. Lazard 2001; Plungian 2001; Aikhenvald 2004; Aikhenvald & LaPolla 2007; Aikhenvald 2015), and others say that they are in the inclusion relation, either evidentiality falling within the scope of modality (e.g. Willett 1988; Palmer 2001) or modality falling within the scope of evidentiality (e.g. Chafe & Nichols 1986; Rooryck 2001; Tournadre & LaPolla 2014). However, as Aikhenvald (2018: 17) puts it, “the days when evidentiality was erroneously confused with epistemic modality [...] are all but gone”; recent research has shown that evidentiality is distinct from epistemic modality (e.g. Korotkova 2016; Boye 2018; Wiemer 2018; Faller 2019).

⁷ Though Aikhenvald (2015: 241) also mentions that there are further parameters, including “general knowledge, different kinds of assumption and reasoning, and degrees of verbal report – secondhand and thirdhand.”, we do not discuss these parameters in this article as they are not related.

⁸ Sensory can be a misleading name since vision also belongs to sense. We clarify here that sensory is used to refer to all non-visual senses.

Table 2: Invariant and variant properties of evidentials in Brugman & Macaulay (2015: 232).

Invariant properties
(i) Express source of evidence
(ii) Belong to closed class of grammatical items
Variant properties
(i) Degree of certainty, commitment, or informativity
(ii) Shift of origo to 3 rd person
(iii) Obligatoriness
(iv) Complementarity of meaning of items
(v) Truth-conditionality

A grammatical category relevant to evidentiality is deixis. Matthews (2007: 96) claims that the definition of deixis is “[t]he way in which the reference of certain elements in a sentence is determined in relation to a specific speaker and addressee and a specific time and place of utterance”. Similarly, according to Levinson (2018a: 2, 6), “the deictic field is often divided into the semantic domains of space, time, person, discourse and social dimensions”, and the demonstrative, a typical member of deixis, “by convention indicates that the speaker warrants that the addressee can find the referent in the context”.⁹ The speaker providing information on referents to the addressee can be related to evidentiality, the category of information source, and this gives rise to a possibility of grammaticalisation of deictics to evidentials, or an interpretation of evidentiality by the deictics. For example, demonstratives containing information about the referent’s visibility are widely observed in Indigenous languages of the Americas, which shows a relation to visual evidentials (e.g. Romero-Méndez 2009: 216 for Ayutla Mixe; Brandão 2014: 97–98 for Paresi; Skilton 2021 for Ticuna). Faller (2004) suggests that there is a morpheme *-sqa* in Cusco Quechua, which is analysed as a spatio-temporal deictic and whose deictic meaning gives an interpretation of indirect evidentiality. Levinson (2018b) mentions that in Yélí Dnye, a demonstrative *kí* is used for referents with direct perceptual access, and *wu* is used for referents with indirect or inferential access; it is clear that demonstratives in Yélí Dnye are relevant to evidentiality (also refer to Levinson 2018a for examples in Jahai and Tiriyo). Some examples of a combination of evidentiality and spatial deixis are found in languages like Dyribal, Mataco-

⁹ Hanks (2017) considers deixis to consist of demonstratives and pronouns and Levinson (2018a) claims that demonstratives are taken to be the prototype elements of deixis. As we do not discuss pronouns in this article and the deictic system in Xiaoshan is typically demonstrative, we do not clearly distinguish deixis and demonstratives if not necessary.

Mataguan languages, Maká, Santali, and Tsou (Aikhenvald 2015: 248–249).¹⁰ All of these studies suggest a relationship between evidentiality and deixis.

Some researchers further point out the connection between these two categories. Schlichter (1986: 57) regards “evidentials as a deictic phenomenon” through an investigation of evidentials in Wintu. Boye (2012: 293) regards epistemic justification (information source) as a “conceptual anchor” and suggests evidential meanings in a sense to be considered “deictic”. Brugman & Macaulay (2015: 216) indicate that “evidentials generally encode person deixis, and are usually described as speaker deictic in that they reflect the speaker’s point of view concerning the situation described in the sentence.” All these studies consider evidentiality as a deixis-based system to some extent. Further, de Haan (2005) provides a detailed investigation of the relationship between evidentiality and deixis, suggesting that evidentiality is a kind of propositional deixis. De Haan (2005: 379) claims that “direct evidentials describe events that take place in the speaker’s deictic sphere, while indirect evidentials describe events outside this sphere.” We follow de Haan’s (2005) argument that evidentiality arises from deixis, at least in Xiaoshan, and will argue that *le²³ta⁴⁴*, *le²³toŋ⁴⁴* and *le²³hã⁴⁴* in Xiaoshan interpret evidential meanings which are based on their original deictic meanings.

3 Information on Xiaoshan and evidentials in Sinitic languages

The Xiaoshan dialect is spoken mainly in the Xiaoshan District of Hangzhou City, the capital city of Zhejiang Province. This dialect belongs to the Taihu subgroup of Wu, a member of Sinitic languages, distributed mainly in Shanghai, Zhejiang, southern Jiangsu and some other regions in southeastern Mainland China.¹¹ Wu is thought to have separated from Middle Chinese at an early

¹⁰ However, all these examples are from a non-propositional evidentiality system with a noun phrase as its scope, which might deserve further investigation.

¹¹ The number of subgroups differs according to different criteria. You (2018: 26–41) introduces three kinds of division: a two-way division, a three-way division and a six-way division, but You (2018) explains that the distinct divisions are due to different criteria, and all of these divisions are possible. In the two-way division, Wu is divided into Northern Wu and Southern Wu; in the three-way division, Western Wu is added; in the six-way division proposed by Zhengzhang (1987), Wu is divided into Taihu, Taizhou, Oujiang, Wuzhou, Chuqu, and Xuanzhou. There is a correspondence between these divisions, such that Northern Wu corresponds to the Taihu subgroup, Western Wu corresponds to the Xuanzhou subgroup, and Southern Wu consists of the rest of the subgroups in the six-way division (You 2018: 31). In any of these divisions, the Xiaoshan dialect is subgrouped with other Taihu dialects, which suggests that it is a typical member of the Taihu subgroup.

As Xiaoshan belongs to the Taihu subgroup, we will give some information about the subgroup here. According to You (2018: 4), Taihu is a subgroup with the most significant number of speakers in Wu (about 47 million speakers, with a proportion of 63.38% of Wu speakers). Taihu displays many different features compared to other subgroups, and some examples are as follows. First, a particular deadjectival adverbialiser suffix ‘-teip’ is used frequently in the Taihu subgroup but not in other subgroups (You 2018: 202). Also, Southern Wu nouns can become a diminutive form by segmental or suprasegmental means,

stage and displays many unique characteristics of the Sinitic languages (You 2018: 10).¹²

The system that we investigate in our article is not an isolated phenomenon among Wu languages. There was a three-way distinction for expressions of existence in other Wu dialects, similar to those in Xiaoshan, as exhibited in Section 1; however, in many dialects, such as Hangzhou and Shanghai, the existential expressions were reduced. This distinction is still preserved only in some dialects, such as Shaoxing and Ningbo (Wang 1998).¹³ As shown in Section 1, Xiaoshan is also one of the dialects with this preservation, and we argue this system, at least in Xiaoshan, is spatial deixis-based and related to evidentiality.

There is not much discussion on whether Wu has grammatical evidentiality markers. Sheng (2014: 418) claims that an evidential ‘话(道)’, which comes from the verb meaning ‘to tell, to speak’, is a hearsay evidential in the Keqiao dialect.¹⁴ Other possible evidentials mentioned in previous research are mainly related to existential and aspectual expressions (also the subject of this article). Ōnisi (1999: 151) argues that in Xiaoshan, when $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is used, both the event and the agent of it are visible to the speaker, and when $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ is used, both of them are not visible to the speaker. On the contrary, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ can be used in both situations (Ōnisi 1999: 151). However, Ōnisi (1999) only described such a phenomenon and did not provide a detailed investigation based on evidentiality. Song (2015) claims that in Shaoxing, the difference between the existential expressions *leda*, *ledoŋ* and *lehaŋ* (which corresponds to $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ in Xiaoshan, respectively) is accounted for by evidentiality and modality.¹⁵ Shaoxing is closely related to Xiaoshan and has cognate forms to these verbs/evidentials, suggesting there is a possibility that Song’s account can be applied to Xiaoshan; therefore, we present his account in detail to see if

usually realised by lexical items in Northern Wu (You 2018: 201–202). All dialects mentioned below, including Hangzhou, Shanghai, Ningbo and Shaoxing, belong to the Taihu subgroup.

