

**The rise of an inferential evidential in medieval Catalan:  
The verb *témer* between the XIII and XV centuries<sup>1</sup>**

Jordi M. Antolí-Martínez  
Universitat d'Alacant

1. Introduction

The prototypical meaning of the verb *témer* in contemporary Catalan is '[Someone, an animal] is afraid of [someone, an animal, a thing, an action, an event]' (*DDLC*, s.v. *témer*, 1a), with structure [N1 V N2] (cf. example 1).

1. Tothom **tem** els alzinars i les rouredes perquè són estimats per les bruixes [...]. (Joan Barceló i Cullerés [1979], *Ulls de gat mesquer*, 15; CTILC)  
[Everyone **fears** oak and holly oak groves because they are beloved by witches]

This said, in contemporary Catalan, just as in Spanish, Portuguese and Italian, there is another meaning of the verb that covers not only affected states of mind, the fear of some being, thing or event, but rather the prediction of something that is considered negative by the subject: '[Someone] considers possible [something negative]' (*DDLC*, under the lemma *témer*). This new meaning of the verb goes hand in hand with a change of the construction making up the verb *témer*, which now prototypically selects as Direct Object (henceforth DO) a subordinate clause introduced by *que* (see exemple 2) and only secundarily does one find a NP. Moreover, this construction alternates a pronominal and a non-pronominal realization with *-se* (henceforth called reflexive and non-reflexive).

2. Si aquestes fadrines no “moderan la marcha” ens veurem obligats a dir al Sr. President que cridi l'atenció d'aquestes nenes, del contrari ens **temem** que porti mals resultats. (*L'Hereuet* [1927], 43, 1, 2; CTILC)  
[If these unmarried women do not “take it easier” we will be forced to tell the President that he should call these girls to order, otherwise we **fear** negative results.]

In this case, the verb is converted into an evidential marker of inference (according to the by now classic evidentiality typology established by Willett, 57), and it feeds the list of verbs already studied in the peninsular languages that have also developed an evidential value: Spanish verbs such as *parecer*, *resultar*, *prometer* and *amenazar* (Cornillie) or *olerse* (Fernández Jaén); and for Catalan, verbs such as *estimar* and *esmar* (Martines 2013 and 2015), *(a)parer* (Antolí-Martínez 2012; Sentí and Antolí-Martínez 2013), *veure* (Antolí-Martínez 2014; González Condom) or the periphrasis *deber* + infinitive (Sentí; Sentí and Antolí-Martínez 2013).

---

<sup>1</sup> This article is part of the research tasks carried out by the Institut Superior d'Investigació Cooperativa IVITRA [ISIC-IVITRA: <http://www.ivitra.ua.es>] (Ref. ISIC/2012/022) and in the activity of the competitive projects PROMETEOII/2014/018 (Prometeo Program of the Generalitat Valenciana for Excellence in Research Groups in I+D, co-financed by the UE FEDER), FFI2012-37103-FILO, IVITRA-IEC/PT2008-S0406-MARTINES01, 2008-2010 PT2012-S04-MARTINES, GITE-09009-UA, USI-045-UA, VIGROB-125.

I would like to thank Prof. Josep Martines, the real motor behind this research project, without whom none of this would have been possible.

This study aims at describing the process of semantic change, and consequently also syntactic change, whereby the first, experiential meaning of *témer* in the older stages of the language becomes tagged as the prediction of a negatively perceived event between the end of the XIV and beginning of the XV century. The start of the study is based on about 500 examples of the Catalan verb *témer* culled from the Corpus Informatitzat de la Gramàtica del Català Antic (CIGCA) between the XIII and the XVI centuries and that will be interpreted using theoretical tools provided by Cognitive Linguistics and usage-based Construction Grammar according to Traugott and Trousdale's proposals. The process of change in the construction will be reconstructed using the phases described by Traugott and Trousdale (91-93). The following concepts integrated in the Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change (TCSII, Traugott 2012) will be co-opted here: bridging context, implicature, invited inference and semantic persistence, as well as the notions of subjectivity, subjectification and derived process (Traugott 2010), as general tendencies that can be discerned in the change described here. This theoretical framework for semantic change has been used for Catalan in studies such as those carried out by Martines and Montserrat.

A general description of the semantics and usage of contemporary Catalan *témer* follows (§2). After that, the article describes the situation in medieval Catalan (§3), where we will first look at the constructions in which Catalan *témer* participates in the XIII and XIV centuries (§3.1), then we will propose what context may have started the change (§3.2), following Traugott's TCSII proposal (2012) and the concept of constructionalization described by Traugott and Trousdale; and, finally, we will describe the new evidential construction that starts to take shape in the XV and XVI centuries (§3.3). Lastly, we will summarise the results of the present study, paying specific attention to what it suggests in terms of advances for evidentiality studies (§4).

## 2. *Témer* in contemporary Catalan, a contrastive perspective

According to the *DDL*C (lemma *témer*), in contemporary Catalan the verb *témer* participates in three constructions: the first one, i.e. the one that is quantitatively most important, is the transitive construction, in which the verb selects a subject with the thematic role of experiencer and a direct object (DO) with the theme function; from here onwards, this construction will be referred to as the *experiential transitive construction* (in section 3.1. we will analyse in depth the features of this and other constructions). This DO can be realised as a noun phrase (NP) with a noun as its nucleus (example 1), as well as an infinitival clause (example 3, *DDL*C, lemma *témer*, 1a and 2) or as a clause introduced by *que*. The constructions are [N1 V N2]; [N1 V Vinf2].

3. Temo saltar la tanca / que t'envolta [...]. (Narcís Comadira [1976], *Desdesig*, 43, 12; *CTILC*)  
[I am afraid to jump over the fence / that surrounds you]

The second construction is the intransitive one (to which we will refer as experiential intransitive construction), which takes prepositional phrases (PPs) as adjuncts introduced by the preposition *de*, followed by a noun and an infinitive, as well as *en* that only precedes infinitives ([N1 V (de N2)]; [N1 V de/en Vinf2]) (*DDL*C, s.v. *témer*, 1b). The possibility to select an adjunct introduced by *de*, which exists either in contemporary or past stages of other Romance languages such as Spanish or French, has developed much further in Catalan and is highly productive in contemporary Catalan (*DECat*, 383b, 43-53).

4. [...] no hauràs de **témer** de la bèstia de la terra. (Ramir Augé i Montanyà [1959], *Job*, 78, 2; *CTILC*)  
[you will not need to **fear** the beast from the land.]
5. Desperta't, alça't, amor meu, no **temis**! (Marià Villangómez i Llobet [1977], *Noves versions de poesia anglesa i francesa*, 32; *CTILC*)  
[Wake up, get up, my love, **have no fear**!]

Finally, in third place for importance, there is a second transitive construction derived from the first one, in which the verb no longer codifies an emotional experience, but rather an inferential one (heretofore we will refer to it as *evidential transitive construction*). This construction prototypically introduces a noun clause in the indicative or subjunctive (example 2), or -not as frequently- a NP as DO (example 6). In this construction the verb can be realised by a pronoun and acquires the meaning 'Someone considers [something negative] possible' (*DDL*C, s.v. *témer*, 5).

6. [...] jo ja **em temia** alguna mala cosa; però... això! (Joaquim Ruyra [1934], *Les coses benignes*, 31; *CTILC*)  
[I already feared something negative; but ... that!]

The resulting statement is a prediction, but not just: it can also consist of abductive explanations of past events (example 7A, with an expletive negation), or suppositions about present events (example 7B).

