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Introduction: Indexicals

Pure indexicals in English: *I, you, here, now, today, ...*

- In declaratives, indexicals anchored to speech act: *I* to the agent of the speech act (speaker), *you* to the addressee, ...
  
  (1) [Dale and Albert are sitting at a cafe. The waitress, Shelley, comes up and asks them what they’d like.]
  
  
  b. Albert: *I’d like a coffee.*

- In interrogatives, indexicals still anchored to speech act

  (2) [Dale is in the hospital. He wakes up, asks the nurse:]  
  
  a. Dale: *Was I shot?*  
  
  cf. *I was shot.*

  (3) *Are you here today?*  
  
  cf. *You are here today.*

Introduction: Evidentials

The encoding of source of information (Aikhenvald 2004)

- Cheyenne, a Plains Algonquian language spoken in Montana

  (4) *É-hó’táheva-séstse Floyd.*
  
  3-win-RPT.3SG.A  Floyd
  
  ‘Floyd reportedly won.’ / ‘Floyd won, *I* hear.’

- Evidentials in declaratives, anchored to speaker

  (5) *Mó=é-hó’táheva-séstse Floyd?*
  
  y/n=3-win-RPT.3SG.A  Floyd
  
  ‘Did Floyd reportedly win?’ / ‘Given what *you* heard, did Floyd win?’

- Evidentials in interrogatives, anchored to addressee

  - interrogative flip (see, e.g., Speas and Tenny 2003)
Introduction: Talk Overview

- The Cheyenne reportative has an anaphoric indexical component: the (reportative) evidence holder
  - slightly less constrained than pure indexicals
  - more constrained than general anaphora

- Pure indexicals and anaphoric indexicals cannot be represented the same way
- One flips in interrogatives, the other doesn’t

(6) $M\tilde{a}=n\acute{a}-h\acute{o}t\tilde{a}heva-m\acute{a}se$?
y/n=1-win-RPT.1SG
‘Did I reportedly win?’ / ‘Given what you heard, did I win?’
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Pure Indexicals: Different from Anaphors

- Felicitous discourse initially
  - (7) [Discourse initial:] ✓ I won the contest.
  - (8) [Discourse initial:] # She won the contest.

- Different speakers → different content, even in same discourse context
  - (9) Three lawmen are sitting around talking about a girl who was murdered, Laura.
    - Dale: Did you know Laura?
    - Harry: I knew her. [Harry knew Laura]
    - Andy: I knew her. [Andy knew Laura]

- Harry and Andy have uttered the same sentence, but have said different things – not because of the anaphor her
**Indexicals: Different from Anaphors**

- Always the speech event: pure indexicals do not shift in embedded contexts or questions (only in direct quotes, performance)
  
  \[(10)\] *Dale believes that I am the murderer.*

- Not in general bindable (but: *Only I did my homework*)

- Pure indexicals do not have anaphoric uses
  
  \[(11)\] *A man came in. He sat down.*

  \[(12)\] *A speaker came in. #I sat down.*

---

**Kaplan (1978, 1989) Contexts**

- Pre-Kaplan (1978, 1989): Sentences are evaluated with respect to a world \( w \) and time \( t \) of evaluation, and the assignment function \( f \)
  
  - Modals shift \( w \), temporal operators shift \( t \), quantifiers shift \( f \)
    
    \[(13)\] *I could be taller than I actually am.*

- Kaplan (1978, 1989): pure indexicals such as *I* and *you* always refer to something in the (speech) context \( c \):
  
  - \( c_W \) (world of \( c \))
  - \( c_A \) (agent of \( c \))
  - \( c_P \) (position of \( c \))
  - \( c_T \) (time of \( c \)), ...

---

**Kaplan (1978, 1989) Contexts to Content**

- How can one sentence in different contexts express different contents?

- The ‘character’ of a linguistic expression is a function from contexts to contents

- Kaplan (1978): “In different contexts, an utterance of \([(14)]\) expresses different contents (propositions).”

  \[(14)\] *I am here now*

  - \([I]_{cftw} = c_A\)
  - \([here]_{cftw} = c_P\)
  - \([now]_{cftw} = c_T\)

---
Background on Cheyenne

- **Cheyenne**
  - a Plains Algonquian language
  - ~1000 speakers, in Montana and Oklahoma
  - data from my fieldwork, plus Cheyenne Grammar (Leman 1980) and dictionary (Fisher et al. 2006)

- **Evidentiality in Cheyenne**:
  - part of the matrix illocutionary mood paradigm (not syntactically embeddable)
  - four-way evidential distinction: direct, conjectural, reportative, narrative
  - this talk: reportative

