

On Evidentiality and Perception. Ambivalent adjectives in the Spanish non-finite complements of *ver*¹

Ángeles Carrasco Gutiérrez
Angeles.CGutierrez@uclm.es

University of Castilla-La Mancha (Spain)

ABSTRACT.

In this paper, I will pay attention to the behavior of adjectives such as *altísimo* and *torpe*, called *ambivalent* (Luján 1981) or *underspecified* (Fernández Leborans 1995), due to the fact that they can be combined with both the copulative verb *ser* and the copulative verb *estar* in languages such as Spanish. More specifically, I am interested in two structures, both of them dependent on the Spanish verb of perception *ver*. In the first, *altísimo* and *torpe* combine with the copula *estar* in infinitive clauses. In the second, subordinate infinitive clauses are headed by the copula *ser*. I will try to elucidate which is the contribution of the copulative verbs to the interpretation of these structures. With Escandell-Vidal (2018), I assume that the adjectives *altísimo* and *torpe* in combination with *estar* give rise to an evidential effect: the spatio-temporal situation to which the property they denote is anchored is conceived as a situation of visual experience. In the first of the structures I am interested in, the source of information is likewise encoded in the verb of perception. Therefore, the research question that will guide this study is whether the evidential content is actually being expressed twice.

KEYWORDS.

Evidentiality; verbs of perception; ambivalent adjectives.

RESUMEN.

En este trabajo, prestaré atención al comportamiento de adjetivos como *altísimo* y *torpe*, llamados *ambivalentes* (Luján 1981) o *infraespecificados* (Fernández Leborans 1995), debido a que pueden combinarse tanto con el verbo copulativo *ser* como con el verbo copulativo *estar* en lenguas como el español. Más en concreto, me interesan dos estructuras, ambas dependientes del verbo español de percepción *ver*. En la primera, los adjetivos se combinan con la cópula *estar* en oraciones de infinitivo. En la segunda, las oraciones de infinitivo subordinadas a *ver* están encabezadas por la cópula *ser*. Mi objetivo es tratar de elucidar cuál es la contribución de las cópulas a la interpretación de estas estructuras. Asumo con Escandell-Vidal (2018) que los adjetivos *altísimo* y *torpe* en combinación con *estar* dan lugar a

¹ To my dear colleague Fátima Oliveira. This study is part of the research project SBPLY/19/180501/000051 *Syntax variation in Spanish: the verbal phrase*, financed by the regional government of Castilla-La Mancha with the support of the European Regional Development Funds. I would like to thank the audience of the XIV *International Congress of General Linguistics* (University of Sevilla, Spain, June 23-25, 2021), the 54th *Annual Meeting of the Societas Lingüística Europaea* (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece, 30 August-3 September, 2021), and the III *Doctoral Seminars ALTYA* (University of Jaen, April 21-22, 2022) for their thoughtful remarks.

un efecto evidencial: la situación espacio-temporal a la que se ancla la propiedad que denotan se concibe como una situación de experiencia visual. En la primera de las estructuras que me interesan la fuente de información está codificada asimismo en el verbo de percepción. Por tanto, la pregunta de investigación que guiará este estudio es si el contenido evidencial se está expresando realmente dos veces.

PALABRAS CLAVE.

Evidencialidad; verbos de percepción; adjetivos ambivalentes.

1. Introduction

In this paper, I am interested in the behavior of adjectives denoting physical properties, like *altísimo* in (1a), and evaluative adjectives like *torpe*, in (1b). Both can co-appear with the copulas *ser* and *estar*:

- (1) a. Juan {es ~ está} *altísimo*.
 Juan is_{SER [PRS. 3SG]} ~ is_{ESTAR [PRS. 3SG]} very tall_{.M.SG}
 ‘Juan is_{SER/ESTAR} very tall’
- b. Juan {es ~ está} *torpe*.
 Juan is_{SER [PRS. 3SG]} ~ is_{ESTAR [PRS. 3SG]} clumsy
 ‘Juan is_{SER/ESTAR} clumsy’

It is wellknown that *ser* is usually combined with *Individual-Level Predicates*, that is, with predicates that denote unbounded properties that allow entities to be included in classes (Carlson 1977). On the contrary, *estar* is usually combined with *Stage-Level Predicates*, that is, predicates that denote bounded and non-classifying properties.² That’s why adjectives such as *altísimo* or *torpe*³ have been considered to belong to a different class, called *ambivalent* (see Luján 1981) or *underspecified* adjectives (see Fernández Leborans 1995).

To analyze the behavior of the adjectives in (1), I will start from the

² The literature on the copulative verbs *ser* and *estar* is very extensive. For the main approaches to explain the selection of the copulas and for some salient references, see Escandell-Vidal (2018: 61-64).