¹² For example, Wu phonologically distinguishes between voiced plosives, voiceless unaspirated plosives and voiceless aspirated plosives at the syllable onset. At the same time, many other Sinitic languages, like Mandarin, Yue, and Hakka, have lost voiced plosives and only maintain a two-way contrast in onset position (Ho 2015: 153). Also, the three-way distinction between plosives in coda position in Middle Chinese has been reduced to a glottal stop in Wu, in contrast to some Sinitic languages (like Xiang), which have lost all coda plosives, and some other Sinitic languages like Yue and Hakka, which still keep the three-way distinction (Ho 2015: 153). Syntactically, postpositions are used in more circumstances, and prepositions are unnecessary in many cases in Wu, which is opposite to Mandarin (Liu 2001: 341–342).

¹³ Wang (1998) claims that Ningbo has a three-way distinction. However, Ruan (2009: 22–27) has shown that no such distinction exists based on spatial deixis in Ningbo regarding the progressive aspect, as Shaoxing or Xiaoshan does. In the continuous aspect, Ningbo distinguishes between proximal and distal, displaying a two-way distinction (Ruan 2009: 32–42). Although Ruan (2009) did not mention existential expressions, the three-way distinction in Ningbo might have already been reduced in both aspectual usages.

¹⁴ Sheng (2014: 418) did not give the phonological form of this evidential, so we use the Chinese characters here.

¹⁵ Song (2015) did not provide information about these forms’ tones.

his claim is still effective in Xiaoshan.¹⁶ Table 3 is a summary of Song (2015).

Table 3: Difference between *leda*, *ledoŋ* and *lehaŋ* in Song (2015: 165)¹⁷

Speaker		Hearer			In the range of visibility	Out of the range of visibility
		Visible				
Invisible	In the range of visibility	Audible or non-sensory source	Recognition of existence	Sureness	<i>leda</i>	
				Avoiding assertion		
			Transmission of information about existence		<i>ledoŋ</i> (accessible)	
	No source		<i>ledoŋ</i>			
	Out of the range of visibility	Non-sensory source			<i>ledoŋ</i> (accessible)	<i>ledoŋ</i> (accessible); <i>lehaŋ</i>
			No source		<i>ledoŋ</i>	<i>lehaŋ</i>

Song (2015) introduced the concept of *range of visibility*, which means the field of vision that a person's eyes can reach; it is not necessary for an entity in the range of visibility to be visible to someone, since the space between the eyes and the entity can be blocked by something. For example, when someone enters a room, the clothes in the closet are not visible to them but are in their range of visibility, because their field of vision could have reached the clothes but is blocked by the closet. According to Table 3, *leda* is used when the entity is visible to the speaker, or when the entity is not visible but in the speaker's range of visibility and the speaker is sure about its

¹⁶ Xiaoshan is said to be similar to the Shaoxing dialect; however, because of phonological, morphological and syntactic differences between Shaoxing and Xiaoshan, for example, in the pronoun system, we treat them as separate dialects (cf. Wu 2007; Ye 2014).

¹⁷ Though not as important as the 'range of visibility', some other concepts in Table 3 need unpacking, especially the cells of 'recognition of existence' and 'transmission of information about existence'. The former is used when the speaker usually recognises something's existence and describes it. The latter is only used for answering questions about something's existence. In this case, the speaker needs to transmit the information about the existence of the object being questioned. As an example, if an object is invisible to the speaker but in his or her range of visibility, and the speaker has some sort of source in a situation where he needs to answer someone's question about the object's position, the speaker will use *ledoŋ*, according to Song (2015).

existence. *lehaŋ* is used when the entity is out of both the speaker's and the hearer's range of visibility. Elsewhere *ledoŋ* is used. According to Song (2015), in many cases, there is a modal reading of this form where the entity is accessible, with an implication that the speaker urges the hearer to access that entity. This is the difference between *ledoŋ* and *lehaŋ* in an environment where both of them are possible.

Table 3 provides the distinction between *leda*, *ledoŋ*, and *lehaŋ* in Shaoxing. However, this distinction seems insufficient to explain the situation in Xiaoshan. Sentence (6) shows us an unexplainable example if we apply Song's analysis to Xiaoshan directly.

- (6) Someone told me that there is a person near the riverside and I went there to see if it was true. However, I could not find that person and called someone else on the phone, saying:

渠 话 有 个 人 来 带 河 边
ɦi²³ ɦuo²³ ɦio²³ kə²⁵ niŋ²³ le²³ ta⁴⁴ ɦio²³ piē⁴⁴.
 3SG say some person EXIST riverside

'He said someone is at the riverside.'

Although the entity described in the utterance is outside the range of visibility of the speaker and the information source is hearsay, with the speaker unsure about the validity of the statement since he or she did not find the person there, the speaker can still use *le²³ ta⁴⁴* to describe the situation here. This means that some other factors not listed in Table 3 are in effect, at least in Xiaoshan.

Even in Shaoxing, the distinction in Table 3 seems to fail to explain all the circumstances. Song (2021: 138) gives an example from Shaoxing that Table 3 cannot explain.¹⁸

Shaoxing dialect of Wu

- (7) I am in a room. Someone from another room called me on my phone and asked me where the key is:

钥匙 摆 带/咚/亨 抽斗 里。
ɦia²zi ba da/#doŋ/#haŋ tɕ^hiodio li.
 key put CONT drawer POSTP

'The key was put in the drawer.'

¹⁸ The original example is written in Chinese characters, so we do not provide information about tone here.

As the key is in the drawer, it is invisible to the speaker and *doŋ* or *haŋ* should be used, rather than *da* (Song 2021: 138–139), which is contrary to (7). To account for the problem found in (7), Song (2021: 144) criticises the evidentiality approach of Song (2015) and proposes a new perspective to clarify the distinction between these forms, which is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Difference between *da*, *doŋ* and *haŋ* in Song (2021: 144)

Physical distance to the entity		Person with control power and the choice of <i>da</i> , <i>doŋ</i> , <i>haŋ</i>	
Close to the speaker	Closer than the hearer	Speaker/ <i>da</i>	
	Equal distance	Speaker/ <i>da</i> (to access by the speaker)	Hearer/ <i>doŋ</i> (to urge hearer to access)
	Closer to the hearer	Hearer/ <i>doŋ</i>	
Far from the speaker	Close to the hearer	Hearer/ <i>doŋ</i>	
	Far from the hearer	Someone else/ <i>haŋ</i>	Hearer/ <i>doŋ</i> (to urge hearer to access)

Song (2021) suggests a new concept, *control power*, to explain the distinction. According to Song (2021), control power is decided by the physical distance between the speaker, the hearer and the entity described in the utterance, and the closer participant in the conversation to the entity has the control power; when the distance from the entity to the speaker is equal to that of the hearer, the control power is decided by who is going to access the entity. Song (2021: 144) gives an example to explain this concept, as shown in (8a) and (8b).

Shaoxing dialect of Wu

(8) In an office, there is a desk with a drawer. I am sitting to the left of the drawer and another person is sitting to the right. I am asked to give that person the key in the drawer. I answer:

- a. 钥匙 摆 带/咚/亨 抽斗 里 我 拔 佢 驮。
ɦiaʔzi ba da/#doŋ/#haŋ tɕʰiodio li, ɲo bəʔ nəʔ do.
 key put CONT drawer POSTP 1SG give 2SG take

‘The key was put in the drawer. I will get it for you.’

- b. 钥匙 摆 带/咚/亨 抽斗 里 佬 己 驮。
hiaʔzi ba #da/don/#han tɕʰiodio li, nəʔ zi do.
 key put CONT drawer POSTP 2SG oneself take
 ‘The key was put in the drawer. Get it by yourself.’