- 7A. He sortit a buscar-li una dosi, però la porta està tancada i no respon... Em **temo** que no li hagi passat re... Podria venir? estic preocupat de debò... (Jaume Fuster [1984], *Les Claus de vidre*, 141, 7; *CTILC*)  
[I went out to look for a dosis, but the door is closed and he is not answering... I **fear** that something may have happened to him... Will he be able to come? I am really worried]
- 7B. El problema de les secularitzacions [...] no és, tan sols, un problema de celibat, sinó un problema d'identitat del sacerdot. Em **temo** que hi ha hagut èpoques, i aquesta n'és una, en què el sacerdot no sap què fer, no sap què dir, no sap, exactament, quin paper és el que li toca desenvolupar en aquest món. [*Diari de Barcelona* (1987), 211, 12, 10; *CTILC*]  
[The problem of secularization is not just a problem connected to celibacy, but rather a problem of identity for the priest. I **fear** that there have been periods, and this is one of them, in which the priest did not know what to do, or which role he was supposed to adopt in this world.]

The peculiarity of this evidential in comparison with others (such as Catalan *semblar* or *parèixer*, *deure* + inf., the future, etc.) is that the statement is evaluated as negative by the subject-conceptualizer. We are dealing, then, with an inferential evidential with many similarities to the Spanish verb *amenazar* studied by Cornillie, since in both verbs the speaker makes a negative evaluation of the statement (Cornillie, 86). The difference between the two lies in the fact that for *amenazar* the subject is the origin, the cause, and the clues on which the inference is based, which therefore results from a process of subjectivization of the verb, implying in turn a decreased agentivity of the subject. On the other hand, with *témer* the subject is an experiencer, as appropriate for a psych verb, which in turn is low in agentivity from the start. But in any case, there has been an increase in subjectivity, since the verb goes from describing fear induced by an external cause, to a fear induced by an internal belief evaluated negatively by the speaker.

From a contrastive perspective, it is important to underline that in other Romance languages, the orally handed down reflexes of TĪMĒRE have also developed this evidential value.<sup>2</sup> The evidential construction has developed in Spanish (*DRAE*, s.v. *temer*, 3) or Italian (*VTreccani*, s.v. *temere*, d).

### 3. The verb *témer* in Old Catalan

In this section, we will describe the evolution of the verb *témer* in medieval Catalan, with the goal of describing the process through which this verb acquires an evidential value. The section is divided into three parts, corresponding to the different moments of the constructionalization process described by Traugott and Trousdale (90-93). Adapting these phases to the process followed by the construction at hand, we distinguish between the following:

- a) Starting point in which constructions with *témer* (both transitive and intransitive) share one conventional semantic nucleus reflecting emotional experience (section 3.1).
- b) Innovation: in a concrete communicative situation, the hearer interprets a construction with a different meaning from that attributed to it by the speaker. The concepts of invited inference and bridging context are important to explain this process (section 3.2).
- c) The hearer becomes a speaker in turn, and at some point s/he will use this construction again, now associated with the new meaning, which is not yet conventional. Reiterative usage of the construction associated with the new meaning will signal to a community of speakers that the construction has become conventional. The new evidential meaning will prompt not only a semantic reanalysis (following the tendency towards subjectivization, Traugott 2010), but also a syntactic reanalysis for the case at hand (section 3.3).

Table I collects the cases for the verb *temer* analysed here, ordered according to the following factors: a) chronology; in 25-year groupings; b) type of construction that they build: whether there is a reflexive pronoun or not, and what type of complement is selected.

---

<sup>2</sup> M. Lübke (*REW*, s.v. TĪMĒRE) mentions the following descendants: Rumanian *teme*, Italian *temere*, Logudorese *timire*, Friulian *temé*, Anglo-Norman *tameir*, Occitan and Catalán *temer*, Spanish and Portuguese *temer*. He does not include the already extinct *temer/tamoir* from medieval French.

**Table I.** Distribution of examples according to the reflexive or non-reflexive usage of the verb and the stage of the language

Centuries	Non-reflexive construction					Total	Reflexive construction			Total	Grand Total
	Abs	NP	Inf	Clause	PP		Abs	PP	Clause		
XIIIa	-	2 100%	-	-	-	2 100%	-	-	-	-	2
XIIIb	3 3,4%	67 76,1%	12 13,6%	5 5,7%	1 1,2%	88 100%	5 26,3%	3 15,8%	11 57,9%	19 100%	107
XIVa	-	17 89,6%	1 5,2%	1 5,2%	-	19 100%	1 33,3%	-	2 66,7%	3 100%	22
XIVb	1 2,9%	30 85,7%	1 2,9%	1 2,9%	2 5,6%	35 100%	1 14,4%	3 42,8%	3 42,8%	7 100%	42
XVa	14 10,6%	98 74,3%	9 6,8%	9 6,8%	2 1,5%	132 100%	1 6,2%	4 25%	11 68,8%	16 100%	148
XVb	-	71 77,2%	12 13%	9 9,8%	-	92 100%	2 28,6%	3 42,8%	2 28,6%	7 100%	99
XVIa	5 13,5%	16 43,3%	5 13,5%	8 21,6%	3 8,1%	37 100%	-	3 100%	-	3 100%	40
XVIb	-	11 34,4%	1 3,1%	18 56,3%	2 6,2%	32 100%	-	-	1 100%	1 100%	33
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23 5,2%</b>	<b>312 71,4%</b>	<b>41 9,4%</b>	<b>51 11,7%</b>	<b>10 2,3%</b>	<b>437 100%</b>	<b>10 17,8%</b>	<b>16 28,6%</b>	<b>30 53,6%</b>	<b>56 100%</b>	<b>493</b>

\* Used abbreviations: *Abs*: absolute use, *NP*: noun phrase; *Inf*: infinitival clause; *PP*: prepositional phrase

### 3.1. The verb *témer* as experiential verb (s. XIII-XIV)

#### 3.1.1. Introduction

When we talk about fear, we are referring to a psychological concept, an emotion:

[...] that is used to describe the cluster of behaviours that are observed and experienced when a human being faces a threatening situation. [...] Thus fear is a complex set of reactions which include both the expression and the experience of the emotional event. (Winn, 614)

According to this definition, the situation can be described as a mental state of fear, which can be accompanied by other physical expressions typical of animate beings (prototypically human) and resulting from the perception of a potential danger (a stimulus, or an agent that causes it). When giving linguistic form to this scenario, one tends to use the transitive construction (§3.1.2). And just as with other psych verbs of the same class, such as Catalan *odiar*, *menysprear* or *apreciar* (Rosselló, 1921), the experiencer has the function of grammatical subject, and the theme (stimulus, agent) is the direct object (DO).

This is, however, not the only construction in which the verb *témer* participates. There is another intransitive and reflexive construction (§3.1.3). As we will see, the origin of this second construction can be explained because it encodes a different type of situation, an achievement, i.e. an event that implies a change of mental state (that of fear).

One should mention that Latin already had two constructions that were by and large similar to the Romance ones. The verb *TĪMĒRE* is transitive in Classical Latin (*DShort & Lewis*, s.v. *TĪMĒRE*), and so are its synonyms *VEREOR*, *METUO* and *PAVEO*. As such it selects a NP as DO (*DShort & Lewis*, s.v. *TĪMĒRE*, 1) and infinitival, relative, or *ut* and *ne* subordinate clauses (*DShort & Lewis*, s.v. *TĪMĒRE*, 1-4). Also attested is an absolute use (*DShort & Lewis*, s.v. *TĪMĒRE*, 5), which can be associated to complements introduced by *de*, *pro*, *ab* or ablative case, and which identify the cause of fear.

