We present results from a forced-choice acceptability judgement task investigating whether English evidential constructions are constrained by parametrized evidential sub-dimensions, as argued by Matthewson (to appear). Results support Matthewson’s hypothesis that evidential dimensions are more fine-grained and argue that evidentiality is grammatically encoded in certain constructions in English, namely copy raising constructions (cf. Asudeh & Toivonen, 2012; Rett & Hyams, 2014).

**Background**

An evidential construction marks the source of information that a speaker has for their assertion. While every language has the means to express evidential concepts, an evidential is defined by obligatory grammatical marking (Aikhenvald, 2004). Copy raising constructions (e.g., *John looks like he is cooking*) are one place where it has been argued that English might encode direct evidentiality. Asudeh & Toivonen (2012) argue that English copy raising constructions require direct perception of the subject while unraised constructions (e.g., *It looks like John is cooking*) do not. Thus, in the previous example, copy raising is only felicitous in a situation where John is observed in the kitchen, whereas the unraised structure can be used when one simply sees pots boiling on John’s stove. In an online felicity judgement task, Rett & Hyams (2014) confirmed this basic pattern and argue that copy raising encodes direct evidentiality in English. Yet the criteria used to distinguish direct and indirect evidence has been inconsistent. For Asudeh & Toivonen (2012), the speaker must directly perceive the subject while for others, the speaker must have direct sensory evidence. Matthewson (to appear) argues that cross-linguistic evidentiality can be further refined into three sub-dimensions, presented in Table 1, which can each have a direct or indirect value, and that languages differ in which dimensions are incorporated into their grammars. We have added direct perception of the subject, or Evidence Source, as a fourth possible dimension.

**Goal**

Our study aims to test and further refine the results of Rett & Hyams (2014) by examining precisely which evidence dimensions are encoded in English evidential constructions.

**Experiment**

To facilitate the task of making subtle linguistic judgements, participants were told that they would be helping a non-native speaker, Idan, learn the subtleties of English. In response to a discourse context, participants were asked to rate the acceptability of evidential sentences as well as a declarative control on a scale of 1 (unacceptable) to 6 (acceptable), as in (1). Contexts were manipulated to test for all possible combinations of dimension and direct/indirect values.

**Results**

By-participant $z$-scores of judgement ratings served as the dependent variable in a series of linear mixed-effects regression models, which included interactions between Syntax and the four evidential dimensions (Type, Strength, Location and Source). Significant simple main effects across all four models showed that unraised structures were more likely to be rated higher than copy raising structures. Higher ratings were also more likely when the speaker could directly perceive the sentential subject (Source) or the event (Location). However, higher ratings were more likely when the context contained *not best* Evidence Strength, compared to the *best*. We found significant two-way interactions between Syntax and all four evidential dimensions. The interactions between Syntax and Evidence Source (Figure 1) and Location (Figure 2) indicate that while participants preferred unraised constructions overall, this effect was stronger when the evidence was indirect.

**Implications**

By controlling for the evidence available in the discourse context, we used linguistic judgements to uncover the parameters relevant for the encoding of evidentiality in English. Our findings support the view that copy raising constructions grammatically encode direct evidentiality for certain dimensions, i.e., source and location, but that unraised constructions are unmarked.
Context: Idan walks into the house and sees that his wife is in the kitchen. She is wearing an apron that is full of flour and has chocolate on her face. Idan thinks to himself:

a. *Unraised*: It seems/sounds/looks like she has been baking.
b. *Copy raised*: She seems/sounds/looks like she has been baking.
c. *Declarative*: She has been baking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Type</td>
<td>Sensory information.</td>
<td>Reports or reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Strength</td>
<td><em>Best</em> evidence possible for event.</td>
<td><em>Not best</em>: Lacking best possible evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Location</td>
<td>Perceive event itself.</td>
<td>Perceive results of event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Source</td>
<td>Perceive sentential subject.</td>
<td>Do not perceive sentential subject.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Parametrized evidential sub-dimensions