Here in (8a), the speaker is going to access the entity ‘key’, so the control power belongs to the speaker and *da* is used, instead of *don* or *han*. In (8b), the speaker asks the hearer to get the key by himself or herself, meaning the control power belongs to the hearer, so *don* is used.

Similar to Table 3, Table 4 also shows a complex distinction between these three forms in Shaoxing and again, it seems insufficient to apply this explanation to the situation in Xiaoshan. Example (9) is a counterexample wherein the speaker is closer to his or her father than the hearer; therefore, *le²³ta⁴⁴* is expected to be used. However, *le²³ton⁴⁴* is also allowed in this example, which is unexplainable based on Table 4.

- (9) I am home, and my mother telephones me to ask where my father is. I see my father’s shoes in the hallway and infer that he is also at home. I answer:
 渠 来东 屋 里
hi²³ le²³ton⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST home POSTP
 ‘He is at home.’

In (10), the hearer is closer to the key, and *le²³ton⁴⁴* is supposed to be able to appear according to Table 4. However, *le²³ha⁴⁴* is also allowed, which cannot be explained by Table 4.

- (10) My colleague is searching for a key in our company office, but cannot find it. He calls me to complain while I am home. I say:
 钥匙 来东/来亨 公司 里 个 哪格 会
hiaʔzi²³ le²³ton⁴⁴/le²³ha⁴⁴ koŋ⁴⁴si⁴⁴ li¹³ gəʔ², naʔkaʔ⁴ hue²³
 key EXIST company POSTP should how will
 冇有 呢
ŋ⁴⁴nio²³ni³¹?
 be.not.in INT
 ‘The key should be at the company. How could it not be there?’

Although Song (2021) does not use evidentiality and modality to explain the distinction between *da*, *don* and *han* in Shaoxing, the corresponding forms in Xiaoshan, $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}ton^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$, are related to evidentiality, which is unique and based on spatial deixis. We analyse the distinction of these forms in Section 4.

4 Evidentials in the Xiaoshan dialect

Before we investigate the evidentials in Xiaoshan, we first must introduce a concept named *perceptual field*, defined by Bühler (1934) and applied to evidentiality by Faller (2004). According to Faller (2004: 69), “the perceptual field of a person at time *t* is defined as the set of locations *l* that (s)he has perceptual access to at *t*, where perception may involve any of the senses, not just sight.” Faller (2004: 80) used this concept to argue that indirect evidential *-sqa* in Cusco Quechua is different from the system of enclitics (the Direct *-mi*, the Reportative *-si* and the Conjectural *-chá*) expressing evidentiality in the same language. The enclitics are referred to as ‘propositional-level evidentiality’, which “establishes a relation between the speaker and the proposition expressed” and is the only type to be evidentiality proper, while *-sqa* is referred to as ‘event-level evidentiality’, which expresses the relation between the speaker and the eventuality described and indirectly arises from the deictic system.¹⁹ Faller (2004: 80) argues that “*-sqa* encodes that the event is located outside the perceptual field at topic time from which it follows that the speaker cannot have had direct evidence for it” according to general physical laws; therefore, *-sqa*’s evidential meaning is not directly encoded but a kind of “deictically induced evidential interpretations”. The perceptual field may remind us of the ‘control power’ concept proposed by Song (2021). However, Song’s (2021) ‘control power’ is a concept mainly related to physical distance, while the perceptual field here is a relatively more psychological concept. We will use the same concept to investigate $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}ton^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ in Xiaoshan.

Another concept utilised by Faller (2004) is about time in utterances (as we have cited in the paragraph above), borrowed from Klein (1994). Klein (1994: 3–9) distinguishes three kinds of time in utterances: *topic time* (TT), *time of situation* (TSit) and *time of utterance* (TU). In a sentence like ‘The light was on’, there is a non-finite component, ‘the being-on of the light’, and a finite component which is expressed by tense in this sentence (Klein 1994: 2–3). TSit is the time corresponding to the non-finite part, TT is the time corresponding to the finite part, and TU is the time at which the utterance is made (Klein 1994: 3).

¹⁹ According to Faller (2004: 64), eventuality here is a concept used to denote both event and state, so we use this word in this article the same way.

We first argue that $le^{23}ta^{44}$ implies the eventuality described inside the speaker's perceptual field at TU. As a result, a visual source of information is always expressed by $le^{23}ta^{44}$. In (11a), (11b) and (11c), there are examples where $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$, and $le^{23}hã^{44}$ are used as existential verbs, progressive aspect markers and continuous aspect markers, respectively. However, only $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is allowed here because the information source is visual.

- (11) a. While I am sitting in the living room next to my father, my mother telephones me and asks me where my father is. I answer:

渠 来带/来东/来亨 房间 里
 $fi^{23} le^{23}ta^{44}/\#le^{23}toŋ^{44}/\#le^{23}hã^{44} v\tilde{b}^{23}k\tilde{e}^{44}li^{13}$.
 3SG EXIST room POSTP

'He is in the room (I see him).'

- b. While I am sitting in the living room, watching my father eating lunch, my mother telephones me and asks me what my father is doing. I answer:

渠 来带/来东/来亨 吃 饭
 $fi^{23} le^{23}ta^{44}/\#le^{23}toŋ^{44}/\#le^{23}hã^{44} t\tilde{e}ie^{25}v\tilde{e}^{23}$.
 3SG PROG eat meal

'He is eating a meal (I see him eating).'

- c. It starts raining. I am home, and my mother telephones me to ask if the door to the balcony is closed. I go to the door and find it still open. I answer:

扇 门 开 带/东/亨
 $s\tilde{a}^{34} m\tilde{a}ŋ^{23} k^he^{44} ta^{44}/\#toŋ^{44}/\#hã^{44}$.
 CLF door open CONT

'The door is open (I see the door open).'

The thing to emphasise here is that $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is used regardless of the distance between the speaker and the entity or eventuality described in the utterance since the speaker can obtain the information through vision, which means that the entity or eventuality is still inside the speaker's perceptual field at TU. As shown in (5), repeated herein (12), the speaker can observe these situations from a distant place with some instruments such as binoculars.²⁰

²⁰ One might ask if binoculars create the perception of being much closer. We observed that even without instruments, as long as the speaker can observe the situation, $le^{23}ta^{44}$ will be used.

- (12) A police officer is monitoring a suspect through binoculars and reports to his colleague:

渠 来带 房间 里

$\acute{h}i^{23}$ $le^{23}ta^{44}$ $v\tilde{v}^{23}k\tilde{e}^{44}$ li^{13} .

3SG EXIST room POSTP

‘He is in the room.’

Furthermore, other non-visual senses are also a part of the speaker’s perception. As a result, these senses are also expressed by $le^{23}ta^{44}$. The speaker uses $le^{23}ta^{44}$ for auditory in (13a), olfactory in (13b), gustatory in (13c), and somatosensory evidence in (13d).

- (13) a. While I am on the first floor of my house, my mother calls me to ask where my father is. I cannot see my father, but I can hear his voice from upstairs. I answer:

渠 来带/来东/来亨 屋 里

$\acute{h}i^{23}$ $le^{23}ta^{44}/\#le^{23}to\eta^{44}/\#le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ uo^{25} li^{13} .

3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I hear his voice).’

- b. When I come back home, my mother telephones me and asks where my father is. I cannot see my father, but there remains a strong smell of his unique perfume at the front door. I answer:

渠 来带/来东/来亨 屋 里

$\acute{h}i^{23}$ $le^{23}ta^{44}/\#le^{23}to\eta^{44}/\#le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ uo^{25} li^{13} .

3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I smell his distinct odour).’

- c. While I am eating a piece of watermelon and tasting it, my friend asks me if it is sweet. I answer:

颗 西瓜 蛮 甜 带/东/亨

$k^h o^{23}$ ϵi^{44} kuo^{44} me^{44} $di\tilde{e}^{13}$ $ta^{44}/\#to\eta^{44}/\#h\tilde{a}^{44}$.

CLF watermelon very sweet CONT

‘The watermelon is very sweet (I taste it).’