³ For studies on this type of adjectives, see Arche (2006), (2011), Martin (2006), Marín (2010), Fábregas, Leferman & Marín (2013), Carrasco Gutiérrez (2017), Leferman (2017), among others.

proposal of Escandell-Vidal (2018). According to this author, *altísimo* and *torpe* should be regarded as Individual-Level Predicates. The examples in (2) will help us to explain her point of view:

- (2) a. Acabo de encontrar = me con los Peláez. Su hijo está {*enfermo* finish_{:PRS.1SG} of meet_{:INF}-myself with the_{:M.PL} Peláez their son is_{ESTAR [PRS.3SG]} sick_{:M.SG} ~ *altísimo* ~ *torpe*}.
 ~ very tall_{:M.SG} ~ clumsy
 ‘I’ve just met the Peláez. Their son is_{ESTAR} sick ~ very tall ~ clumsy’
- b. Hace mucho que no veo a los Peláez. Su hijo está make_{:PRS.3SG} a lot that not see_{:PRS.1SG} to the_{:M.PL} Peláez their son is_{ESTAR [PRS.3SG]} {*enfermo* ~ #*altísimo* ~ #*torpe*}.
 sick_{:M.SG} ~ very tall_{:M.SG} ~ clumsy
 ‘I have not seen the Peláez for a long time. Their son is_{ESTAR} sick ~ very tall ~ clumsy’
 [adapted from Escandell-Vidal (2018: 59), exs. (1a-b), (2a-b)]

In both (2a) and (2b) the copula is *estar*. So, if *altísimo* and *torpe* were ambivalent adjectives, the combination with the copula should be possible. Note that this prediction is not borne out. *Altísimo* and *torpe* render (2b) unacceptable. The Stage-Level Predicate *enfermo* does not.

If we aim to understand what happens in these examples, we need to pay attention to a crucial difference. In (2a), the state of affairs represented by the Peláez son’s being ill, very tall or clumsy is reported as related to a perceptual experience of the speaker. Instead, in (2b), there is an explicit indication that the meeting did not take place. So, the speaker couldn’t see the Peláez son. Escandell-Vidal claims that in the latter contexts Individual-Level Predicates are excluded. The reason is that they are sensitive to what it is called *direct experience effect*. Stage-Level Predicates are not.

Let’s briefly put together Escandell-Vidal’s main ideas to explain where this effect comes from:

- First, both the copula *estar* and the adjectives have their own semantic features that combine compositionally to give rise to a complex predication.
- Second, *estar* introduces into the semantic representation a presuppositional requirement: there must be a specific spatio-temporal situation to which the predication is anchored.⁴
- Third, the spatio-temporal anchoring presupposition of *estar* and the unbounded and classifying nature of Individual-Level adjectives are not compatible semantic features. Thus, their combination causes a mismatch that is resolved through an inferential process. As a result, we get a systematic evidential interpretation.⁵ More precisely, the spatio-temporal situation to which the predication is anchored would be conceived as a situation of direct or visual experience. In other words, in (1a) and (1b) it would be asserted that there is a situation in which an entity perceives the state of the Peláez son's being very tall or clumsy.

I am going to leave aside the question of the relevance of maintaining a third group of ambivalent adjectives. I share the aspiration to simplification. However, I think that explanations that try all adjectives to fit into the two types commonly accepted, Individual-Level Predicates and Stage-Level Predicates, should address not only the behavior of adjectives such as *altísimo* or *torpe*, but also the behavior of adjectives like *nervioso*. As can be seen in (3b), *nervioso* is not sensitive to the direct experience effect. That means that it cannot be considered as an Individual-Level, but a Stage-Level Predicate. So, it would be necessary to explain also which would be the interpretive consequence of the semantic mismatch of its combination with the copula *ser* (3a).

4 Leonetti & Escibano (2018) use the term *situational dependency requirement* (see also Escandell & Leonetti 2002). For previous formulations, see Clements (1988), Maienborn (2005), Arche (2006), Deo, Sánchez-Alonso & Piñango (2017). The anchoring presupposition can also be related to studies in which the behavior of *estar* is attempted to be derived from its original spatial meaning. See Gruber (1965), Anderson (1971), Jackendoff (1990), Mateu (2002), Marín (2010), Gallego & Uriagereka (2009), Brucart (2010), Mangialavori (2013a), (2013b).

5 The strategy chosen to resolve the conflict resulting from the lack of feature affinity is conceived as a variant of the presupposition accommodation mechanism: "In informal terms, when a linguistic expression requires the acceptance of a certain background assumption, and this is not already present in the context, the assumption is added inferentially in order to proceed with the interpretation", p. 72 (trans., ACG).