Table II shows the cases of the verb *témer* corresponding to the XIII and XIV centuries, ordered by construction (experiential transitive or intransitive).

**Table II.** Distribution of the examples by construction for the verb *temer* during the XIII-XIV centuries

Centuries	Transitive construction				Intransitive construction			
	Abs	NP	INF	Clause	TOTAL	Abs	PP	TOTAL
XIII-XIV	4	116	14	23	157	7	9	16
	2,3%	67%	8,1%	13,3%	90,8%	4,1%	5,2%	9,2%

### 3.1.2. The experiential transitive construction

Within our study, in the first phase described here (XIII-XIV centuries), the transitive construction is the most frequent for the verb *témer* (160 examples of 173, i.e. 90,8% of the total). However, the transitive construction built by *témer* does not show the prototypical characteristics of this construction as laid out in –say– Goldberg (1997, 383): [Subj V Obj ], where the Subj is an agent and the Obj is the theme or patient, with the meaning ‘X ACTS on Y; X EXPRESSES Y’. As for other cognitive verbs, one finds that the grammatical subject of the transitive construction is not an agent but an experiencer, whereas the object is semantically a stimulus or an agent, i.e. the cause of the reaction experienced by the subject. Some authors have tried to explain this peculiarity with Prototype Theory, conceiving of transitivity as gradual (Dahl & Fedriani, 3). Experiential verbs would then be peripheral elements of this category. In fact, as Dahl y Fedriani (4) observed, both experiencer and the stimulus/agent both have features of the agent role in the transitive construction: the experiencer is an animate being and the stimulus/agent is the source or the cause of the state or the event.

The characterization of the experiencer and the stimulus above produces different possible types of experiential constructions. We identify two types of predicate according to the distribution of syntactic functions (from Verhoeven, 71 and 219):

- a) Experiencer-oriented, when the subject is the experiencer and the DO the stimulus.
- b) Stimulus and agent-oriented, when the subject is the stimulus or agent, and the DO is the experiencer.

The verb *témer* corresponds to a type construction, i.e. a transitive, experiential, and experiencer-oriented. Moreover, it is significant that, as mentioned before, in terms of lexical aspect, it describes a mental state –fear– that the experiencer-subject suffers and that has, as the object of the fear a theme-DO. The situation is stative, homogenous, with no inherent temporal structure, and prototypically not agent-controlled (Pérez Saldaña, 2604). The stative character of the verb is also seen in the choice for the verbal tense: we fundamentally find the indicative present tense indicating duration and the indicative imperfect, both tenses signalling the duration and the homogenous character of the situation being described. Formally, the construction takes the following shape: [N1 V N2/Vinf/que Vsubj/Ø]. The analysis below follows the shape of the DO.

3.1.2.a. In the oldest examples that we find in Catalan (the first of which is taken from *Homilies d’Organyà*, from the first half of the XIII century), the semantic construction of the verb is very similar to that found in Latin (§3.1.1). Essentially, one finds that the verb selects for nominal complements (116 cases of 173 examples from the XIII and XIV centuries, i.e. 67%) in contexts where the subject feels that emotion faced with the possibility of suffering physical harm. More concretely, the cause of the fear can be an entity able to cause physical violence to the experiencer (such as the Sarracens, demons, the emperor or God; example 8B); it can also be a situation or an object that causes the harm that is feared (swords, torments, dangers in general; example 8A).

- 8A. Qi caritat à no qer aquel[e]s coses qe sues són. Zo és, qe no vol la volluntad de la carn, mas solament de l' ànima zo és, qe no à cor e-mal a fer, mas en segir dretura e veritat. Aquel om, s[einors], qi **tem** la persecució del segle, sapiatz qe no à perfeita caritat, qar qi à caritat no à paor for de Déu. (*Homilies d'Organyà* [XIIIa], 118, 14; *CIGCA*)  
[Whoever is enlightened by mercy, he does not want those things that are his. This means that he rejects the desires of the flesh, but accepts only those of the soul, meaning that he has no wish to do harm, but rather to pursue righteousness and truth. That man, my lieges, that **fears** the ravages of time, you must know that he has not perfected his exercise in mercy, because those who have mercy fear nothing but God]
- 8B. E Na Juliana li dix: –Si tu **tems** enaxí l'emperador mortal, com pots tu voler que eu no **tema** l'emperador no-mortal? (*Vides de Sants Rosselloneses* [XIIIb], 272, 13; *CIGCA*)  
[And Mrs. Juliana said to him: –If you are so afraid of the mortal emperor, how can you ask me not **to fear** the immortal emperor?]

3.1.2.b. One variation of this construction is the one that takes an infinitive as a theme (14 cases, 8,1% of the total). In this construction, the cause of fear is the event encoded by the infinitive (example 9). The parallel structure of the coordinated clauses in example 10A, alternating an NP and an infinitive as the DO of *témer*, shows that they are synonymous constructions.

9. **Tembre** mort natural és temor que natura dóna, e **tembre** sostenir trebayls e mort per loar e honrar Déu no és temor qui sia dada per obre de Sant Esperit; doncs, temor que hom no muyre per servir Déu és obre que'l Sant Esperit dóna. (Ramon Llull [XIIIb], *Doctrina pueril*, 96, 13; *CIGCA*)  
[To fear natural death is a fear given by nature and to fear sufferings and death in praise and honour of God is not the fear caused by the Holy Spirit; it is rather the fear of not dying in service of God that is the work of the Holy Spirit.]

3.1.2.c. A second variation of the transitive construction is that in which the theme is a subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction *que* (23 cases, 13.3% containing 11 in which the verb is realized reflexively). In actuality, it is a variation of the infinitive construction, as it appears in the cases where the grammatical subjects of the main and of the subordinate clauses do not coincide, making it necessary to recur to a finite verb. The secondary value of this structure becomes manifest in the data in Table 2: we only find 5 examples, as opposed to the 12 that we found in the infinitive construction in the second half of the XIII century. In agreement with our interpretation, in this first study we shouldn't look for a semantic difference between this construction and that of the infinitive (difference found in the modern stage of the language, since the construction with the infinitive cannot have evidential features). Example 10 expresses the fear that occurs in the experiencer (Herodes) caused by the possibility of the birth of the child of a king. It does not express, however, the certainty that it will come to pass, it is not a prediction, but simply a possibility that occurs to him.

10. Per la qual cosa Herodes, quant ó ausí dir, fo mot torbat, per so cor **temia** que aquel fos nat d'alcun rey ver qui'l gitàs de son regne (*Vides de Sants Rosselloneses* [XIIIb], 97, 8; *CIGCA*)

[For which reason Herodes, as soon as he heard it said, he left very disturbed, he feared that the child would be born of a true king and expel him from his reign.]

A significant feature, like the respective contrastive element of the constructions that we will find in the later centuries, is that now *to fear* admits an adjunct, a quantifier that emphasizes the intensity of the emotion felt by the experiencer (both with a NP and with a nominal clause).

11. On con Pilat liurés Jhesuchrist als juseus per crucificar, **temé molt** qu'En Tiberi no li volgés mal, per so car avia condepnat Jhesuchrist a mort senes raysó. Per què Pilat tramès un seu amic a l'emperador a Roma per so que l'escusés d'aquel feyt. (*Vides de Sants Rosselloneses* [XIIIb], 366, 18; *CIGCA*)  
[As Pilot turned in Jesus Christ to the Jews to crucify him, he **was really afraid** that Tiberius didn't want to do him any harm, for having condemned Christ to death without reason. So Pilot sent his friend to the Roman Emperor so that he would be pardoned for what he did.]