- d. My friends and I are playing a game in which we need to touch something blind-folded and guess what it is. It is my turn and I feel that the object I am touching is round. I describe it:

个 东西 蛮 圆 带 / 东 / 亨
kəʔ⁵ toŋ⁴⁴ ɛi⁴⁴ me⁴⁴ yə̃¹³ ta⁴⁴ / #toŋ⁴⁴ / #hã⁴⁴.
 CLF object very round CONT

‘The object is very round (I am touching it blindfolded).’

Next, we suggest that *le²³toŋ⁴⁴* expresses that the entity or eventuality described is outside the speaker’s perceptual field at TU. Similar to *-sqa* in Cusco Quechua, this perceptual field-based interpretation causes *le²³toŋ⁴⁴* to be a morpheme for indirect evidence and it is possible to express inference, hearsay, or other indirect evidence through *le²³toŋ⁴⁴*, which is shown in (14a), (14b) and (14c). In these examples, the speaker is not physically in the ‘house’ where the eventuality takes place; the eventuality is obviously not in the speaker’s perceptual field at TU, so the speaker can use *le²³toŋ⁴⁴*, but not *le²³ta⁴⁴*.

- (14) a. I come back from shopping and stand in front of the door of my house. Before I use my key to open the door, my mother calls me to ask where my father is. I see the light has been turned on through the window next to the door. I answer:

渠 来东 / 来带 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³toŋ⁴⁴ / #le²³ta⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I inferred from the turned-on light).’

- b. I am shopping and my mother calls me to ask where my father is. I saw my father at home an hour ago. I answer:

渠 来东 / 来带 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³toŋ⁴⁴ / #le²³ta⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I assumed so because I saw him in the house an hour ago).’

- c. I am shopping and my mother calls me to ask where my father is. My sister told me that my father arrived home five minutes ago. I answer:

渠 来东 / 来带 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³toŋ⁴⁴ / #le²³ta⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I heard from my sister).’

However, in some cases, *le²³ta⁴⁴* can be used to convey indirect evidence.²¹ It might be odd since we suggested *le²³ta⁴⁴* as a sensory evidential, but we argue that the factor influencing the distribution here is still the perceptual field.²² If the speaker is physically in the house and psychologically considers the entire house as his or her perceptual field at TU, he or she would use *le²³ta⁴⁴* instead of *le²³toj⁴⁴*. Otherwise, if the speaker only considers the space around him or her as a perceptual field and the other rooms, whose inside is invisible or unknown to the speaker, out of his or her perceptual field at TU, the speaker would use *le²³toj⁴⁴*. The situation is illustrated in (15a), (15b) and (15c).²³

- (15) a. I come back home and have just entered the door and my mother calls me to ask where my father is. I see my father's shoes in the hallway but cannot see him directly. I answer:

渠 来东/来带 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³toj⁴⁴/le²³ta⁴⁴ uoɿ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I inferred from his shoes in the hallway).’

- b. I come back home and have just entered the door and my mother calls me to ask where my father is. I saw my father at home an hour ago and did not think that he would go out. Therefore, I assume that he is still at home, although I cannot see him now. I answer:

渠 来东/来带 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³toj⁴⁴/le²³ta⁴⁴ uoɿ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I assumed so because I saw him in the house an hour ago).’

- c. I come back home and have just entered the door and my mother calls me to ask where my father is. My sister told me that my father arrived home five minutes ago. However, I cannot see him directly now. I answer:

²¹ Another evidential system where direct and indirect evidence are expressed in the same way is observed in Bulgarian (cf. Smirnova 2012).

²² Though the size of the perceptual field can change, it is always something with a physical shell, like a room, a house or a company.

²³ In addition, the perceptual field sometimes overrides the physical location. For example, when the speaker opens the door before entering the house, he or she is not physically in the house, but as long as the speaker considers the house in his or her perceptual field, he or she can still use sentences with *le²³ta⁴⁴*. Another possible explanation for this phenomenon is that people can use speaker-centred demonstratives for the speaker's motion goal (cf. Hanks 1990: 431; Skilton 2019: 155–159). It is rational to use *le²³ta⁴⁴* here since the house is the speaker's motion goal.

渠 来东/来带 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³toŋ⁴⁴/le²³ta⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I heard from my sister).’

This distinction is more clearly seen in (16a) and (16b). When the client makes a phone call, the speaker can choose to take a small perceptual field and use *le²³toŋ⁴⁴*, or choose the whole company as his or her perceptual field, which contains the manager’s office, and use *le²³ta⁴⁴*. Both of these are possible, as shown in (16a). However, when the client comes to the front desk, and the conversation occurs face-to-face, the speaker cannot take a broad perceptual field. The client right in front of the speaker means that the client is in the company as well, and the speaker cannot be sure that he or she perceives things broader than his or her client does. Therefore, the client at the site becomes an obstacle, reducing the speaker’s perceptual field. As a result, only *le²³toŋ⁴⁴* is allowed, as shown in (16b).

- (16) a. I am at the front desk of a company, and a client asked me where our manager is on the phone. I saw the manager in the office an hour ago. I answer:

科长 来带/来东 办公室 里
k^ho⁴⁴tsã³⁴ le²³ta⁴⁴/le²³toŋ⁴⁴ be²³koŋ⁴⁴səʔ⁵ li¹³.
 manager EXIST office POSTP

‘The manager is in the office (I assumed so because I saw him in the office before).’

- b. I am at the front desk of a company, and a client asks me where our manager is, face to face. I saw the manager in the office an hour ago. I answer:

科长 来带/来东 办公室 里
k^ho⁴⁴tsã³⁴ #le²³ta⁴⁴/le²³toŋ⁴⁴ be²³koŋ⁴⁴səʔ⁵ li¹³.
 manager EXIST office POSTP

‘The manager is in the office (I assumed so because I saw him in the office before).’

A similar situation is provided in (17a) and (17b). In (17a), when the speaker’s mother is not at home, he or she can take either the living room or the whole house as his or her perceptual field, giving rise to the acceptability of both *le²³ta⁴⁴* and *le²³toŋ⁴⁴*. In (17b), when the speaker’s mother is inside the house, the speaker cannot guarantee that he or she perceives broader than his or her

mother does; as a result, the speaker can only regard the living room as his or her perceptual field and an answer with *le²³ta⁴⁴* is infelicitous.

- (17) a. While I am sitting in the living room on the first floor of my house, my mother calls me to ask where my father is. I saw my father on the second floor an hour ago. I answer:

渠 来带/来东 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³ta⁴⁴/le²³toŋ⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I assumed so because I saw him before).’

- b. While I am sitting in the living room on the first floor of my house, my mother comes home from work and asks me where my father is. I saw my father on the second floor an hour ago. I answer:

渠 来带/来东 屋 里
ɦi²³ #le²³ta⁴⁴/le²³toŋ⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I assumed so because I saw him before).’

We now turn to *le²³hã⁴⁴*, a form displaying more complicated conditions on its usage. Some examples are given in (18a), (18b) and (18c). First, *le²³hã⁴⁴* requires the speaker not to be physically in the same place where the entity or eventuality described exists. In these examples, the sentence is grammatical only when the speaker is not in the house. In comparison, when the speaker uses *le²³toŋ⁴⁴*, he or she can be at the same place where the entity or eventuality described exists by taking a narrow perceptual field. Second, the speaker considers the entity described outside his or her perceptual field at TU. Third, the usage of *le²³hã⁴⁴* is also related to the hearer, implying that the speaker also considers the entity outside the hearer’s perceptual field at TU.

- (18) a. While I am driving home, my mother asks me where my father is. I have driven to a place close to our house from which I can see the light turned on in our home. I infer that my father has come back, and I answer:

渠 来亨 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³hã⁴⁴ uoʔ⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I inferred so from the turned-on light).’

- b. While I am shopping, my mother asks me where my father is. I saw my father at home an hour ago. I assume that my father does not go out, and I answer:

渠 来亨 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³hã⁴⁴ uo²⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I assumed so because I saw him in the house an hour ago).’