Cheyenne Reportative

- The Cheyenne reportative: secondhand reports only
- Thirdhand reports: ‘conjectural’/ indirect evidential
- Shorthand example: Dale to Harry: *Bob is the murderer-DIR*
  Harry to Andy: ✓ *Bob is the murderer-RPT*, # DIR
  Andy to Lucy: ✓ *Bob is the murderer-CNJ*, # RPT
- Different from, e.g., English *reportedly* which is not restricted in this way

Reporting Self Ascriptions

- The Cheyenne reportative: secondhand reports only
- Reports of self-ascriptions: direct evidential
- Shorthand example: Pranav to Hans: *I am hungry-DIR*
  Hans to Eric: ✓ *Pranav is hungry-RPT*, # RPT
  Eric to Stephen: ✓ *Pranav is hungry-RPT*, # DIR
  Stephen to Sarah: ✓ *Pranav is hungry-CNJ*, # RPT
- Different from English *reportedly*?
The Reportative: Source versus Recipient

- Two individuals involved in the reportative evidential:
  - Source of original report (evidence source) and recipient of original report (evidence holder)
- Declarative:
  Bob 3-be.that-RPT.3SG.A DEP-kill-IMPER-DEP
  ‘Bob is reportedly the murderer.’ / ‘Bob is the murderer, I hear.’

  - Evidence source: who knows!
  - Evidence holder: the speaker, Dale
- Evidence holder component is indexical

Evidence as Indexical

- Felicitous discourse initially, like pure indexicals
- Different speakers → different content
  (15) Bob é-nêchóvé-sêstse tsé-na’sené-stse.
  Bob 3-be.that-RPT.3SG.A DEP-kill-IMPER-DEP
  ‘Bob is reportedly the murderer.’ / ‘Bob is the murderer, I hear.’
  - Dale: (15) → Dale heard that Bob is the murderer.
  - Albert: (15) → Albert heard that Bob is the murderer.
- Not bindable (the evidence holder component)
- Evidence holder is not generally anaphoric

Evidence Holder Cannot be Anaphoric

(16)

i. Tsé-h-méo-vóona’o ná-hko’eehe é-ho’eeéstse-Ø
  DEP-PST-early-morning 1-mother 3-incoming.call-DIR
  ‘Early this morning, my mother called’

ii. Ného’eehe é-vónomóhtahe-sêstse
  1-father 3-be.sick.all.night-RPT.3SG.A
  ‘My father was reportedly sick all night’
  # ‘[She was told] my father was sick all night’

  - The evidence holder in (16ii) cannot be the speaker’s mother
  - (If she had said something to me with the reportative, I couldn’t repeat it with the reportative)
  - Different for English *reportedly* and evidence source

Evidentials Differ from Pure Indexicals

- Almost always the speaker: Cheyenne evidentials do not embed (morphosyntactic reasons), but they do shift in questions (and direct quotes, performance)
  (17) Bob mó=é-nêchóvé-sêstse tsé-na’sené-stse?
  Bob y/n=3-be.that-RPT.3SG.A DEP-kill-IMPER-DEP
  ‘Is Bob reportedly the murderer?’ / ‘Given what you hear, is Bob the murderer?’

  - Evidence source: Who knows!
  - Evidence holder: the addressee
- True of evidentials in interrogatives crosslinguistically
Embedded Evidentials

Evidentials can embed in certain languages

- Tibetan evidentials (Garrett 2001)
  - Restricted set of embedding predicates: “verbs of speech or thought”
  - Evidential anchored to matrix subject
- German reportative sollen (Schenner 2008)
  - Restricted set of embedding predicates: “communication, (semi-)factive, certain negative (denial/doubt)”
  - Evidential either anchored to the speaker or anchored to matrix subject

This is still a restricted set of interpretations – not generally anaphoric (Similar to shifted indexicals, logophors; see Rice 1986, Anand 2006, McCready 2007, Schlenker to appear, a.o.)