- (3) a. Juan {es ~ está} nervioso.
 Juan is_{SER [PRS. 3SG]} ~ is_{ESTAR [PRS. 3SG]} nervous_{:M.SG}
 'Juan is_{SER/ESTAR} very nervous'
- b. Hace mucho que no veo a los Peláez. Su hijo está nervioso.
 make_{:PRS.3SG} a lot that not see_{:PRS.1SG} to the_{:M.PL}
 Peláez their son is_{ESTAR [PRS.3SG]} nervous_{:M.SG}
 'I have not seen the Peláez for a long time. Their son is_{ESTAR} nervous'

In this paper, I will focus on the behavior of adjectives like *altísimo* and *torpe* in combination with *estar* in the infinitive complements of the Spanish verb of perception *ver*. These structures would have the peculiarity that the source of information is expressed twice, at least apparently, i.e., by means of the matrix verb of perception, and inferentially. My research question is whether there is indeed redundancy in the expression of the source of information. Despite appearances, I will propose that the source of information, the visual experience, is expressed just once, by means of the verb of perception. Two properties of the construction would block the evidential effect: the first one is the morphological defectivity of infinitives; the second one is the syntax of the embedded complement.

The study is organized as follows. In section 2, I will present the relevant data. In section 3, I will pay attention to the selection properties of *ver* in non-epistemic perception contexts, and I will explain why adjectives like *altísimo* are rejected, but adjectives like *torpe* are not. In section 4, I will give an answer to the research question of the paper. In addition, one more context will be examined: infinitive complements with the copula *ser*. Finally, section 5 summarizes the main conclusions.

2. (In)compatibility of the evidential indications

Let's begin section 2 with the following example:

- (4) A: -¿Cómo es posible? No consigue
 abrir la puerta... ¿Qué
 how is_{SER [PRS. 3SG]} possible? not manage_{:PRS.3SG}
 open_{:INF} the_{:F.SG} door... what
 le pasa?
 him_{:DAT} happens_{:PRS.3SG}?
 'How is it possible? He can't get the door open. What happens
 to him?'
- B: - No sé... Estará dormido /cansado/
 borracho/drogado.
 not know_{:PRS.1SG}... is_{ESTAR [FUT.3SG]} asleep_{:M.SG} /tired_{:M.SG}/
 drunk_{:M.SG} /drugged_{:M.SG}
 'I don't know. He must be_{ESTAR} asleep/tired/drunken/drugged'
- B': - # No sé... Estará torpe /tonto /lento...
 not know_{:PRS.1SG} ... is_{ESTAR [FUT.3SG]} clumsy/stupid_{:M.SG} /slow_{:M.SG}...
 'I don't know. He must be_{ESTAR} clumsy/stupid/slow'
 [Escandell-Vidal (2018: 90), ex. (43)]

According to Escandell-Vidal, the conjectural future in (4) indicates that the sentence's statement is inferred from indirect evidence. Thus, the incompatibility of the future with Individual-Level Predicates in constructions with the copula *estar* is due to a conflict between opposite evidential indications: "... conjecture is exactly the opposite of direct experience, since one can only speculate about what is unknown", p. 93 (trans. ACG). The incompatibility disappears if the information about the evidential source falls on different propositional contents. That's what happens in (5), where the conjectural future and the copula *estar* head different sentences:

- (5) A: - Lo estoy viendo desde aquí y no
 lo consigue... ¿Qué le
 him_{:ACC} is_{ESTAR} see_{:PRS.PROG.1SG} from here and not
 it_{:ACC} get_{:PRS.3SG}... what him_{:DAT}
 pasa?
 happens_{:PRS.3SG}?
 'I am seeing him from here, and he can't get it. What happens to him?'

B: -Será que está torpe /tonto/ lento...
 is_{SER [FUT.3SG]} que is_{ESTAR [PRS.3SG]} clumsy/stupid_{.M.SG}/ slow_{.MSG}...
 'It must be_{SER} that he is_{ESTAR} clumsy/stupid/slow'
 [Escandell-Vidal (2018: 95), ex. (52)]

Now, we can look at the examples I am interested in. Consider (6):

- (6) a. *Ayer lo vimos estar *altísimo*.
 yesterday him_{.ACC} see_{.PST PFV.1PL} be_{ESTAR [INF]} very tall_{.M.SG}
 'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} very tall'⁶
 b. Ayer lo vimos estar *torpe*.
 yesterday him_{.ACC} see_{.PST PFV.1PL} be_{ESTAR [INF]} clumsy
 'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} clumsy'