- c. While I am driving home, my mother asks me where my father is. My sister has told me a few minutes ago that my father arrived home. I answer:

渠 来亨 屋 里
ɦi²³ le²³hã⁴⁴ uo²⁵ li¹³.
 3SG EXIST house POSTP

‘He is in the house (I heard from my sister).’

An example of these conditions was provided in (10) and repeated below in (19). When the speaker wants to simply express that the key is out of his or her perceptual field, he or she uses *le²³toŋ⁴⁴*. When the speaker realises that the hearer cannot find the key and considers it outside the hearer’s perceptual field, he or she uses *le²³hã⁴⁴*.

- (19) My colleague is searching for a key in our company office, but cannot find it. He calls me on the phone to complain while I am home. I say:

钥匙 来东/来亨 公司 里 个 哪格 会
ɦia²³zi²³ le²³toŋ⁴⁴/le²³hã⁴⁴ koŋ⁴⁴si⁴⁴ li¹³ gə², na²ka² ɦue²³
 key EXIST company POSTP should how will
 哪有 呢
ŋ⁴⁴ni²³ni³¹?
 be.not.in INT

‘The key should be at the company. How could it not be there?’

A conflict between spatial and temporal dimensions can occur when uttering something that is not happening at TU. In (20a), the speaker is not physically at the hospital, implying that the hospital is outside the speaker’s perceptual field at TU; therefore, it is natural that *le²³ta⁴⁴* is not allowed. On the other hand, as shown in (20b), when the speaker is physically at the hospital at TU, though the eventuality described is temporally outside the speaker’s perceptual field, *le²³ta⁴⁴* should be used. We suppose that spatial and temporal dimensions of the eventuality can be

disentangled when spatial and temporal dimensions conflict (cf. Link 1998; Krifka 1989, 1998), and the spatial factor overrides the temporal factor when the speaker decides what his or her perceptual field is. The speaker's being at the place where the eventuality took place forces the speaker to describe the eventuality from the topic time (TT) rather than TU, making the eventuality inside the speaker's perceptual field and explaining the usage of *le²³ta⁴⁴* here.²⁴ The use of *le²³ton⁴⁴* in (20b) can be explained similarly in (15a). If the speaker takes a narrow range, such as the room in which he or she is now instead of the whole hospital, as his or her perceptual field, *le²³ton⁴⁴* is used.

- (20) a. I saw my father in the hospital yesterday. I say this at home to my mother now:

□□ 佻 爹 来带/来东/来亨 医院 里
wã²³tsi³⁴ ŋa²³ tia⁴⁴ #le²³ta⁴⁴/le²³ton⁴⁴/le²³hã⁴⁴ i⁴⁴yã²³ li¹³.
yesterday 1PL father EXIST hospital POSTP

‘My father was in the hospital yesterday.’

- b. I saw my father in the hospital yesterday. I say this in the hospital to my mother now:

□□ 佻 爹 来带/来东/来亨 医院 里
wã²³tsi³⁴ ŋa²³ tia⁴⁴ le²³ta⁴⁴/le²³ton⁴⁴/#le²³hã⁴⁴ i⁴⁴yã²³ li¹³.
yesterday 1PL father EXIST hospital POSTP

‘My father was in the hospital yesterday.’

As a result, the evidential meaning in these morphemes is secondary, and the evidentiality system in Xiaoshan arises indirectly from a deictic system based on the speaker's and the hearer's perceptual fields, which is the same as *-sqa* in Cusco Quechua. When an entity or eventuality is inside the speaker's perceptual field, the information source is usually visual or non-visual sensory, so *le²³ta⁴⁴* is used. However, *le²³ta⁴⁴* is also compatible with indirect access in some cases when the speaker takes a broad perceptual field. *le²³ton⁴⁴* and *le²³hã⁴⁴* express the entity or eventuality described outside the speaker's perceptual field. There are two distinctions between *le²³ton⁴⁴* and *le²³hã⁴⁴*. The first is that *le²³hã⁴⁴* requires the speaker not to be at the site where the entity described exists. The other relates to the hearer: the speaker should consider the entity described out of the hearer's perceptual field. Table 5 summarises how these forms are distinguished.²⁵

²⁴ As will be discussed in Section 5, the evidential system based on perceptual fields in Xiaoshan allows the origo to be shifted into the 2nd or 3rd person. It is not mysterious here that the speaker is forced to shift the origo into his or her past self when he or she is at the same place where the eventuality occurred.

²⁵ As shown in Table 5, there is a distinction between direct and indirect sources of information in Xiaoshan,

Table 5: The distribution of $le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toj^{44}$ and $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$.

The speaker's perceptual field	Evidence source	Other conditions	Distribution
Inside the speaker's perceptual field	Direct (vision or other senses)	None	$le^{23}ta^{44}$ (ta^{44})
		None	$le^{23}ta^{44}$ (ta^{44})
Outside the speaker's perceptual field	Indirect	None	$le^{23}toj^{44}$ (toj^{44})
		Outside the hearer's perceptual field and the speaker is not at the site	$le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ ($h\tilde{a}^{44}$)

The evidential system in Xiaoshan is similar to *-sqa* in Cusco Quechua in that both of them arise from spatial deixis concerning the perceptual field. However, there are also differences between them. First, Cusco Quechua has only one morpheme for event-level evidentiality, expressing indirect evidence, but Xiaoshan's system consists of three morphemes, both direct and indirect evidence indirectly expressed. Second, *-sqa* is claimed to “encode that the event is located outside the perceptual field at topic time” (Faller 2004: 80), but Xiaoshan's evidential system is mainly related to the perceptual field at the time of utterance.

5 Properties of Xiaoshan's evidential system from a typological view

We follow Faller (2004) not to regard event-level evidentiality as evidentiality proper since the evidential system in Xiaoshan arises indirectly from a deictic system based on perceptual fields. However, this secondary evidential system in Xiaoshan still exhibits some properties observed in typical evidential systems in other languages. As for the invariant properties of evidentials proposed by Brugman & Macaulay (2015), evidentials in Xiaoshan express information sources (though indirectly) and form a closed class of grammatical items, showing similarity to typical evidential systems.

Brugman & Macaulay (2015: 229–231) also list some other properties an evidential system can

where $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is used to express the information source as vision or other senses. Such a two-way distinction is not rare typologically. Aikhenvald (2004: 26–29) introduced some languages, such as Cherokee and Yukaghir, with a firsthand and non-firsthand distinction system. Also, evidentials in Xiaoshan constitute a closed-class grammatical system fused with aspect and spatial deixis.

have, which vary across languages. First, evidentials may mark the degree of certainty. However, in Xiaoshan, indirect evidentials do not seem to mark certainty because they can appear with adverbs expressing different degrees of certainty, and these adverbs can only take low scopes.^{26,27} This is illustrated in (21a), (21b) and (21c).

- (21) a. I come back home and have just entered the door and my mother calls me to ask me where my father is. I see my father's shoes in the hallway but cannot see him directly. I answer:

渠 肯定/可能 来带 屋 里
ɦi²³ k^hiŋ³⁴ niŋ³¹/k^ho³⁴ nəŋ¹³ le²³ ta⁴⁴ uo^{ʔ5} li¹³.
 3SG must/can EXIST house POSTP

‘He must/may be in the house (I inferred from his shoes in the hallway).’

- b. I am shopping and my mother calls me to ask where my father is. I saw my father at home an hour ago. I answer:

渠 肯定/可能 来东 屋 里
ɦi²³ k^hiŋ³⁴ niŋ³¹/k^ho³⁴ nəŋ¹³ le²³ toŋ⁴⁴ uo^{ʔ5} li¹³.
 3SG must/can EXIST house POSTP

‘He must/may be in the house (I assumed so because I saw him in the house an hour ago).’

- c. I am shopping and my mother calls me to ask where my father is. My sister told me that my father arrived home five minutes ago. I answer:

渠 肯定/可能 来亨 屋 里
ɦi²³ k^hiŋ³⁴ niŋ³¹/k^ho³⁴ nəŋ¹³ le²³ hã⁴⁴ uo^{ʔ5} li¹³.
 3SG must/can EXIST house POSTP

‘He must/may be in the house ((I heard from my sister).’