Evidentials and Indexicals in Declaratives

(18) [I am summoned to the police office where they tell me that I am the murderer that they have been looking for. They arrest me. You come to visit me in my cell and ask why I have been arrested. I say:]

\[ N\acute{a}\-n\acute{e}eh\acute{o}\-v\acute{e}\-m\acute{\text{"o}}se \ ts\acute{\text{"e}}-n\acute{\text{"a}}\-t\text{-sen}\acute{\text{"e}}\-stse. \]

1-be.that-RPT.1SG DEP-kill-IMPER-DEP

‘I am reportedly the murderer.’ / ‘[They say] I am the murderer.’

\[ \rightarrow I \text{ hear that I am the murderer} \]

- Kaplanian analysis of both indexicals: ✓

\[ q = \lambda w[\text{be.the.murderer}(w, i)] \]

\[ q' = \lambda w[\text{RPT}(w, i, q)] \]

(see Murray 2010 for analysis of evidentials)

Interim Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pure indexicals</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>×</th>
<th>×</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anaphoric indexicals</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘General’ anaphors</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidentials as Not-at-issue Content (Murray 2010)

(19) \[ I \text{ am the murderer-DIR} \]

\[ q = \lambda w[\text{be.the.murderer}(w, i)] \]

\[ q' = \lambda w[\text{DIR}(w, i, q)] \]

- Some properties of evidentials due to not-at-issue status, and how not-at-issue information is interpreted (direct restriction)
- Some due to particular evidential relation, i.e. \( \text{DIR}(w, i, q) \)
Evidentials and Indexicals in Interrogatives

(20) [A warrant is issued for my arrest, but I don’t know why. I am hiding out at your house, and the police call. I hear you ask them: Is Sarah the murderer?, but I don’t hear their reply. When you hang up, I ask:]

\[M\ddot{a}=n\acute{a}-\acute{n\acute{e}h\acute{o}v\acute{e}-m\acute{a}se \ ts\acute{e}-n\acute{a}'-s\acute{e}-n\acute{e}-stse. \ y/n=1-be.that-RPT.1SG \ DEP-kill-IMPER-DEP\]

‘I am reportedly the murderer.’ / ‘[They say] I am the murderer.’
→ I hear that I am the murderer

- Kaplanian analysis of both indexicals: 
  - \[q = \lambda w[\text{be}.\text{the}.\text{murderer}(w, i)]\]
  - \[q' = \lambda w[RPT(w, AGT(e), q)]\] ← wrong prediction

Proposal: Two Kinds of Indexicals

- Pure indexicals
  - specialized constant (function), a la Kaplan (1978)
  - refers to (agent of) the speech event
  - \[q = \lambda w[\text{be}.\text{the}.\text{murderer}(w, i)]\]

- Anaphoric indexicals
  - refer to (agent of) the currently topical event
  - usually the speech event
  - can be overridden by other ‘topical events’, e.g., questions, perhaps propositional attitude verbs in some languages
  - \[q' = \lambda w[RPT(w, AGT(e), q)]\]
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Two Kinds of Context

- Two kinds of context (Partee 1989, Condoravdi and Gawron 1996, Bittner 2011, ...):
  - utterance context: the external context of the utterance, a la Kaplan (1978)
  - discourse context: information state, a la Karttunen (1976), Kamp (1981), ...

- Pure indexicals refer to the utterance context (c), represented by the speech event
- Anaphoric indexicals refer to the discourse context (s), to the currently topical event
Background: Anaphora and Centering


- Discourse referents represent objects under discussion, potential antecedents for anaphora (Karttunen 1976)

- Grammatical centering (Grosz et al. 1995), ranked discourse referents

- Anaphora and centering, centering across domains (Stone 1997, Stone and Hardt 1999)

- Top/bottom centering contrast across domains, center vs. periphery of attention (Bittner 2001 et seq.)

Update with Centering (UC, Bittner 2011)

- UC: an update semantics with centering based anaphora

  - models information (propositions, what is added to the common ground) as well as discourse reference

- I use a fragment with discourse referents for individuals, worlds, events, and propositions

- incorporates analysis of evidentials, simple English sentences, parentheticals in Murray (2010)

Utterance Context and Discourse Context

- Utterance context $u$: a pair of a common ground $p_0$ and a speech event $e_0$: $u = \langle p_0, e_0 \rangle$ (Bittner 2011)

- Discourse context: Information state, set of lists of discourse referents for individuals, events, worlds, propositions

- Two sub-lists of discourse referents: top (foreground), bottom (background): $s = \{\langle...,\rangle\}$

  - top list for keeping track of common ground, foregrounded events and individuals
  
  - bottom list for keeping track of content of sentences, backgrounded events and individuals

  - Sample list of discourse referents: $\langle\langle a, w_1, p_0, e_0, p_2, d, e_1, p_1, w_2 \rangle\rangle$

Discourse Initial Update

- Stalnaker (1978) ‘secondary’ or ‘commonplace’ effect of assertion:

  "... the context ... will include any information which the speaker assumes his audience can infer from the performance of the speech act."