What calls my attention is, first, that there is no indication of different sources of information, but of the same one: direct experience. Second, that one of the adjectives is admitted, *torpe*, but the other is excluded, *altísimo*. Third, that the different behavior of *altísimo* and *torpe* cannot be explained either by relating these examples to (4), or by relating them to (5). Let's see. As in (5), suppose that the two indications of the information source affect different propositional contents. Then, we would have to explain why *altísimo* is excluded just when the embedded structure is headed by an infinitive (6a). As (7) shows, the sentence is grammatical if the embedded structure is headed by an inflected verbal form:

- (7) Ayer vimos que estaba {*altísimo* ~ *torpe*}.
 yesterday see_{.PST PFV.1PL} that was_{ESTAR [PST IPFV.3SG]} very tall_{.M.SG} ~ clumsy
 'Yesterday we saw that he was_{ESTAR} very tall ~ clumsy'

Now suppose, as in (4), that the two indications of the information source affect the same propositional content. Then, the ungrammaticality of (6a) would seem to suggest that there is a certain redundancy in indicating

⁶ (6a, b) are examples of *non-epistemic* or *direct* perception (see section 3). That's why the Spanish infinitives are translated to English as infinitives without *to*. Infinitives with *to* are used in English in perception sentences with an *epistemic* reading.

both through an explicit lexical form (the verb of perception) and through an inferential strategy that the assertion is supported by a visual experience. Note, however, that the grammaticality of (6b) would invalidate this explanation.

Before going on, a clarification is needed. The embedded structure of (6a, b) is halfway between the syntax of (4B, B') and the syntax of (5B) or (7). With the latter it shares the existence of a sentential argument. However, this sentential argument is not semantically equivalent to a *third-order entity*, a proposition, but to a *second-order entity*, an event (Lyons 1977). Consequently, the examples of (6) would share with (4B, B') that the propositional content is unique. So, once we find out why *altísimo* renders (6a) ungrammatical, it's necessary to explain whether there is redundancy in the indication of the source of information in (6b). This is the plan to be developed in the following sections.

Aikhenvald (2004: 88) observes that "Marking evidentiality more than once is different from the multiple expression of any other category: it is never semantically redundant". Nevertheless, she provides only two examples of coincidence of evidential markers in one sentence.

So far, only one such example has found. Tsafiki (Dickinson 2000: 408) allows the reported marker to be repeated to indicate up to three sources 'between the speaker and the original event'. Each source is connected to the previous one. Two sources are indicated in 3.29, and three in 3.30.

Tsafiki

- 3.29 tsachi = la jo-la-jo-ti-e ti-e
 Person-PL be-PL-VCL.BE-REP-DECL say-DECL
 'They say he said they were people'
- 3.30 Man-to = ka ji-ti-e ti-ti-e ti-e
 other-earth = LOC go-REP-DECLsay-REP-DECL say-DECL
 'They say that they say that they say that he went to Santo Domingo'

Note that the morphemes of the quotation's examples indicate up to three indirect reported sources between the speaker and the original event. The examples (6a, b) are very different. In (6b), the two supposed sources

would be direct experiences, and the speaker would be involved in both of them.

3. *Altísimo* and *torpe* in non-epistemic perception complements

Now, it's time to talk about some semantic and syntactic properties of the infinitive complements of the Spanish perception verb *ver*. Consider (8):

- (8) a. *Vimos cerrar la puerta a María.*
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} close_{:.INF} the_{:.F.SG} door to María
 'We saw Mary close the door'
- b. *Vimos que María cerraba la puerta.*
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} that Mary close_{:.PST IPFV.3SG} the_{:.F.SG} door
 'We saw that Mary closed/was closing the door'

Sentences such as (8a) and (8b) are used, respectively, to talk about what is seen and to talk about what is known. In the first case, the perception is *non-epistemic* or *direct*; in the second, *epistemic* or *indirect*. In Spanish, non-epistemic perception structures are headed by infinitives. Instead, epistemic perception structures are headed by inflected verbs. As stated in section 2, the argument of the perception verb behaves in (8a) as a second-order entity from a semantic point of view, i.e., it denotes a state of affairs, an event. On the contrary, the argument of the perception verb behaves in (8b) as a third-order entity, i.e., it denotes a proposition.