3.1.2.d. Finally, the experiential transitive construction also has an absolute realisation (example 12), in which the verb encodes the psychological state of the experiencer, without expressing the cause of the fear.

12. Aytant con los hòmens àn més de seyn e de rahó, aytant **temen** e fugen als majors perils. (Ramon Llull [XIIIb], *Doctrina pueril*, 160, 18; *CIGCA*)  
[Considering that men have more understanding and reason, they **fear** and flee from grave dangers]

### 3.1.3. The experiential intransitive construction

In Old Catalan, just as in the medieval stage of the other Romance languages mentioned above, *témer* is also the nucleus of a reflexive intransitive construction: [*someone*] *témer-se*. There are equivalent ones in Spanish (*DCuervo*, *DCECH*), French (*DGodefroy*), Occitan (*Lexique Roman*; *DLevy*), Italian (*VTreccani*) and Portuguese (*Corpus do português*). This reflexive use has been handed down unevenly to the modern language: it survives in Portuguese in the construction *temerse de* + some thing (*DMichaelis*, s.v. *temer*, 2); and it has reached Catalan and Spanish in the evidential construction *témer-se que* (*temerse que*, in Spanish); in this case, the construction is transitive, however.

About the origins of this reflexive use and about the function of the pronoun; Coromines maintains that, in comparison with the transitive construction, “the reflexive construction adds greater emphasis to the fear as something intense and subjective” (*DECat*, 383b, 41-43; my translation). Even if, for certain periods, this explanation may be true, it does not explain the origin of the construction. *DGodefroy*, for Old French, gives us some more clues when it defines the reflexive verb as ‘get worried, anxious’ (*DGodefroy*, s.v. *temer*). In this sense, the verb does not encode a mental state as for the transitive construction, but rather an achievement. The existence of an eventive meaning for the intransitive reflexive construction can also be seen in modern Balearic Catalan. Coromines (*DECat*, 384a 31-b 57) and Meyer-Lübke (*REW*, s.v. *TĪMĒRE*) give examples of this equally eventive construction: ‘realise, have knowledge of something, become aware of something’ (*DCVB*, s.v. *témer*, 3).



- 13A. E quant Herodes vesé que a él no venien, pensà-se que per la visió de la estela éls fossen decebutz, e que per vergoya a él no volguessen tornar. E per assò él se tolc de l'emfant a querer. Mas con él ausís assò dir que ·ls pastors avien dit, e aquelò que Symeon e Anna avien profetitzat, mot fortment **se temé**; per què ·s pensà que ·ls ·III· reys l'aguessen escarnit. (*Vides de Sants Rosselloneses* [XIIIb], 97, 16; *CIGCA*)  
[And when Herodes sw that they were not appearing before him, he thought that because they had seen the star, they were disappointed and did not want to return to him for shame. For that reason he stopped searching for the child. But when he heard what the shepherds had said, and what Simeon and Anna had prophesised, **he became** very **afraid** and because of that he thought that the three kings had deceived him]
- 13B. [...] enayxí los demonis que són en aquest àer escur **se temen** fortment cant ausen les trompes de Crist [...]. (*Vides de Sants Rosselloneses* [XIIIb], 472, 3; *CIGCA*)  
[thus, the demons that reside in the dark air **become** very **afraid** when they hear Christ's trumpets]

If we look at the two cases, they all share the same context: antecedents are described that trigger the experiencer's emotional reaction of fear. Therefore, unlike examples 8-12, the reflexive intransitive form of *témer* encodes the change in mental state resulting from previous events. As for lexical aspect, we are looking at an achievement, i.e. a non-durational culminative situation (Pérez Saldaña, 2608), essentially a change of mental state.

According to this proposal, the reflexive *-se* pronoun represents the theme, in this first stage, which corresponds to the subject-experiencer. The *-se* is a so-called 'obligatory' reflexive (Todolí, 1430, i.e. there is no equivalent non-reflexive construction), denoting internal causation. We could extend this construction as a derived variant of the transitive construction described above (§3.1.2); however, now the construction marks a change of state caused internally by the subject-experiencer, which is agent and patient simultaneously. It is the same construction as that of modern Catalan verbs *alegrar-se*, *decebre's*, *entristir-se*, *enujjar-se*, *inquietar-se*, *irritar-se*, *preocupar-se*, *sorprendre's*, etc.: an intransitive, reflexive, eventive, and semantically orientated towards the experiencer.

It is a fact, however, that in the same works we also find examples that are hard to interpret as achievements:

14. E nós conseylam-li que per nuyla res ell no y anàs, que no era cosa covinent a ell a anar en tan estranya terra, e, encara, que havia a passar per la terra dell rey de França, del qual ell **se temia**. (Jaume I [XIIIb], *Llibre dels Fets*, 391, 16; *CIGCA*)  
[And they suggested to us that he should not go for any reason, since it was not a good idea to go to such a strange land, especially because he'd have to go through the land belonging to the king of France, whom he **feared**]

The use of the imperfect in this example denotes that we are not facing a punctual, but rather a durative event. We understand therefore that the example shows a reanalysis of the construction, which now does not encode an achievement, but rather a mental state as in the case of the transitive experiential construction (§3.1.2). In this

case, we agree with Coromines that the pronoun acts as a subjective marker, and emphasises the intense and internal character of the sentiment described.

#### 3.1.4. Summary

The verb *témer* is found as a nucleus in two constructions: one is a transitive and the other is intransitive and reflexive, both experiential (encoding an emotion, i.e. fear). We find two differences: one is semantic in nature (the intransitive construction encodes an event, i.e. an achievement, and the transitive one a state) and the other is syntactic in nature: the theme of the intransitive construction is realised as an adjunct (PP) marking the cause or origin.

It is important also to underline that the transitive reflexive construction (with a nominal clause as DO) is semantically almost identical to the non-reflexive one. The reflexive, however, endows the experience with a more intense and subjective character (in agreement with Coromines). In our proposal, this second construction arises out of the eventive intransitive construction, interpreted as stative: thus the pronoun stops marking a change of state and becomes a subjectivity marker exclusively. By analogy it is therefore possible that the same meaning is then extended to the non-completive transitive construction, thus adjusting to the use of other verbs encoding personal opinion.

Other common points between the two constructions are worth analysing separately below, considering the reality we find in later centuries.

- a) The verb encodes an emotional state or change of state. This emotion is in the majority of examples a psychological response to the possibility of suffering physical harm. The source of the fear is either an agent able to cause that harm, or a stimulus, a situation or an object that lets the experiencer foresee the future harm it will cause.
- b) The negative emotional load towards the cause of said state (agent, stimulus); the subject assesses the situation and considers the object of his/her fear as able to affect him negatively.
- c) The prospective character of that evaluation. Prospective aspect is a concept used by Martines (in press) in the study of the epistemic future in medieval Catalan and by Narrog (278) in the study of the English construction *to be about to*. It is also useful to characterise the constructions with *témer* and describe their evolution. According to Narrog, “The prospective [...] is an aspectual category describing the transition from a current state to some subsequent event, which also has temporal, modal, and evidential features” (Narrog, 278). This triple characterization is temporal, modal (epistemic in our case), and evidential. It is perfectly adjusted to the reality of the verb at hand:
  - Temporal component, portraying future: there is a detachment between the mental state and the anticipation -or not- of the foreseen danger.
  - Modal epistemic component: As said before, the fear is caused by an external entity, the possibility of suffering harm. We should mention that in these examples, the experiencer is not recorded as expressing the opinion that the threat will indeed be carried out; we are not told whether this is true, but just that it is a possibility.
  - Evidential component: after all, the danger is only potential, based on some type of clue.