- $u = \langle p_0, e_0 \rangle$, where $p_0 = \{w_0, w_1\}$

- Discourse initial update to $s_0$, after Stalnaker (1978), ‘start-up update’ (e.g., Bittner 2011)

  $s_0 = \langle\langle w_0, p_0, e_0, p_2, d, e_1, p_1, w_2 \rangle\rangle$

  - $e_0$ is the speech event
  
  - $p_0$ is the context set
  
  - $w_0, w_1$: worlds in the common ground (context set)
Adding Individuals and Information

Initial state $s_0$: \[
\begin{align*}
\langle w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
\langle w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
e_0 is the speech event 
p_0 is the context set 
w_0, w_1: worlds in the common ground (context set)

- New individuals add a referent to a list
  - a to the top list $\top$, b to the bottom list $\bot$:
    \[
    s_1 = \begin{align*}
\langle a, w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
\langle a, w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
- Assertions add information
  - modeled by reducing the context set (eliminating rows)
  - adding the information that $q$ where $q$ is true in $w_1$ and $w_2$:
    \[
    s_2 = \begin{align*}
\langle a, w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
\langle a, w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\end{align*}
\]

Discourse Initial Update and Indexicals

Initial state $s_0$: \[
\begin{align*}
\langle w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
\langle w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
e_0 is the speech event 
p_0 is the context set 
w_0, w_1: worlds in the common ground (context set)

- Referring to the speech event: $\bar{\top} \bar{e}$
  - rightmost $\rightarrow$ event $e$ in top list $\top$
- Referring to the speaker: $\text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e})$
- Referring to the currently topical event: $\bar{\top} \bar{e}$
  - most prominent event $e$ in top list $\top$
- Referring to the agent of the currently topical event: $\text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e})$
- By default, $\text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e}) = \text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e})$

New Topical Events and Indexicals

Initial state $s_0$: \[
\begin{align*}
\langle w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
\langle w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
e_0: the speech event 
p_0: the context set 
w_0, w_1: worlds in context set

- Certain elements may introduce a new topical event:
  \[
  s_1 = \begin{align*}
  \langle e_1, w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
  \langle e_1, w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
  \end{align*}
  \]
- In this case, $\text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e}) \neq \text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e})$
  - $\top \bar{e} = e_1$
  - $\bar{\top} \bar{e} = e_0$
- $\top \bar{e}$ can change, while $\bar{\top} \bar{e}$ will always pick out $e_0$, the speech event

Evidentials and Indexicals in Declaratives

Initial state $s_0$: \[
\begin{align*}
\langle w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
\langle w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
e_0: the speech event 
p_0: the context set 
w_0, w_1: worlds in context set

(21) Ná-hó’tâheva-máse
1-win-RPT.1SG
‘Given what I heard, I won’
\[
\begin{align*}
\langle w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle \\
\langle w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\end{align*}
\]
e_1: winning event 
$q_1$: proposition that I won 
w_1: world where I won

- First person pronoun: $\text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e}) = \text{agent of } e_0$
- Reportative: $\text{RPT}(w, \text{AGT}(\bar{\top} \bar{e}), p) = \text{agent of } e_0$
Evidentials and Indexicals in Interrogatives

Initial state $s_0$: \[
\langle w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle, \langle w_1, p_0, e_0 \rangle
\]

- $e_0$: the speech event
- $p_0$: the context set
- $w_0, w_1$: worlds in context set

(22) $Mó=ná-hó’táheva-máše$?
y/n=1-win-RPT.1SG
‘Did I reportedly win? / ‘Given what you heard, did I win?’

$\langle e_2, w_0, p_0, e_0 \rangle, q_1, w_1, e_1 \rangle$

- $e_2$: question answering event
- $e_1$: winning event

The interrogative introduces a new topical event $e_2$
First person pronoun: $\text{AGT}(\overrightarrow{\epsilon}) = \text{agent of } e_0$ (speaker)
Reportative: $\text{RPT}(w, \text{AGT}(\overrightarrow{\epsilon}), p) = \text{agent of } e_2$ (addressee)

Summary of Analysis

- Pure indexicals:
  - refer to (agent of) the speech event
  - e.g., $\text{AGT}(\overrightarrow{\epsilon})$
- Anaphoric indexicals:
  - refer to (agent of) the currently topical event
  - e.g., $\text{AGT}(\overrightarrow{\epsilon})$
- Typically, the speech event is the currently topical event
  - usually $\overrightarrow{\epsilon} = \overrightarrow{\epsilon}$
  - can be overridden by other ‘topical events’, e.g., interrogatives, perhaps propositional attitude verbs in some languages
  - if so, then $\overrightarrow{\epsilon} \neq \overrightarrow{\epsilon}$
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## Related Phenomena

(23) That was fun. [for me]

(24) Was that fun? [for you]

(25) Bob might be the murderer. [e.g., my epistemic state]

(26) Might Bob be the murderer? [e.g., your epistemic state]

(27) It is raining. [in place of speaker]

(28) Is it raining? [in place of addressee]

(29) A local bar is selling cheap beer. [place of speaker]

(30) Is a local bar selling cheap beer? [place of addressee]


---

## Evidence Holder = ‘Tasty’ Judge?

- Is the evidence holder the judge argument of predicates of personal taste? (as in Deal and O’Connor 2011)
    - 3-good-taste-RPT.3SG.B
      - ‘It [coffee] reportedly tastes good.’ / ‘It tastes good, I hear.’