In addition to the syntactic and semantic differences just mentioned, there is another characteristic that is relevant for my purposes: stative predicates tend to be rejected in direct perception structures (see 9a), but to be accepted in indirect ones (see 9b):

- (9) a. **Vimos estar cerrada la puerta.*
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} be_{ESTAR [INF]} closed_{:.F.SG} the_{:.F.SG} door
 'We saw the door be_{ESTAR} closed'
- b. *Vimos que la puerta estaba cerrada.*
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} that the_{:.F.SG} door was_{ESTAR [PST IPFV.3SG]} closed_{:.F.SG}
 'We saw that the door was_{ESTAR} closed'

In previous works (Carrasco Gutiérrez & González Rodríguez 2011, Carrasco Gutiérrez 2018), I proposed an explanation for the resistance of states to appear in the infinitive clauses subordinated to *ver*. The key ideas are the following:

- First, to perceive an event means to witness a change of state:

I mean that the percipient must see A *at the time it passes from state S₁ to S₂* and A's being in state S₁ must look different to him that A's being in state S₂. There must be some visual differentiation between *the temporally successive states whose succession constitute the event*.

Dretske (1969: 32)

- Second, perception verbs denote physical events that enter into different overlapping relationships with the events denoted by the embedded predicates. The kind of overlapping relationship depends on the subordinate subeventive structure. In (10a), the event of perception is included in the perceived event, a non-instantaneous process that lacks lexically determined initial or final states. In (10b), there is complete simultaneity. The embedded event is instantaneous. In (10c) and (10d) there is, respectively, simultaneity with the final and with the initial state:⁷

- (10) a. Vimos correr por el parque a María.
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} run_{:.INF} through the_{:.M.SG} park to María
 'We saw Mary run through the park'
- b. Vimos marcar un gol a María.
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} score_{:.INF} a gol to María
 'We saw Mary score a gol'
- c. Vimos hundir=se el barco.
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} sink_{:.INF} the_{:.M.SG} boat
 'We saw the boat sink'
- d. Vimos salir=se la leche del cazo.
 see_{:.PST PFV.1PL} come.out_{:.INF} the_{:.F.SG} milk of.the_{:.M.SG} pan
 'We saw the milk come out of the pan'

⁷ I assume the typology of events of Moreno Cabrera (2003).

- Third, in any work on subeventive structure, states are considered as primitives of the analysis. They are atoms. They are not the appropriate type of event in non-epistemic perception contexts because they are homogeneous. In other words, there are no changes or progress in the properties and locations that they denote.

- Nevertheless, Stage-Level Predicates can be embedded if explicitly bounded, as in (11). The temporal expressions *hasta las 20:00* and *dos horas* introduce transitions to new states of affairs. So, due to these external temporal limits, states behave as non-homogeneous events.

- (11) a. Lo vimos estar dormido *(hasta las 20:00).
 him_{:ACC} see_{:PST PFV.1PL} be_{ESTAR [INF]} asleep_{:M.SG} until the_{:F.PL}
 20:00
 'We saw him be_{ESTAR} asleep (until 20:00)'
- b. Lo vimos estar en la reunión *(dos horas).
 him_{:ACC} see_{:PST PFV.1PL} be_{ESTAR [INF]} in the_{:F.SG} meeting
 two hours
 'We saw him be_{ESTAR} at the meeting (for two hours)'

The data that I examine in this paper are difficult to fit into this general picture. Neither if we consider with Escandell-Vidal (2018: 88, note 10) that *altísimo* and *torpe* are Individual-Level Predicates, nor if we assume with her (p. 66) that *estar* imposes its stage character from its hierarchically superior position it can be explained the different judgments that the examples in (6a), **Ayer lo vimos estar altísimo*, 'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} very tall', and (6b), *Ayer lo vimos estar torpe*, 'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} clumsy', deserve. From the first point of view, both examples should be ungrammatical. From the second, both should be grammatical.

Besides, as it is shown in (12), the grammaticality judgements do not change with the copula *ser* instead of *estar*:

- (12) a. *Ayer lo vimos ser altísimo.
 yesterday him_{:ACC} see_{:PST PFV.1PL} be_{SER [INF]} very tall_{:M.SG}
 'Yesterday we saw him be_{SER} very tall'

b. Ayer lo vimos ser torpe.
 yesterday him_{:ACC} see_{:PST PFV.1PL} be_{SER (INF)} clumsy
 'Yesterday we saw him be_{SER} clumsy'

To put in a nutshell, predicates such as *torpe* satisfy the selection properties of the verb of perception irrespective of the copula; predicates as *altísimo* do not. In my terms, this means that the embedded predicate of (6a) denotes a homogeneous event. In contrast, the embedded predicate of (6b) denotes a non-homogeneous one. The problem we face is to explain how it is possible for an adjective as *torpe* to be classified as Individual-Level Predicate and to denote a non-homogeneous event at the same time.