### 3.2. Bridging contexts

TCSII (according to Traugott, 2012) is based on the premise that linguistic expressions have two meanings, the encoded (lexical, semantic) meaning independent of the context, and the context-dependent meaning inferred by the recipient (the pragmatic, non-lexicalised meaning). When the second pragmatic meaning becomes standardised through metonymic processes, semantic change occurs.

From the perspective of the diachronic study of semantic change, and according to these premises, we can only assume that change arises from a process, but that we can only take stock of its result, i.e. of the change once it has occurred. This places severe constraints on diachronic research, but lets us nonetheless postulate some hypotheses as to the conditions preceding the change that could have promoted it. Implementing TCSII, we consider here that the change is due to the encoding of some implicatures, and is therefore the responsibility of the recipient, rather than of the speaker. We will therefore try to uncover the previous contexts facilitating the encoding of this innovative meaning, although we are aware of the fact that “context itself is only an enabling factor” (Kuteva, cited in Traugott 2012) and that we will find no proof of it until the recipient becomes speaker in turn and uses the construction with the innovative meaning.

This concept of a bridging context (in Figure 1, stage 2) refers to those examples that allow for a double interpretation: both the original meaning (‘p’), as well as an innovative one (‘q’).

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4
Form	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>
Meaning	‘p’	‘p’ (+> ‘q’)	‘p’, ‘q’	‘q’

**Figure 1.** Stages of the semantic change process according to Enfield, 29

The transition phase occurs between a first stage (1) of the process in which only the meaning ‘p’ is possible and a third polysemous stage in which the new meaning ‘q’ has already been encoded but is used in parallel with ‘p’, the first meaning. This means that “the implicature, usually defeasible, happens to be true in the bridging context, and so *in that context* is non-defeasible” (Enfield, 29, cited in Traugott 2012). Thus, “what must have originally emerged as an implicature connected to a specific context, and as a variant to a specific meaning, will eventually acquire a new semantic meaning with no connection to the original context, and -depending on the case [and this is one of them]- can subsist with that original meaning or, even displace it” (Martines and Montserrat, 197; the translation and the note in brackets are mine). In this section, we will focus on those bridging contexts that allowed for the encoding of the new evidential meaning of the verb *témer*.

Since the second half of the XIII century we already find some ambiguous contexts that could be considered as bridging contexts towards the evidential usage of the XV century, in which the verb encodes inference. The ambiguous examples that can attribute an evidential reading (predictive) to the verb feature the cause of fear as an event or reality (formally, a nominal clause, an infinitive, or an NP, in order of decreasing frequency), which does not exist at the time of the experience, but could exist in the future. This context allows for the possible inference: X (cause of fear) causes fear in Y (experiencer) because Y foresees the probability of X. This entails that: a) future projection is maintained; but b) the prediction is highlighted, and c) there is a

higher endorsement by the speaker of the reported information, which was at first just possible and has now become likely. Let us consider some examples:

- 15A. Con G. Miró fos bandeyat públicament per la vila a instància d'en G. Messeger, qui ·s volia assegurar d'él, que·s **temia** que no li fes mal. (*Llibre de Cort de Justícia de Cocentina* [XIIIb], 49, 14; *CIGCA*)  
[When G. Miró was publicly expelled from the town upon insistence by Mr. G. Messeguer, who wanted to protect himself from him, because he **feared** he would harm him]
- 15B. E con la febra li cresqués él **temé** morir (*Vides de Sants Rosselloneses* [XIIIb], 439, 6; *CIGCA*)  
[When the temperature rose, he **feared** that he would die]
- 15C. Recompta Fulgencius, en la sua poecia, que Sabius, duch de Àustria, **tement-se** de la mala fortuna en l'esdevenidor, ajustà gran tresor en temps de sa prosperitat. (*Francesc Eiximenis* [XIVb], *Dotzè del Crestià*, 224, 3; *CIGCA*)  
[Fulgencius, in his poetry, says that Sabius, duke of Austria, **fearing** bad luck in the future, amassed a great treasure during the time of his prosperity]
- 15D. E no content de ço que fet havia, volent multiplicar mal a mals, trach una espasa o basalart que tenia e volch-ne ferir lo dit pastor, qui encara jahia en terra, que no s'era pogut levar. E lo dit pastor, **tement** los colps d'aquell, axí com se levava, tenia les mans en lo aristol de la lança que portava [...]. (*Epistolari de la València Medieval I* [XIVb], 159, 26; *CIGCA*)  
[And not satisfied with what he had done, and wishing to multiply the evils he had caused, he drew a sword or dagger that he had and aimed at the shepherd still lying on the ground, since he had been unable to get up again. And said shepherd, fearing his attack, while he got up had his hands on the spear that he was carrying]

As we can see, ambiguous contexts are possible with any type of DO: NP (15D), infinitive (15B) and clausal (15A); also with the PP of the intransitive construction (15C). If we try to interpret them, we realise that both a strictly emotional reading, as an evidential one are possible: in 15A, is it just a feared possibility or did the subject (G. Messeguer) really expect to be attacked? In 15B, are we being apprised of the subject's fear of death, or of his intuition that death was coming? In 15C, the bad luck that is feared was just a possibility or was the subject certain that in the future his luck would turn? And in 15D we are told that the subject fears the attack of the aggressor, or is it that he is certain that he will receive those blows?

For the implicature to be encoded and standardised, it is necessary that this bridging context be recurrent in the period at hand. In our corpus, for the XIIIb-XIVb centuries – the moment in which the change took place – we find the following data:

**Table III.** Percentage of ambiguous examples according to DO type, XIII-XIV centuries

Centuries	NP		INF		Clausal		PP	
	Total	Ambiguous	Total	Ambiguous	Total	Ambiguous	Total	Ambiguous
XIIIa	2	1 (50%)	-	-	-	-	-	-
XIIIb	67	3 (4,5%)	12	5 (41,7%)	16	14 (87,5)	4	-
XIVa	17	1 (5,8%)	1	-	3	3 (100%)	-	-
XIVb	42	3 (7,1%)	2	-	4	4 (100%)	5	1 (20%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>8 (7%)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5 (35,7%)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>21 (91,3%)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1 (11,1%)</b>

The preceding data are coherent and help explain the situation in modern Catalan, where the construction with *témer* is mainly realised with a nominal clause as DO, and secondarily with a NP (*DDLC*, s.v. *témer*, 5). The initial situation leads coherently to that result: the constructs with a clausal DO are mostly ambiguous, and can be interpreted also as predictive (which is understandable, since the clause expresses an event, after all). Further away are nominal DO (7% of ambiguity), as is reasonable considering that they embody more diversity of contexts: future achievements, but also the agents that cause fear.

The higher frequency of this implicature will cause the following (repeated from the three features mentioned in section 3.1.4.A):

- a) The progressive subjectivization of the cause of fear, which stops being an external agent or stimulus and becomes a belief.
- b) The weakening of the emotional semantic value (of fear) and strengthening of the prospective value (future/epistemic/evidential). The emotional component will survive, even if in a much more subdued form, in the subject's 'negative evaluation' of the inferred event, which is typical of the evidential construction (an example of semantic persistence according to Traugott 2012).
- c) The focalization of the prospective aspect of the prediction, i.e. the fact that the utterance is considered to be the subject's conviction about the likelihood that an event will occur in the future.