²⁶ One might doubt that the co-occurrence of evidentials and adverbs expressing the degree of certainty is not enough to prove evidentials in Xiaoshan do not mark the degree of certainty. An example from English, as shown in (ia), might lead to such a conclusion. However, the sentence is unacceptable if we change the adverb *certainly* into *possibly*, as shown in (ib).

(i) a. *She almost certainly must be home.*

b. #*She almost possibly must be home.*

This situation differs from (21a), (21b) and (21c), where adverbs expressing different degrees can co-occur with evidentials, indicating that the evidentials express no specific degree of certainty in Xiaoshan.

²⁷ One might be curious about what scope these adverbs take. As we have clarified in the main text, only a low scope acting on the proposition itself can be taken, meaning ‘Based on what I saw, he must/may be in the house’. A high scope acting on the evidentiality cannot be taken; as a result, (21a) cannot mean that ‘It’s certain/possible that I saw him in the house’.

In addition, Aikhenvald (2015: 265) mentioned that a visual evidential might acquire a meaning related to certainty and general knowledge (also refer to von Fintel & Gillies 2010 for the incompatibility between epistemic modals and direct evidentials). This can explain why modal adverbs cannot co-occur with $le^{23}ta^{44}$ used as a visual evidential, like (22).

- (22) While I am sitting in the living room next to my father, my mother telephones me and asks me where my father is. I answer:

渠 肯定/可能 来带 屋 里
 $\#fi^{23} k^hij^{34} ni\eta^{31} / k^ho^{34} n\eta^{13} le^{23} ta^{44} uo\gamma^5 li^{13}$.
 3SG must/can EXIST house POSTP
 ‘He must/may be in the house (I see him).’

Second, evidentials may shift the origo to 3rd person (and, in some languages, to 2nd person). Brugman & Macaulay (2015: 222) claim that “there are evidential systems which allow the evidential origo to be shifted to the addressee of the speech event, and also systems that allow the origo to index participants in the narrated event instead of the speech event”.²⁸ Xiaoshan seems to allow a shift to the 2nd person or 3rd person, who is usually the protagonist of the story, as shown in (23a) and (23b) (for origo shift, refer to Murray 2021 for a different kind of shift in interrogative sentences; also refer to Korotkova 2016 and Deal 2020 for indexical shift).²⁹

- (23) a. A presenter on a TV program asks the audience:

尔 回到 屋 里 看到 个 陌生人 来带 哪
 $\eta^{23} hue^{13} tv^{53} uo\gamma^5 li^{13}, k^h\tilde{o}^{53} tv^{53} k\tilde{a}\gamma^5 m\tilde{a}\gamma^2 s\tilde{a}^{44} ni\eta^{31} le^{23} ta^{44} na^{13}$
 2SG return house POSTP see CLF stranger EXIST 2PL
 屋 里 尔 会 哪格 做
 $uo\gamma^5 li^{13}, \eta^{23} hue^{31} na\gamma^2 ka^{44} tso^{13}?$
 house POSTP 2SG will how do
 ‘You go back to your house, seeing a stranger in your house. What would you do?’

²⁸ Though not mentioned in Brugman and Macaulay (2015), almost all the examples of origo shift are related to the sensory evidential. The reason is not explicit.

²⁹ Two native speakers think these two sentences sound strange if the speaker is not at the house at the moment of speaking. This might suggest these sentences are not semantically acceptable for them. We still consider these sentences acceptable as other native speakers consider these sentences natural; however, future research is probably necessary.

b. A person tells a story:

渠	回到	屋	里	看到	个	陌生人	来带	□
<i>ɦi²³</i>	<i>ɦue¹³tw⁵³</i>	<i>uo²⁵</i>	<i>li¹³</i> ,	<i>k^hə̃⁵³tw⁵³</i>	<i>kə²⁵</i>	<i>mə²⁵sā⁴⁴niŋ³¹</i>	<i>le²³ta⁴⁴</i>	<i>ga¹³</i>
3SG	return	house	POSTP	see	CLF	stranger	EXIST	3PL
		屋	里					
		<i>uo²⁵</i>	<i>li¹³</i> .					
		house	POSTP					

‘He went back to his house, seeing a stranger in his house.’

Third, in some languages, it is obligatory to use evidentials, which is the case for Xiaoshan. Xiaoshan does not have expressions for existence, progressive aspect or continuous aspect without evidential interpretation. As a result, if we use existential, progressive or continuous aspectual expressions, evidential readings are obligatory to appear.

Fourth, Brugman & Macaulay (2015: 226) argue that “most sets of evidentials are described in the literature as having complementary semantics”, but in some languages, like Karuk, there is an overlap in the meaning of the evidentials. However, in the case of Karuk, there is a form, *yánava*, for general sensory evidence (including visual evidence here), and another form, *súva*, restricted to auditory evidence, and the general one can be used in some contexts to express auditory evidence (Brugman & Macaulay 2015: 228). This makes the auditory form a hyponym of the general form. Although the direct evidential *le²³ta⁴⁴* is compatible with some contexts where the source of information is indirect, as shown in Table 5, Xiaoshan seems not to be the type of overlapping that Brugman & Macaulay (2015) describe.

Fifth, some evidentials are related to truth-conditionality. Faller (2006) provides some tests for truth-conditionality, and we use the one named *challengeability* here (also refer to Matthewson et al. 2007; Murray 2017: 90–92; Murray 2021). It is said that “if an element can be questioned, doubted, rejected or (dis)agreed with, it contributes to the truth conditions of the proposition expressed. Otherwise, it does not” (Faller 2002: 110; slightly reformulated in Faller 2006: 10). An example is given in (24). Here, B cannot express his disagreement against A on the information source, which means that evidentiality in Xiaoshan is irrelevant to truth conditions.

- (24) B, who is A’s mother, is telephoning A to ask if A’s father is at home. A sees his father sitting on the sofa next to him. The conversation follows:

渠 来带 屋 里
 A: hi^{23} $le^{23}ta^{44}$ $uo\gamma^5$ li^{13} .
 3SG EXIST house POSTP
 我 弗 相信 尔 看到 渠
 B: $\#ho^{23}$ $f\partial\gamma^5$ $ei\tilde{a}^{44}$ $ei\eta^{53}$ η^{23} $k^h\tilde{\partial}^{53}$ tv^{53} hi^{23} .
 1SG NEG believe 2SG see 3SG

‘A: He is in the house (I see him). – B: I do not believe that you see him.’

Another test Faller (2006) used is to see if a form takes scope over propositional-level operators, like negation. Although this is not a sufficient test, according to Faller (2006), since de Haan (1997, 1999) claims that evidentials always take broad scope over negation cross-linguistically, the negation test still can be an additional piece of evidence besides the challengeability test. In (25), the negation can never take scope over the evidential.

- (25) I come back home and have just entered the door and my mother calls me to ask me where my father is. I do not see him or any other evidence. I answer:

渠 弗 来带 屋 里
 hi^{23} $f\partial\gamma^5$ $le^{23}ta^{44}$ $uo\gamma^5$ li^{13} .
 3SG NEG EXIST house POSTP

‘(I see that) he is not at home./#I do not see that he is at home.’

Some other typological features can also be examined. Regarding evidentiality’s relevance to the deixis category, de Haan (2005: 389) mentions that “when inferentials are grouped with (kinds of) direct evidence, the deictic presence of the speaker to the result of the action is highlighted” and “when inferentials are kept separate the fact that there is a temporal separation between the action and the speaker is brought to the forefront.” Although $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is compatible with indirect evidence, $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is preferred to express inferential based on sensory evidence, like (15a) and (21a), providing an example of de Haan’s argument.