Following Carrasco Gutiérrez (2017), I assume that the difference between *altísimo* and *torpe* lies in the nature of the properties they attribute. Specifically, *altísimo* would involve the attribution of a *simple* property to an entity (see 13). *Torpe* would involve the attribution of a *complex* property, constituted by a property and an implicit process (see 14):⁸

(13) Σ (Juan, λx [Altísimo (x)])

(14) Σ (Juan, λx [Torpe_i (x) \Rightarrow ... \Rightarrow Torpe_n (x)])

According to the typology of events of Moreno Cabrera (2003), states are relationships between either entities and properties (*attributive states*), or entities and locations (*locative states*). The attributive state of (13) relates the entity denoted by *Juan* to the property of being very tall. On the contrary, the attributive state of (14) would relate Juan to the property of being an entity that experiences a process of clumsy behavior. This process of clumsy behavior is conceived as the repeated manifestation of a state of clumsiness. The formulation of (14) suggests that in the attribution there is an underlying judgment that is caused by the clumsy participation of the entity denoted by *Juan* in processes that remain unspecified.

My proposal is that the different nature of the attribution shown by the semantic formulas of (13) and (14) would be at the origin of the contrasts of (6a), **Ayer lo vimos estar altísimo*, 'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} very tall', and (6b), *Ayer lo vimos estar torpe*, 'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} clumsy'. I will return

⁸ I am grateful for the help of Juan Carlos Moreno Cabrera in developing this idea.

to this issue in section 4. But to complete the puzzle, two remaining questions have yet to be answered. First, is (6b) an example of a single propositional content that involves a double indication of the same source of information (see section 2)? Second, what is the interpretive effect of substituting *estar* for *ser*? I will dedicate the following section to answer these questions.

4. Three structures and their interpretation

4.1. The adjective *torpe* in infinitive complements headed by *estar*

I will face the first of our remaining questions paying attention both to the defective morphology of the copula and to the syntactic characteristics of direct perception structures. The idea is inspired by the observation of Aikhenvald (2004: 253) that can be found in this quote: “If evidential marking is fused with tense and person, and if dependent clauses allow only a reduce tense choice, one expects them to have fewer evidentiality choices than main clauses, or none at all”.

Before going on, it is necessary to briefly introduce the Evidentiality model that I assume, also following Escandell Vidal (2018) in this regard. With Speas (2008), (2010) and Kalsang, Garfield, Speas & de Villiers (2013), I will take the different sources of information as the result of the possible relationships between three situations:

- Evaluated Situation (ES): the situation about which the proposition *p* is true;
- Information Situation (IS): the situation in which the speaker acquired the evidence or knowledge of *p*;
- Speech Situation (DS): the speaking situation.

The relationships that are established between them are, as in the Reichenbachian approach, of inclusion and precedence (or accessibility). The relationships are established, on the one hand, between the evaluated situation ES and the information acquisition situation, IS, and, on the other, between this and the DS discourse situation.

Escandell-Vidal (2018: 83; translation ACG)

Simplifying a lot for space reasons, when the source of information is direct evidence, there is a relation of inclusion between the *Evaluated Situation*, for example, the manifestation of Juan's clumsy behavior, in *Juan está torpe*, 'Juan is_{ESTAR} clumsy', and the *Information Situation*, the situation of being a witness of the clumsy behaviour. Besides, the Information Situation is accessible at the Speech or Discourse Situation. That means that the information that Juan is_{ESTAR} clumsy is present in the situation in which we are talking, even if Juan is not.⁹

The primitive that interests me is the third one, the *Speech Situation*. The possibility of referring to the Speech Situation depends on the temporal information of the verb forms. Verb forms can be *deictic* or *non-deictic*. Verb forms that can place the Topic Time, i.e., the specific time of the situation about which we make an assertion (see Klein 1994), as before or after the Speech Time or as simultaneous with it are deictic. Verb forms that cannot locate the Topic Time in relation to the Speech Time are non-deictic. Due to their morphological defectivity, non-inflectional verb forms belong to the second group. That is the reason why we do not find infinitives heading main sentences.

Infinitive complement clauses can be analyzed either as structures with a projection of a non-deictic TP (see 15a)¹⁰, or as structures without a projection of any temporal head (15b). The syntax of (15b) is based on the fact that *ver* and the subordinate clause constitute restructuring constructions, as I argued in Carrasco Gutiérrez (2018):

⁹ Inclusion is different from accessibility. A situation S is accessible from another S' iff S' includes the information available in S. S' need not include S itself, but only the information present in S. Consider the situation in which you and I are talking and my diary is open to a page that tells me that I have a doctor's appointment tomorrow afternoon. Now consider the situation tomorrow afternoon when I am at the doctor's office. The present situation does not contain the future situation, but it contains information about it. So, tomorrow's situation is accessible from today's, even though not included in it. (De Villiers & Garfield 2017: 123, footnote 8)

¹⁰ For the sake of simplicity, suffice it to say that following Reichenbachian (1947), that temporal head would provide information just about the relationship between the Time of the Event (E) and the Reference Time (R). The information about the relationship between the Reference Time and the Speech Time (S) couldn't be projected, due to the morphological defectivity of the non-finite verb.