To summarise: through the analysis of our corpus of constructions from the XIV century, we can conclude that this century was a transition period that made possible the inception of the evidential value of the construction that we find in the XV century. In the following section, we will describe the new evidential construction arising from the described reanalysis in more detail.

### 3.3. The Evidential Transitive Construction

Starting from the XV century, we began to encounter examples that the verb no longer encodes an emotional reaction, but rather a prediction of something that isn't pleasing to the experiencer. Let us focus on example 16, where there are various indicators that something has changed:

16. E jassia que nosaltres ab gran raó confiem que·l senyor rey no y innovarà alcuna cosa, pus causa no y ha, però, sí **ns temem** que la senyora reyna no volgués fer qualque complacència a cathalans en aquest punt de les corts, e sobre açò scrivim al dit senyor, segons porets veure clarament per la cèdula ací inclusa. (*Epistolari de la València Medieval II* [XIVb], 26, 18; *CIGCA*)  
[And although we trust with great reason that the King our Lord will not change anything, since there is no reason to do so, we fear that the Queen our Lady doesn't want to give any satisfaction to the Catalans about this point in Parliament, and we write therefore to the said King our Lord, as you can clearly see in the included document.]

Firstly, the verb is juxtaposed to *confiar* 'trust', a verb that expresses the certainty – not the possibility- that the subject has that something will happen. As much as this opposition exists, we understand that *confiar* expresses the certainty that something good will happen and *témer* is the prediction of a negative situation. Additionally, the

certainty of the event is reaffirmed by the adverb *yes*. It enforces, then, the epistemic/evidential value, i.e. the value of prediction. Other examples are:

- 17A. Digous lo primer de agost mataren los de Morvedre en Morvedre a Joan Siso, ostaler del bordell de València [...], e açò perquè lo marquès de Atzaneta, don Rodrigo de Mendoza, avia de anar de dia en dia [...] a Morvedre; **tement** que no·l portàs a València e no li donàs escapo, lo tragueren de la presó e a coltellades lo feren troços viu. (*Soria* [XVIa], 19, 9; *CIGCA*)  
[The first Thursday of August, the inhabitants of Morvedre killed Joan Siso in Morvedre, owner of the Valencia brothel, and because of that the Marquis of Atzanetan, Sir Rodrigo de Mendoza had to go [...] to Morvedre time and again; **fearing** that he would be taken to Valencia and that he would be freed, they took him out of prison and they cut him up, still alive, into small pieces]
- 17B. A ·VII· de octubre ·MDXXXX·, dimarç, entre tres y quatre après migjorn, vingué lo riu de la present ciutat de València tant gran que plegà fins a la porta del monestir de la Sanctíssima Trinitat, per hon entra la vitualla per a les monges. Y entrava dins l'aygua. Y entrava dins lo Real y ·l monestir del Remei. Y, **tement** que aumentàs més, lo reverent Capítol féu tocar les campanes de la Seu com qui toca a temporal. (*Llibre d'Antiquitats de la Seu de València* [XVIa], 155, 19; *CIGCA*)  
[On Tuesday, October 7, 1540, between 3 and 4 in the afternoon, the river flooded the present city of Valencia so badly that it flooded up to the door of the Monastery of the Holy Trinity, where the provisions for the nuns enter the building. And water entered too. And it entered the Real, and the Monastery of Remei. And fearing that it would rise more, the most reverend Chapter had the bells of the cathedral rung, as when there is a storm approaching]

And not only examples with nominal clauses, but also with NP and PP:

- 18A. E quant vengué huna hora ans de la oració feu certes flamades de foch, de hon ixqueren de Alzira treçents hòmens ab dos banderes e atanbors tocant alarma, de què **tement** lo governador de trayció [...]. (*Soria* [XVIa], 25, 12)  
[And one hour before prayers, there were constant blazes and 300 men with two flags and drums sounding an alarm left Alzira, **fearing** the governor's treason]
- 18B. De aquest deffalt, a mon juý, vénen totes les sospites y recels; que per ço **tem engan** [...]. (Francesc Moner [XVIa], *Obres catalanes*, 132, 21)  
[From this absence, in my opinion, all of the suspicions and doubts are born, for that it **fears** deception...]

Therefore, we now find that the construction has by now acquired epistemic and evidential character, in which the emotional character of the mental state is weaker (but the 'negative perception' still subsists, inherited from the primitive meaning of the construction); simultaneously the objective existence of the cause of fear has also been weakened into a belief. Predictive, evidential and epistemic value are now foregrounded; the speaker is now also endorsing the veracity of the expressed information, which turns from possible to likely.

The standardisation of this semantic reanalysis of the verb entails some formal changes, as well as changes in the frequency of the verb:

- a) Increased frequency of the construction with the nominal clause. Despite the reduced sample analysed, especially for certain periods, a considerable increase in frequency of this construction can be observed in the XVI century, with 20% of the total of cases in the first half of the century and 57.6% in the second half, well above the average for the analysed period (16,4%). It also entails a progressive growth compared to the data for the previous centuries, in which the frequency of occurrence varies between 8,8% and 14,9%, an increase that remains consistent even in the first half of the XIV century, when the sample is smallest. This feature, which is typical of grammaticalization processes, is the result of semantic change, since we are moving away from a lexical verb towards a construction with a more pragmatic, epistemic/evidential value. In Table IV are the raw numbers and percentages of the tokens for the nominal clauses, divided by century and type of verb (reflexive or not).

**Table IV.** Relative weight of a clausal DO within the totality of examples, XIII-XVI centuries

Construction	Centuries								Total
	XIIIa	XIIIb	XIVa	XIVb	XVa	XVb	XVIa	XVIb	
Total examples w/ nominal clause	-	16	3	5	20	11	8	19	81
		14,9%	13,6%	8,8%	13,5%	11,1%	20%	57,6%	16,4%
Total examples	2	107	22	57	148	99	40	33	493

- b) The quantifiers that marked the intensity of the emotion disappear (see example 19). Unlike Spanish *mucho me temo que* (a fixed form meaning ‘I greatly fear that’), the quantifier did not crystallise within the reflexive construction in Catalan, when this adopts an evidential/epistemic value.
19. Dicmenge, a ·II· de octubre ·MCCCCLXVIII·, en la nit, la gent d’armes del rey Johan scalaren e prengueren per lo pus fort loch de la muralla, là on menys se **temien**, la vila de Berga, a gran càrrech d’aquells qui dins eren, qui ·s· gordaven mal. (Jaume Safont [XVb], *Dietari o Llibre de jornades*, 235, 16; *CIGCA*)  
[Sunday, October 2, 1468, in the night, king Joan’s army scaled the walls at their strongest point, there where it was least **feared** that anyone would, and took the town of Berga, mostly because of the fault of those inside that defended it badly]

In this example, *menys* ‘less’ does not quantify the intensity of the fear caused by the attack, which surely would be the same regardless of where they breached the walls, but rather quantifies the foreseen probability that that specific stretch of the walls would be attacked.

- c) The alternations between subjunctive and indicative mood: since the XV century we encounter some scarce cases in which the subordinate clause introduced by *que* does not require subjunctive, but rather indicative. We think that this is a formal realisation of the semantic reanalysis of the verb, which is no longer just a verb denoting fear, but now admits a predictive reading, as an inference marker. The indicative, the mood of assertiveness, becomes possible, as the statement becomes a prediction and the speaker endorses its contents. The first case we find is example 20; the fact that in this example *témer* alternates with *recelar* ‘to suspect’ and *dubtar* ‘to doubt’ confirms that it is already functioning as an inferential evidential.