Another category related to evidentiality and spatial deixis is the grammatical person. De Haan (2005: 382) claims that “there is an apparent incompatibility between indirect evidentiality and 1st-person subjects” and “the reason is of course that it is very hard to have only indirect evidence for actions in which the speaker himself was the main participant.” As support, in Xiaoshan, if we use indirect evidentials, based on the deictic meaning that the eventuality is outside the speaker’s perceptual field, with 1st person, there is always an implicature for the past or future tense. In

(26a), a 1st person subject with $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ or $le^{23}hã^{44}$ being used in reply to the speaker's present situation is inappropriate; only a situation where the temporal interpretation is not present, allows such usage, as illustrated in (26b) and (26c). Since it is impossible for a person not to perceive his or her behaviour at TU, this situation leads to readings with other temporal interpretations except the present. In addition, $le^{23}hã^{44}$ does not only influence the temporal interpretation but also the spatial one, making it clear that the speaker is now not at the place where he or she was eating his or her meal, compared to $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$.

- (26) a. While I am eating lunch, my mother calls me to ask what I am doing. I answer:

我 来东/来亭 吃 饭
 $\eta o^{23} \#le^{23}toŋ^{44}/\#le^{23}hã^{44} \ tɛieʔ^5vẽ^{23}$.
 1SG PROG eat meal

'I am eating a meal.'

- b. I come across my friend. He came to visit me but did not see me an hour ago.

Therefore, he is now asking me what I was doing then. I answer:

我 来东/来亭 吃 饭
 $\eta o^{23} le^{23}toŋ^{44}/le^{23}hã^{44} \ tɛieʔ^5vẽ^{23}$.
 1SG PROG eat meal

'I was eating a meal.'

- c. My friend wants to visit me tomorrow at 11 a.m. but is unsure if I will be home then. He calls me to ask what I would be doing at that time. I answer:

我 应该/可能 来东/来亭 吃 饭
 $\eta o^{23} iŋ^{44}ke^{33}/k^h o^{34}nəŋ^{13} le^{23}toŋ^{44}/le^{23}hã^{44} \ tɛieʔ^5vẽ^{23}$.
 1SG should/can PROG eat meal

'I should/might be eating a meal.'³⁰

Lastly, we observed a particular case where all the morphemes under discussion could appear and describe something visible to the speaker, as shown in (27). We suggest that the phrase $\eta^{23}k^h\tilde{\delta}^{53}$ 'you see' functions as a reminder to the hearer, requiring the hearer to look at something, and as a result, it implies that the source of information is visual. According to Brugman & Macaulay (2015), the speaker will choose the 'strongest' evidential, so $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ and $le^{23}hã^{44}$ here almost lose

³⁰ This sentence will be kind of unnatural if epistemic adverbs are not used here. We consider this to be connected with the future temporal interpretation as the eventuality in future can never be decided at present. Notably, this type of co-occurrence does not mean that these adverbs are obligatorily used with evidentials; it is a result of the temporal interpretation of the sentence.

their evidential meaning and behave only as expressions of existence.³¹ As for the fact that $le^{23}ta^{44}$ can still be used, there is no incompatibility between $\eta^{23}k^h\tilde{\partial}^{53}$ and $le^{23}ta^{44}$, both of which express visual evidence; therefore, here $le^{23}ta^{44}$ may still function as an evidential, with its meaning preserved. A similar function to $\eta^{23}k^h\tilde{\partial}^{53}$ here can be realised by gestures, such as pointing to the window with a finger or a chin.³²

(27) I am walking home with my friend and see a man's shadow reflected in the window of my house from a distant place. I say:

尔 看 有 个 人 来 带 / 来 东 / 来 亨 佢 屋 里
 $\eta^{23} k^h\tilde{\partial}^{53}, hio^{13}k\partial^{25} ni\eta^{23} le^{23}ta^{44}/le^{23}to\eta^{44}/le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44} \eta a^{13} uo\partial^{25} li^{13}$.
 2SG see some person EXIST 1PL house POSTP
 ‘Look! There is a person in our house.’

6 Conclusion

In this article, we analysed the evidential system in Xiaoshan. We argued that the direct and indirect (firsthand and non-firsthand) distinction in Xiaoshan arises indirectly from the perceptual field of the speaker and the hearer. The evidentials encode information about the perceptual fields, and then they implicate direct or indirect evidence sources as a result. In Xiaoshan, $le^{23}ta^{44}$ is a form with a deictic meaning where the entity or eventuality described is inside the speaker's perceptual field, giving rise to a direct evidential meaning. $le^{23}ta^{44}$ can also sometimes convey indirect evidence as long as the entity or eventuality described is considered inside the speaker's perceptual field. $le^{23}to\eta^{44}$ is a form used to convey the entity or eventuality outside the speaker's perceptual field. Compared to $le^{23}ta^{44}$ and $le^{23}to\eta^{44}$, $le^{23}h\tilde{a}^{44}$ is more complicated, where its deictic meaning is that the entity or eventuality described is outside both the speaker's and the hearer's perceptual fields and the speaker is not at the site at the same time. The evidential system in Xiaoshan is a by-product, arising indirectly from the perceptual field interpretation.

We then introduced Xiaoshan's secondary evidential system concretely by discussing whether it exhibits some of the typological properties of an evidential system. As a result, we found that indirect evidentials in Xiaoshan do not pertain to certainty, but rather direct evidentials imply that the speaker is sure. Also, we suggested that direct evidentials in Xiaoshan can shift its origo to 2nd

³¹ Brugman & Macaulay (2015: 214) say that “a model of informativity in which ‘stronger’ evidence counts as ‘more’ or ‘better’ information; that is, that invoking the Gricean Maxim of Quantity concerning this model amounts to the hypothesis that the speaker will choose the ‘strongest’ sanctioned evidential.”

³² Aikhenvald (2018) has mentioned the possibility that a gesture can function as an expression of information source. We suggest that the gestures mentioned here express direct evidence.

or 3rd person. The evidentials in Xiaoshan are obligatory and do not overlap. Xiaoshan's evidential system is also unrelated to truth conditionality. In Xiaoshan, it is normal for 'strong' information to be chosen, such as the speaker's choosing visual evidence rather than indirect evidence, as shown in (27).

We have revealed that Xiaoshan has a secondary evidential system, but some other research still needs to be done. A combination of ta^{44} (the so-called proximal continuous aspect) and the continuous aspect markers $toŋ^{44}$ and $hã^{44}$, which form $ta^{44}toŋ^{44}$ and $ta^{44}hã^{44}$, is possible in Xiaoshan. There is still no explanation for such combinations. Also, evidentiality is known to be related to mirativity in many languages; it will be another task to investigate if evidentials are related to mirativity in Xiaoshan.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004) *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2015) Evidentials: Their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2): 239–277. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2015-0008>.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2018) Evidentiality: The framework. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 1–43. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Randy J. LaPolla (2007) New perspectives on evidentials: A view from Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 30(2): 1–16.
- Boye, Kasper (2012) *Epistemic meaning: A crosslinguistic and functional-cognitive study*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boye, Kasper (2018) Evidentiality: The notion and the term. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 261–272. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brandão, Ana Paula Barros (2014) A reference grammar of Paresi-Haliti (Arawak). Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.
- Brugman, Claudia M. & Monica Macaulay (2015) Characterizing evidentiality. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2): 201–237. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2015-0007>.
- Bühler, Karl (1934) *Sprachtheorie : Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Jena: Gustav Fischer.
- Chafe, Wallace & Johanna Nichols (eds.) (1986) *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- de Haan, Ferdinand (1997) *The interaction of modality and negation*. New York: Garland.
- de Haan, Ferdinand (1999) Evidentiality and epistemic modality: Setting boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 18(1): 83–101.
- de Haan, Ferdinand (2005) Encoding speaker perspective: Evidentials. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier,