- (15) a. María_i desea [... [_{TP} PRO_i estar torpe durante la entrevista para que no la admitan]].
'María wants to be_{ESTAR} clumsy during the interview so that she will not be admitted'
b. Ayer lo vimos [_{VP} estar torpe].
'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} clumsy'

To my point of view, the non-deictic character of the infinitive is the cause that neither the anchoring situation introduced by *estar* in discourse, nor the entity responsible for the evidential judgment can be established by the copula in an autonomous way.

In (15a), the prospective nature of the main verb places the desire of María in a time posterior to the speaking time. The entity responsible for the evidential judgment could be deduced from the context. In this example, this entity corresponds to the interviewers.

On the contrary, in (15b) the absence of TP projection in the complement results in the temporal information to be unique. It is provided by *ver*. Therefore, the perception and the perceived events are understood as coincident. Remember that the embedded event is a state that involves an implicit process. That is to say, clumsiness can be predicated of somebody, if and only if, somebody behaves in a clumsy way. In any case, the copula introduces the presupposition that there should be an anchoring situation for clumsiness to be predicated of somebody. In (15b), it is the situation of visual perception. Finally, there would be no need to talk about evidential effect. The clumsiness is related to the visual experience of the entity denoted by the subject of the verb of perception.

Thus, the answer to our research question is negative: in (6b), *Ayer lo vimos estar torpe*, 'Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} clumsy', there is no redundancy in the expression of the source of information.

4.2. The adjective *torpe* in infinitive complements headed by *ser*

Unlike *estar*, the copula *ser* would not introduce any anchoring presupposition. The assertion involving sentences such as *Juan is torpe*, 'Juan is_{SER} clumsy', is that Juan's behavior is considered as a property that

determines his membership in the clumsy class of people. Therefore, I propose that what changes in examples in which the copulas alternate, as (6b), *Ayer lo vimos estar torpe*, ‘Yesterday we saw him be_{ESTAR} clumsy’, and (12b), *Ayer lo vimos ser torpe*, ‘Yesterday we saw him be_{SER} clumsy’, is not the perceived event, but the relationship between the entity that is involved in it and the complex property it is attributed. To be more precise, with the copula *estar* the entity denoted by the subject of the infinitive is presented as involved in a behavior whose conceptualization as clumsy depends on an observer. On the contrary, with the copula *ser*, this dependence on an observer would not exist. The observer would only confirm what is known. In other words, the perceived clumsy behavior would just have the value of an evidence, a manifestation of the actions on which the assignment of an entity to the class of clumsy people is based.

5. Main conclusions

The aim of this paper has been to study the behavior of Individual-Level adjectives such as *altísimo* and *torpe* with the copula *estar* in infinitive complements of the Spanish verb of perception *ver*. The main characteristic of this context is that the attributive structure is the second argument of a verb that lexically encodes the source of information. I have assumed, with Escandell-Vidal (2018) that the semantic mismatch caused by the combination of *estar* with Individual-Level predicates gives rise to a systematic evidential effect. So, my research question has been to determine whether there is redundancy in referring both lexically and inferentially to the same source on information. My answer has been that there is no redundancy: the evidential effect fades away, due to the morphological defectivity of the infinitive and the fact that the structures of direct perception taken into account, constitute restructuring contexts.

The work has also led me to give an explanation for the different grammaticality judgements that deserve infinitive attributive complements when the copulative verb, no matter whether it is *ser* or *estar*, is combined with *altísimo* or is combined with *torpe*. It has been crucial in the explanation to focus on the nature of the properties denoted by *altísimo* and *torpe*, a

simple and a complex property, respectively.