20. Par-me a mi que un matex pensament y recel és lo de l' enamorad y de la dama, perquè los dos **temen** una mateixa cosa; que si la dama **tem** que no és amada, també recela perdre, y si lo enamorad **tem** perdre la dama, és perquè dupte sia amat. (Francesc Moner [XVIa], *Obres catalanes*, 129, 7)  
 [It seems to me that the male lover has the same thought and suspicion as the lady, because they both **fear** the same thing; if the lady **fears** not being loved, she also suspects that she will lose him; and if the lover **fears** losing the lady, it's because he fears that he is not loved]

Even if the occurrence of the present indicative is limited and very late in the corpus, we are dealing in reality with an alternation of incipient moods in these centuries, which is still continuing in modern Catalan (Quer, 2826-2826; *DDLC*, s.v. *témer*). We will have to wait for further semantic bleaching of the verb (and for further nuances of the predictive, future-projecting component) in order for the present indicative to increase in frequency in the subordinate clause, since that is needed in those cases where the speaker wonders about events in the present, rather than making a future prediction.

In example 20, as mentioned above, the speaker is not predicting a future event, but is rather inferring something about the present. The future character, typical of the prospective aspect, has become weaker, and what remains is rather confirming a suspicion. *Témer*, then, diverges further from its original meaning and turns to encode inference in general (not just the prediction of a future negative event; example 21). The disappearance of the temporal component and the focalisation of the epistemic and evidential components are not, however, exclusive to the verb *témer*: Martines (in press) finds a parallel process in the case of the epistemic future.

21. —Certes, molt me són altat d'aquest cavaller, e molt m'à servit en destrossar aquell ribaut d'Ambrosino de Spíndola; e, sinó que **m tem** que sia retengut per Corralí, yo ·l pregaría que romangués ací. (*Curial* [XVa], 282, 5; *CIGCA*)  
 [—Of course, I like this gentleman a lot, and he has aided me considerably in destroying that unpleasant man Ambrosino de Spíndola; and if it weren't that I **fear** that he works for Corralí, I would ask him to stay here.]

Despite the semantic change, and with the exception of some examples (such as 20), in the cases with evidential value, the verb still has a connection to the expression of fear, even if it is no longer physical harm that is feared, compared to the contexts found in the XIII century. This situation would then change in the following centuries, when the fear towards an external cause was definitely bleached out of the construction. In this fragment from the XVIII century, we can establish that the process is finally concluded and *témer* is a verb of inference, not a verb expressing emotion; the inferred situation is no longer feared, but rather negatively evaluated by the subject (with a possible intersubjective component<sup>3</sup>):

<sup>3</sup> We are referring here to the concept of intersubjectivity defined by Traugott (2010), which “refers to the way in which natural languages, in their structure and their normal manner of operation, provide for the locutionary agent’s expression of his or her awareness of the addressee’s attitudes and beliefs, most especially their ‘face’ or ‘self-image’.” In this case we would be dealing with a use of the evidential construction with *témer* indexing politeness that we had already noticed in our corpus since the XV century. This coincides with Traugott’s proposal according to which the intersubjectivation process



22. SAGRISTÀ: Los marquesos y los duchs / behuen bons vins y resolis, / y aquí dónan los sans olis / a un home perquè té cuchs [...].  
 SAGRISTÀ: Ja·s coneix ab la brumera / que per la boca se'n va. / **Temo** qu·és un gran brivó; / en la cara ja·s coneix. [*'I am afraid that he is a big good-for-nothing'*]  
 CONSULTOR: Ay pobret!, prou que pateix.  
 SAGRISTÀ: Jo·m **temo** que·s fa·l traydó. [*'I fear that he may betray us'*]  
 CONSULTOR: Digau, en què u coneixeu?  
 SAGRISTÀ: Valga'm lo àngel sant Miquel! / Jo li cridava: "Gabriel, / que us fa mal lo cap o·l peu?" / Y ell, posant los ulls en blanch, / se deixà extremuncià, / fen-li tant profit lo untar / com un pagat ab un banch.  
 CONSULTOR: Bé es veu clar que és feridura, / i que, si no, bé parlaria.  
 SAGRISTÀ: Ell féu lo mut, a fè mia, / per escapar de clausura.  
 ("Entremès de l'ermità de la guia", *Teatre burlesc mallorquí* [XVIII], 262, 14-19; *CIGCA*)

In this example we find an alternation between the reflexive and non-reflexive forms, with present indicative marked on the verb in the subordinate clause, as expected in a statement of which the speaker is certain. Fear, as an emotion, does not belong in this context: the character, *Sagrístà*, is not directly suffering the predicted event, nor is there any implication for the other character. It should also be noticed that it alternates with the verb *conèixer*, 'to know': a verb of cognition, not of emotion.

Considering the diachronic perspective, the inception of this new construction entails an increased level of subjectivity from a semantic point of view (as per Traugott 2010). It is true that the original XIII construction was already subjective insofar as it described a mental state; however, in this first stage the emotional reaction corresponded to an objective, external source of fear. The new semantic nucleus that spread in the XV century pivoted around inference, i.e. it was connected to the subject's beliefs about events that took place in the past, present, and especially the future. Thus, this process manifests similarities with the one undergone by *amenazar* described by Cornillie (2007), which also turned into an evidential verb as a result of a subjectification process, entailing the weakening of the agentivity of the subject. In the case studied here, there is also a weakening, but in this case it is a weakening of the role of the agent or the stimulus causing the emotional reaction (which ends up being the subject's belief about the statement), as well as a weakening of the intensity of this emotional reaction (which goes from fear to negative perception).

#### 4. Conclusions

In this study we attempted a reconstruction of the semantic change that takes the verb *témer* 'to fear' from an experiential verb encoding a mental state, to an evidential verb encoding prediction, and more generally, inference. This evolution was explained applying Traugott's TCSII (2012) and following the stages of the constructionalization process described by Traugott and Trousdale. Thus, we were able to describe the bridging context favouring the change and analyse the circumstances that made the innovation possible, and that was later standardised, in an objective way.

---

follows that of subjectification, along a cline of meaning that can be characterised as *non/less subjective* > *subjective* > *intersubjective*.

The process of change described here leading to the evidential meaning of the construction can be identified as a process of subjectification described in Traugott (2010), since the verb realises first the expression of fear and later the encoding of the prediction of a future event, i.e. the subject's beliefs about the likelihood of that future event. This is made possible by a progressive weakening of the cause of fear (stimulus, agent) and of the feeling itself, which ends up being a simple negative feeling towards the information stated in the clause; the fact that the emotional component survives, even if weakened, was here related to semantic persistence (Traugott 2012). At the same time that these components weaken, the prospective aspect of the verb is strengthened (temporal, modal and evidential features, as in Narrog, 278) and in extreme cases, so is the modal/evidential value (and no the longer temporal, future one), in parallel with other processes described, as that of the epistemic future (Martines in press).

In this sense, the process of change shows how interconnected the evidential and epistemic modalities are. Change from an experiential to an evidential construction embodies how committed the speaker is to the information s/he is reporting, which is in turn inherently tied to the idea of prediction. This is how we go from an emotional meaning –concerning a possible danger– to a meaning centred on inference –about a probable event. This overlap of the evidential and epistemic values in inferential markers has been noticed before (cf. van der Auwera and Plungian), and we agree with Cornillie, who says about Spanish verbs *amenazar* ‘threaten’ and *prometer* ‘promise’ that: “*Promise* and *threaten* express some kind of epistemic modality, but the label ‘epistemic’ is not sufficient for their semantic analysis in view of this predictive dimension and this possible evidential import.” (Cornillie, 87). We have also noticed an overlap of epistemic and evidential values in the same form –and not just as an implicature, in the case of the epistemic value– and a description without the evidential value would only present a partial analysis. The evidential component is due to the origin of the construction as predictive; this may also condition the requirement that the information introduced by *témer* must always be inferred, possibly also a manifestation of the notion of semantic persistence; so much so that it cannot even be reported information, although that would also be originating from an indirect source.