- Adam Hodges & David S. Rood (eds.), *Linguistic diversity and language theories*, 379–397. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Deal, Amy Rose (2020) *A theory of indexical shift: Meaning, grammar, and crosslinguistic variation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Faller, Martina (2002) Semantics and pragmatics of evidentials in Cuzco Quechua. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Faller, Martina (2004) The deictic core of ‘non-experienced past’ in Cuzco Quechua. *Journal of Semantics* 21(1): 45–85. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/21.1.45>.
- Faller, Martina (2006) Evidentiality below and above speech acts. Manuscript.
<http://personalpages.manchester.ac.uk/staff/Martina.T.Faller/documents/Evidentiality.Above.Below.pdf> (last access 14 March 2023)
- Faller, Martina (2019) The discourse commitments of illocutionary reportatives. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 12(8): 1–53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.12.8>.
- Hanks, William F. (1990) *Referential practice: Language and lived space among the Maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hanks, William F. (2017) Deixis and pragmatics. In Mark Aronoff (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.213>.
- Ho, Dah-an (2015) Chinese dialects. In William S-Y. Wang & Chaofen Sun (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Chinese linguistics*, 149–159. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, Wolfgang (1994) *Time in language*. London: Routledge.
- Korotkova, Natalia (2016) Heterogeneity and uniformity in the evidential domain. Doctoral dissertation, University of California.
- Krifka, Manfred (1989) Nominal reference, temporal constitution and quantification in event semantics. In Renate Bartsch, Johan van Benthem & Peter van Emde Boas (eds.), *Semantics and contextual expression*, 75–115. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Krifka, Manfred (1998) The origin of telicity. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, 197–235. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Lazard, Gilbert (2001) On the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3): 359–367. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00008-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00008-4).
- Levinson, Stephen C (2018a) Introduction: Demonstratives: Patterns in diversity. In Stephen C. Levinson, Sarah Cutfield, Michael J. Dunn, N. J. Enfield & Sérgio Meira (eds.), *Demonstratives in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C (2018b) Yéli Dnye: Demonstratives in the language of Rossel Island, Papua

- New Guinea. In Stephen C. Levinson, Sarah Cutfield, Michael J. Dunn, N. J. Enfield & Sérgio Meira (eds.), *Demonstratives in cross-linguistic perspective*, 318–342. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Link, Godehard (1998) *Algebraic semantics in language and philosophy*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Liu, Danqing (2001) Wuyu de jufa leixing tedian [The typological features of the grammar in Wu]. *Fangyan [Dialect]* 4: 332–343.
- Matthews, Peter H. (2007) *Oxford concise dictionary of linguistics*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis & Hotze Rullmann (2007) Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St'át'imcets. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 7: 203–256. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.7.07mat>.
- Mélac, Eric (2024) The links between evidentiality, modality, and grammaticalization. *Studies in Language* 48(3): 513–542. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.24011.mel>.
- Murray, Sarah E. (2017) *The semantics of evidentials*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Murray, Sarah E. (2021) Evidentiality, modality and speech acts. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 7: 213–233. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011718-012625>.
- Ōnisi, Hiroko (1999) *Xiaoshan fangyan yanjiu* [A research of the Xiaoshan dialect]. Tokyo: Kōbun Syuppan.
- Palmer, Frank R. (2001) *Mood and modality*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plungian, Vladimir A. (2001) The place of evidentiality within the universal grammatical space. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3): 349–357. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00006-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00006-0).
- Qian, Nairong (1997) Wuyu zhong de “lai” he “lai”zijiegou [“lai” and “lai” structure in Wu]. *Shanghaidaxue Xuebao (Shehuikexue Ban)* [Journal of Shanghai University (Social Science)] 4(3): 102–108.
- Romero-Méndez, Rodrigo (2009) A reference grammar of Ayutla Mixe (Tukyo'm Ayuujk). Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York.
- Rooryck, Johan (2001) Evidentiality, part I. *Glott International* 5: 125–133.
- Ruan, Guijun (2009) *Ningbo fangyan yufa yanjiu* [A research on the grammar of the Ningbo dialect]. Wuhan: Huazhongshifandaxue Chubanshe.
- Schlichter, Alice (1986) The origins and deictic nature of Wintu evidentials. In Wallace Chafe & Johanna Nichols (eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, 46–59. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Sheng, Yimin (2014) Wuyu Shaoxing Keqiaohua cankaoyufa [The reference grammar of Shaoxing Keqiao Wu dialect]. Doctoral dissertation, Nankai University.
- Skilton, E. Amalia (2019) Spatial and non-spatial deixis in Cushillococha Ticuna. Doctoral dissertation, University of California.
- Skilton, E. Amalia (2021) Demonstratives and visibility: Data from Ticuna and implications for theories of deixis. *Language* 97(4): 793–824. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2021.0065>.
- Smirnova, Anastasia (2012) Evidentiality in Bulgarian: Temporality, epistemic modality, and information source. *Journal of Semantics* 30: 479–532. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffs017>.
- Song, Tianhong (2015) Syōkō hōgen no syozai hyōgen “leda” “ledoŋ” “lehaŋ” [Substantive verb “leda”, “ledoŋ”, “lehaŋ” in Shaoxing dialect]. *Tyūgoku Gogaku* [Chinese Linguistics] 262: 153–167.
- Song, Tianhong (2021) Syōkō hōgen no sonzai hyōgen “V-da” “V-doŋ” “V-haŋ” [Existential expressions “V-da” “V-doŋ” “V-haŋ” in Shaoxing dialect]. *Kansaigaikokugodaigaku Kenkyū Ronsyū* [Journal of Inquiry and Research of Kansai Gaidai University] 113: 135–150. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.18956/00007962>.
- Tao, Huan (1996) Shaoxing fangyan de ti [Aspects in the Shaoxing dialect]. In Song-Hing Chang (ed.), *Dongci de ti* [Aspects], 302–330. Hong Kong: T. T. Ng Chinese Language Research Centre of The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Tournadre, Nicolas & Randy J. LaPolla (2014) Towards a new approach to evidentiality. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 37(2): 240–262. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/ltba.37.2.04tou>.
- von Fintel, Kai & Anthony S. Gillies (2010) Must...stay...strong!. *Natural Language Semantics* 18: 351–383. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-010-9058-2>.
- Wang, Futang (1998) Shaoxing fangyan zhong biao chusuo de zhuci “dong”, “dai”, “heng” [Locative particles “dong”, “dai” and “heng” in Shaoxing dialect]. *Yuyanxue Luncong* [Studies in Linguistics] 21: 1–11.
- Wiemer, Björn (2018) Evidentials and epistemic modality. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of evidentiality*, 85–108. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Willett, Thomas (1988) A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.12.1.04wil>.
- Wu, Zihui (2007) Shaoxing fangyan de renchengdaici he yiwendaici [On the personal pronouns and interrogative pronouns in Shaoxing dialect]. *Zhejiangjiaoyuxueyuan Xuebao* [Journal of Zhejiang Education Institute] 2: 95–102.

- Ye, Zugui (2014) Shaoxing diqu fangyan de renchengdaici lunlüe [On personal pronouns in Shaoxing dialect]. *Ningbodaxue Xuebao (Renwenkexue Ban)* [Journal of Ningbo University (Liberal Arts Edition)] 27(2): 71–75.
- You, Rujie (2018) *Wuyu fangyanxue* [Dialectology of Wu language]. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiaoyu Chubanshe.
- Zhengzhang, Shangfang (1987) *Zhongguo yuyan dituji (Wuyu)* [The language atlas of Chinese (Wu dialect)]. Hong Kong: Longman Publishing Company.

空間指示と証拠性

— 呉語蕭山方言を中心に —

葉 晨傑

【要旨】 本稿では、蕭山方言には存在表現やアスペクト形式と融合した証拠性標示 ($le^{23}ta^{44}$, $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$, $le^{23}hã^{44}$) があることを示唆する。これらの形式の証拠性の意味は、話し手と聞き手の知覚領域に関わる空間指示から生じたものである。 $le^{23}ta^{44}$ は、話し手の知覚領域の内部にある物事を表す形式で、通常、直接証拠と解釈される。 $le^{23}toŋ^{44}$ と $le^{23}hã^{44}$ はどちらも話し手の知覚領域の外にある物事を表し、間接証拠と解釈される。一方、 $le^{23}hã^{44}$ には使用上他の制限もあり、話し手が物事のある場所にいらないことと、物事が聞き手の知覚領域の外にあることが求められる。蕭山方言の証拠性システムは二次的なものではあるが、類型的に他の言語にある典型的な証拠性システムと類似点が多い。

【キーワード】 蕭山方言, 証拠性, 空間指示, 存在表現, アスペクト形式

受領日 2024年6月13日
受理日 2024年9月2日