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, S. R. (1971). On the role of deep structure in semantic representation. *Foundations of Language*, 6, 197-219.
- Arche, M. J. (2006). *Individuals in Time: Tense, Aspect and the Individual/Stage Distinction*. John Benjamins.
- Arche, M. J. (2011). Las oraciones copulativas agentivas. In V. Escandell-Vidal, M. Leonetti, & C. Sánchez López (Eds.), *60 problemas de gramática dedicados a Ignacio Bosque* (pp. 99-105). Akal.
- Brucart, J. M. (2010). La alternancia *ser/estar* y las construcciones atributivas de localización. In A. Avellana (Comp.). *Actas del V Encuentro de Gramática Generativa* (pp. 115-152). Editorial Universitaria del Comahue.
- Carlson, G. N. (1977). *Reference to kinds in English* [PhD Dissertation]. University of Massachusetts.
- Carrasco Gutiérrez, Á. (2017). ¿Estados progresivos? *Moenia*, 23, 67-417.
- Carrasco Gutiérrez, Á. (2018). What is complex in *verla hacer algo*. In B. Sanromán Vilas (Ed.), *Semi-lexicality: Studies on light verbs, periphrases, and other constructions* (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki) (Tome CIII, pp. 83-120). Société Néophilologique de Helsinki.
- Carrasco Gutiérrez, Á., & González Rodríguez, R. (2011). La percepción visual de estados. In Á. Carrasco Gutiérrez (Ed.), *Sobre estados y estatividad* (pp. 158-188). Lincom Europa.
- Clements, J. C. (1988). The semantics and pragmatics of Spanish <copula + adjective> construction. *Linguistics*, 26(5), 779-822.
- De Villiers, J., & Garfield, J. L. (2017). What do children learn when they learn about evidentiality. In F. N. Ketrez, A. C. Küntay, S. Özçalışkan, & A. Özyürek (Eds.), *Social environment and cognition in language development: Studies in honor of Ayhan Aksu-Koç* (pp. 113-132). John Benjamins.
- Deo, A., Sánchez-Alonso, S., & Piñango, M. (2017). Alternative circumstances of evaluation and the *ser/estar* distinction in Spanish [Master's Thesis]. Yale University.

- Dretske, F. (1969). *Seeing and knowing*. University of Chicago Press.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V. (2018). *Ser y estar con adjetivos. Afinidad y desajuste de rasgos*. *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística*, 48, 57-114.
- Escandell-Vidal, M. V., & Leonetti, M. (2002). Coercion and the Stage/Individual distinction. In J. Gutiérrez-Rexach (Eds.), *From words to discourse: Trends in Spanish semantics and pragmatics* (pp. 159-179). Elsevier.
- Fábregas, A., Leferman, B., & Marín, R. (2013). Evaluative adjectives are Davidsonian states. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, 17, 237-253.
- Fernández Leborans, M. J. (1995). Las construcciones con el verbo estar: aspectos sintácticos y semánticos. *Verba*, 22, 253-284.
- Gallego, Á., & Uriagereka, J. (2009, april 1-3). *Estar = Ser + P*. [Oral Presentation]. XIX Colloquium on Generative Grammar. Vitoria-Gasteiz: University of the Basque Country, Basque Country.
- Gruber, J. (1965). *Studies in lexical relations*. MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1990). *The antisymmetry of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Kalsang, J. G., Speas, M., & de Villiers, J. (2013). Direct evidentials, case, tense and aspect in Tibetan: evidence for a general theory of the semantics of evidentials. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 31(2), 517-561.
- Klein, W. (1994). *Time in language*. Routledge.
- Leferman, B. (2017). *Evaluative adjectives as a window onto inner aspect* [PhD Dissertation]. University of the Basque Country.
- Leonetti, M., & Escribano, G. (2018). El papel del aspecto gramatical en las construcciones con estar. *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística*, 48(1), 115-152.
- Luján, M. (1981). The Spanish copulas as aspectual indicators. *Lingua*, 54(2-3), 165-210.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maienborn, C. (2005). A discourse-based account of Spanish *ser/estar*. *Linguistics*, 43(1), 155-180.
- Mangialavori, M. E. (2013a). Not always a stage. Atypical patterns in Spanish copular clauses. *Iberia*, 5(2), 1-37.
- Mangialavori, M. E. (2013b). Conciliating states and locations: Towards a more comprehensive and in-depth account of the Spanish copula *estar*. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics*, 6(1), 37-78.
- Marín, R. (2010). Spanish adjectives within bounds. In P. Cabredo Hofherr, & O. Matushansky, (Eds.), *Formal analyses in Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 307-322). John Benjamins.

- Martin, F. (2006). *Prédicats statifs, causatifs et résultatifs en discours. Sémantique des adjectifs évaluatifs et des verbes psychologiques* [PhD Dissertation]. Université Libre de Bruxelles.
- Mateu, J. (2002). *Argument structure: Relational construal at the syntax-semantics interface* [PhD Dissertation]. Autonomous University of Barcelona.
- Moreno Cabrera, J. C. (2003). *Semántica y gramática. Sucesos, papeles semánticos y relaciones sintácticas*. Antonio Machado Libros.
- Reichenbach, H. (1947). *Elements of symbolic logic*. MacMillan.
- Speas, M. (2008). On the syntax and semantics of evidentials. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 940-965.
- Speas, M. (2010). Evidentials as Generalized Functional Heads. In A. M. Di Sciullo, & V. Hill (Eds.), *Edges, heads and projections: Interface properties* (pp. 127-150). John Benjamins.