## Bibliography

- Antolí-Martínez, J. M. “Canvi semàntic i gramaticalització en el sorgiment de marcadors evidencials. Evolució semàntica de PARERE i derivats en el llatí tardà i en el català antic (s. III-XVI).” *eHumanista/IVITRA* 2 (2012): 41-84.
- . “Recursos léxicos en la expresión de la evidencialidad: el verbo catalán *veure* en los *Col-loquis de la insigne ciutat de Tortosa*.” *Revista Internacional d’Humanitats* 31 (2014).
- CIGCA = Martines, J. & V. Martines dirs. “Corpus Informatitzat de la Gramàtica del Català Antic.” En *Corpus Informatitzat Multilingüe de Textos Antics i Contemporanis [CIMTAC]*. Alacant: ISIC-IVITRA.
- Cornillie, B. *Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in Spanish (Semi-) Auxiliaries*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007.
- Corpus do português* = Davis, M. dir. *Corpus do português*. Retrieved from: <http://corpusdoportugues.org>
- CTILC = Rafel, J. dir. *Corpus Textual Informatitzat de la Llengua Catalana*. Barcelona: Institut d’Estudis Catalans. Retrieved from: <http://ctilc.iec.cat/>
- Dahl, E. & C. Fedriani. “The Argument Structure of Experience: Experiential Constructions in Early Vedic, Homeric Greek and Old Latin.” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110, 3 (2012): 342-362.
- DCECH = Coromines, J. & J. A. Pascual. *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. Madrid: Gredos, 1982-1991.
- DCuervo = *Diccionario de construcción y régimen de la lengua castellana*. Barcelona: Herder Editorial, 1998.
- DCVB = Alcover, A. M. & F. de B. Moll. *Diccionari Català-Valencià-Balear*. Palma de Mallorca: Moll, 1985.
- DDLC = Rafel, J. dir. *Diccionari descriptiu de la llengua catalana*. Institut Estudis Catalans. Retrieved from: <http://dcc.iec.cat/ddlc/index.asp>
- DECat = Coromines, J. *Diccionari etimològic i complementari de la llengua catalana*. Barcelona: Curial Edicions Catalanes/La Caixa, 1995.
- DGodefroy = Godefroy, F. *Dictionnaire de l’ancienne langue française et de tous ses dialectes du IXe au XVe siècle*. Paris, 1880-1902.
- DIEC2 = Institut d’Estudis Catalans. *Diccionari de la Llengua Catalana*. Barcelona: Edicions 62/Enciclopèdia Catalana, 2007.
- DLevy = Levy, E. *Provenzalisches Supplement-wörterbuch*. Leipzig, 1898.
- DLewis = Lewis, C. T. & C. Short. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1879.
- DMichaelis = *Moderno Dicionário da Língua Portuguesa*. São Paulo: Melhoramentos, 1998. Retrieved from: <http://michaelis.uol.com.br/moderno/portugues/index.php>
- Enfield, N. J. *Linguistic Epidemiology: Semantics and Grammar of Language Contact in Mainland Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge Curzon, 2003.
- Fernández Jaén, J. “Modalidad epistémica y sentido del olfato: la evidencialidad del verbo oler.” *Estudios de Lingüística Universidad de Alicante* 22 (2008): 65-89.
- Goldberg, A. E. *Constructions: a construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago/Londres: Chicago University Press, 1995.
- . “The relationships between verbs and constructions.” In M. H. Verspoor, K. D. Lee & E. Sweetser eds. *Lexical and syntactical constructions and the construction on meaning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1997. 383-398.
- González Condom, M. “Indirect evidence in Catalan: A case study.” In Ll. Payrató & J. M. Cots eds. *The pragmatics of Catalan*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2011. 146-172.

- Lexique Roman* = Raynouard, M. *Lexique roman: ou, Dictionnaire de la langue des troubadours*. París: Chez Silvestre, 1842.
- Martines, J. “El verb *estimar* i l’amor hereós i Joan Roís de Corella. Un acostament segons la pragmàtica diacrònica.” *Afers* 76 (2013): 717-739.
- . “Diacronia i neologia: canvi semàntic, subjectivació i representació del pensament. El català esmar, des de ‘taxar’ fins a ‘inferir’ i ‘imaginar’ i més enllà.” *Caplletra* 59 (2015): 221-248
- . “Une approche du futur épistémique du catalan médiéval: les premiers pas (xiii s.)” En L. Baranzini, J. Sanchez Mendez & L. de Saussure eds. *Le futur dans les langues romanes*. Université de Neuchâtel, in press.
- Martines, J. & S. Montserrat. “Subjetivización e inferencia en la evolución semántica y en el inicio de la gramaticalización de *jaquir* (s. xi-xii).” *Caplletra* 56 (2014): 185-211.
- Narrog, H. *Modality, subjectivity, and semantic change: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Pérez Saldanya, M. “Les relacions temporals i aspectuals.” En J. Solà, M. R. Lloret, J. Mascaró & M. Pérez-Saldanya eds. *Gramàtica del català contemporani*. Barcelona: Empúries, 2002. 2571-2664.
- Quer, J. “Subordinació i Mode.” En J. Solà, M. R. Lloret, J. Mascaró & M. Pérez-Saldanya eds. *Gramàtica del català contemporani*. Barcelona: Empúries, 2002. 2799-2866.
- REW* = Meyer-Lübke, W. *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1911-1920.
- Rosselló, J. “El SV I. Verb i arguments verbals.” In J. Solà, M. R. Lloret, J. Mascaró & M. Pérez-Saldanya eds. *Gramàtica del català contemporani*. Barcelona: Empúries, 2002.
- Sentí, A. “Modalitat i evidencialitat. Un estudi de *deure* epistèmic al segle XV.” In E. Casanova & C. Calvo eds. *Actes del 26é Congrès de Lingüística i Filologia Romàniques*. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 2013.
- Sentí, A. & J. Antolí-Martínez. “La inferència en l’aflorament dels valors evidencials en català antic.” *Caplletra: Revista Internacional de Filologia* 55 (2013): 157-183.
- Todoí, J. “Els pronoms.” In J. Solà, M. R. Lloret, J. Mascaró & M. Pérez-Saldanya eds. *Gramàtica del català contemporani*. Barcelona: Empúries, 2002. 1395-1401.
- Traugott, E. C. “Revisiting subjectification and intersubjectification.” In K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte & H. Cuyckens eds. *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*. Berlín/New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 2010. 29-70.
- . “Pragmatics and language change.” En K. Allan & K. Jaszczolt eds. *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. 549-565.
- Traugott, E. & G. Trousdale. *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Verhoeven, E. *Experiential Constructions in Yucatec Maya*. John Benjamins, 2007.
- VTreccani* = Istituto dell’Enciclopedia Italiana. *Vocabolario Treccani*. Retrieved from: <http://www.treccani.it/vocabolario/>
- Van der Auwera, J. & V. A. Plungian. “Modality’s semantic map.” *Linguistic Typology* 2 (1998): 79-124.
- Willett, T. “A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality.” *Studies in Language* 12-1 (1988): 51-97.
- Winn, P. ed. *Dictionary of Biological Psychology*. London/New York: Routledge, 2005.