Pragmasemantic Analysis of the Hungarian inferential-evidential expression *szerint* 'according to sy./sg.'

Anna Szeteli and Gábor Alberti
University of Pécs, Dept. of Linguistics
anna.szeteli@gmail.com; alberti.gabor@pte.hu

This paper investigates the pragmasemantic role of the epistemic-evidential postpositional expression *szerint* in the Hungarian grammar, which is highly similar to epistemic discourse markers such as *valószínűleg* 'probably', *talán* 'perhaps', *esetleg* 'could possibly': the propositions modified by them should be interpreted as hypotheses.

(1) a. Ili (én)szerintem hazaköltözött.
Ili (I).acto.1Sg home.move.Past ('acto' = 'according to')
'In my opinion, Ili moved back home.'
b. Ili valószínűleg / talán / esetleg hazaköltözött.
Ili probably / perhaps / possibly home.move.Past
'Ili probably / perhaps / possibly moved back home.'

The difference lies exactly with the pronominal component present in *(én)szerintem*. This makes the degree of (un)certainty less precise than in the case of the discourse markers given in (1b), but shows the person r who should be regarded as (i) knowing some evidence e' in support of the proposition e, and (ii) having a general everyday inferential rule (Kugler 2012) which can be specified in the given context as follows: e' → e.

(2) a. *Ili talán / esetleg is hazaköltözött.
Ili perhaps / possibly also home.move.Past
b. Ili (én)szerintem / (ő)szerinte is hazaköltözött.
Ili (I).acto.1Sg / (he).acto.3Sg also home.move.Past
'In my / his opinion too, Ili moved back home.'

It is a further specialty of the paradigm of *szerint*-expressions that this inferential-evidential discourse marker (Willett 1988: 57), in contrast to other discourse markers (2a), can perform the same information-structural functions as a subject or another argument in Hungarian (É. Kiss 2002), namely the function of an *also*-quantifier (2b). This property is obviously thanks to the pronominal basis of *szerint*-expressions. Furthermore, based on the referent who should be regarded as holding the information, *szerint* can express quotative "hearsay" evidence (3a).

(3) a. Ili Péter / az újság szerint hazaköltözött.
Ili acto.Péter / the newspaper home.move.Past
'In Peter's opinion / According to the newspaper, Ili moved back home.'
b. Ili (én)szerintem gyönyörű.
Ili (I).acto.1Sg beautiful
'In my opinion, Ili is beautiful.'

We claim that the answer to the question whether *szerint* is epistemic or evidential only partly depends on the pronominal basis of the given *szerint*-expression. Along the second relevant parameter, depending on the associated predicate, a *szerint* expression can have two related meanings: the probabilistic/inferential one (1a) and one which expresses some kind of judgment (3b). In this case the expression cannot indicate an outer world evidence, it is necessarily the subjective opinion of the speaker.

In our talk, we intend to account for all these phenomena and a few further properties of *szerint*-expressions (including their acceptability distribution in different sentence types, presented in Table 1) in the representationalist dynamic discourse- and mind-representation

theory ℜeALIS (e.g. Alberti–Kleiber 2014). Due to the formal theoretical framework, we can capture and represent the source of evidence and the epistemic possibility compositionally.

Alberti, G., and J. Kleiber (2014): "ℜeALIS: Discourse Representation with a Radically New Ontology." In *Complex Visibles Out There,* ed. by Veselovská and Janebová. Olomouc: Palacký Univ.. 513–528.

É. Kiss, K. (2002): *The Syntax of Hungarian.* Cambridge: CUP.

Kugler N. (2012): *Az evidencialitás jelölői a magyarban, különös tekintettel az inferenciális evidenciatípusra* [Markers of evidentiality in Hungarian, with special emphasis on the inferential–evidential type]. Budapest: ELTE BTK Dept. of Hungarian Linguistics.

Willett, Th. (1988): "A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality." *St. in Language* 12: 51–97.

Table 1. Acceptability distribution of the three types of *szerint*$_{X\text{person},Y\text{number}}$

	Exclamative		Declarative		Interrogative		Imperative		Optative	
1	*,✓,*	*,?,*	*,✓,✓	?,✓,✓	*,*,*	*,*,*	*,✓,*	*,✓,*	*,*,*	*,?,?
		,,*		*,*?,*?		*,??,*?		*,?,*		*,?,?
2	*,??,*		?,?,?		*,✓,✓		?,?,*		*,(?),(?)	
		*,?,?		?,?,?		*,✓,✓		?,?,*		*,(?),(?)
3	✓,*,✓	✓,*?,✓	✓,✓,✓	✓,✓,✓	(?),✓,✓	(?),✓,✓	??,(?),*	??,(?),*	*,(?),(?)	*,(?),(?)

Triplet: Quotative / Probabilistic / Judgement
In each row: Singular / Plural
Basic sentences:
r szerint Ili ott volt a gyűlésen. / same / r szerint Ili gyönyörű.
r acc_to Ili there was the meeting.Sup / r acc_to Ili beautiful
Q:'In r's opinion, Ili took part in the meeting.' / P: same / J: 'In r's opinion, Ili is beautiful.'
Grades of acceptability: ✓ > (?) > ? > ?? > *? > * (on the basis of minimal pairs evaluated by the authors)