- Who is the reportative evidence holder? the speaker, Dale
- Who is the judge for ‘tastes good’? evidence source!

- So, the reportative evidence holder and the judge cannot be represented in the same way, e.g., as both picking out a judge $j$ from the context $c$

---

## Properties of Implicit Arguments

### Felicitous discourse initially

- (31) [Discourse initial:] ✓ A local bar is selling cheap beer.

### Different speakers → different content

- (32) Harry (Washington): A local bar is selling cheap beer.
- (33) Dale (Pennsylvania): A local bar is selling cheap beer.

### Not aways the speech event:

- b. Dale (Pennsylvania): Is a local bar selling cheap beer?

(After Partee 1989, Condoravdi and Gawron 1996, ...)

---
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Summary

- Implicit arguments and anaphors can be interpreted with respect to a variety of things.
- However, implicit arguments, unlike general anaphors, can be interpreted with respect to the speech event.
- Implicit arguments more like definite descriptions than anaphors: (Partee 1989, Condoravdi and Gawron 1996, ...)
- Different levels of restrictedness: pure indexicals, anaphoric indexicals, implicit arguments, pronouns...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pure indexicals</th>
<th>Anaphoric indexicals</th>
<th>Implicit arguments</th>
<th>'General' anaphors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All indexicals are related to topical events
- the speech event: $\overline{\tau \varepsilon}$
- the currently topical event: $\tau \varepsilon$
- What can introduce topical events is limited, could vary by language, construction

One meaning for the reportative that works in both declaratives and interrogatives: $RPT(w, AGT(\overline{\tau \varepsilon}), p)$

Indexicals like English $I$ and the Cheyenne reportative evidential draw on things that are guaranteed to be provided in any discourse, unlike pronouns such as $he$
Thanks!

I would like to thank Maria Bittner, Roger Schwarzschild, Matthew Stone, William Starr, and audiences at Rutgers University and Cornell University for their comments and discussion. I would also like to thank my Cheyenne consultants for their collaboration and our discussions of Cheyenne. Any errors are my own.

Appendix: Template of the Cheyenne Verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
<th>IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRS-TNS-(DRC)-(prefix⁺)-root-(suffix⁺)-[voice]-arg⁺-mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **PRS**: person, e.g., first, second, one argument of the verb
- **TNS**: tense, e.g., present/recent past (default), distant past
- **DRC**: directional, e.g., toward the speaker, away from speaker
- **prefixes, suffixes**: derivation, e.g., intensifiers, manner
- **VOICE**: for transitive verbs, relationship between arguments
- **ARG**: argument agreement, e.g., person, number, obviation
- **MOOD**: illocutionary mood, e.g., interrogative, imperative

I II III IV V VI VII VIII IX

(37) *Né* sta- evá-hose- voom -átse -me -Ø

2- FUT+TRL- back-again- see₂ -1:2 -2PL -DIR

I II+III IV V VII VIII IX

‘I will see you all again soon.’

(38) *Ná* hene’ena -Ø tsé- ohké-heše-amé- emöhóné -stse

1- know -DIR DEP- hab-that-along- hunt -DEP

I V IX I IV V IX

‘I know that he’s been hunting.’ (Leman 1980: 194)
Cheyenne Reportative Evidential in UC

(39) **Ná-hóťáheva-máse.**
1-win-RPT.1SG
‘I reportedly won.’ / ‘Given what I heard, I won.’

\[ \text{[ew|sang}_{w}(\epsilon, \text{AGT}(\overline{T}_{E}), \overline{\omega}), [p|p = \omega]]; \text{RPT}_{w}(\text{AGT}(\overline{T}_{E}), \overline{\omega}); [\neg[p|p = \omega]] \] (present at-issue proposition \( q \))

\[ \text{[p|p = \omega]]} \] (not-at-issue restriction) (new cg)

See Murray (2010) for definitions and further details of the analysis of evidentials (in a fragment without events)
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