

## Approaches to Evidentiality in Romance

Josep Martines  
Universitat d'Alacant  
Institut d'Estudis Catalans

Viola Miglio  
University of California, Santa Barbara

The expression of evidentiality, i.e. the mechanisms that allow for the encoding of “the existence of a source of evidence for some information” (Aikhenvald 2003), is currently a field of great interest to linguists. A large number titles have been published over the last fifteen years on this topic (Faller 2002, Boye 2010, Cornillie 2009, Diewald and Smirnova 2010, Hengeveld *et al* 2012, Brugman and Macaulay 2015, Hengeveld and Mattos Dall'Aglio Hattner 2015, etc.); many are studies that have maintained a stricter version of evidentiality, considering it expressed exclusively in the form of an obligatory morphological marker, perhaps because they were closer to the pioneering works on that subject. That type of literature focuses, therefore, on languages where evidentiality is marked obligatorily, just as in the Romance languages tense or aspect are obligatory verbal elements. More scarce is the bibliography on evidentiality that includes also languages where evidentiality is expressed by lexical, semantic or other grammatical means, depending on the pragmatic context.

This monographic number of the journal *eHumanista/IVITRA* arises out of the interest expressed towards the study of those lexical mechanisms that embody evidentiality in those languages where the source of the information is not obligatory. We have therefore collected some cogently argued articles that focus on different Romance languages of Western Europe, especially those of the Iberian peninsula, such as Catalan and Spanish, but including also Brazilian Portuguese, Occitan Gascon, and Catalan Sign Language. We also wanted to put together in the same volume different perspectives on evidentiality: the reader will find here synchronic and diachronic studies, focusing on contemporary and past uses of the language, based on oral or written corpora, analyzing lexical and grammatical elements. The common core throughout the articles is their use of corpora, and therefore the emphasis the authors place on actual usage. Overall, authors pay particular attention to communicative contexts, to semantic and pragmatic discourse analysis, as well as to processes of grammaticalization.

Following is a brief description of the contents of the articles gathered in this volume.

Jordi Antolí's diachronic study analyses texts from the XIII-XV centuries in order to show how the Old Catalan verb *témer* ‘to be afraid of’ acquired the role of inferential evidential. The Invited Inferencing Theory of Semantic Change and subjectification play a key role in this article.

Maria Josep Cuenca looks at oral usage in Catalan parliamentary debates, and analyses the interplay between evidential and epistemic markers.

Juliano Desiderato Antonio describes the expression of evidentiality and epistemicity in lectures and in the oral interaction between students and professors in Brazilian Portuguese using Rhetorical Structure Theory.

Jorge Fernández Jaén focuses on the evolution that allowed the Spanish verb *oler* ‘to smell’ to get to express a degree of epistemic certainty and of mirativity, as well as becoming a marker of inferential evidentiality.

Maria Josep Jarque and Esther Pascual work on an even more exotic linguistic field: resources to express evidential meanings in sign language, specific in Catalan Sign Language. These authors study how native Catalan Sign Language signers realise the source of opinions and knowledge of events in direct speech.

Matthew Kanwit shows how the so-called (*de*)*queísmo* can be interpreted as an evidentiality marker. The key element for his analysis is the variable *discourse topic*, which he analyses in a sociolinguistic study of a Venezuelan Spanish corpus.

Marta López Izquierdo analyses the resources to express evidentiality in a corpus of Spanish travel narratives from the periods between the Middle Ages and the beginning of the Renaissance (XV to mid XVI centuries). The author bases her arguments on the variation in usage between verbs denoting direct and indirect knowledge.

Ricardo Maldonado and Juliana De la Mora explain how Spanish *según* 'according to' obtains an evidential reportative value, and how it expanded from there into the domain of mirativity, using a Mexican Spanish corpus.

Susana Rodríguez Rosique establishes a relation between future and mirativity. The author pays particular attention to evaluative contexts as a connection between the two categories and suggests that the mirative value arises when the meaning of the future (a distance metaphorically 'ahead' of the speaker) is projected over the utterance

Andreu Sentí i Pons uses Cognitive Grammar and the study of corpora in order to explain how the evidential values of the originally deontic periphrasis *deure* 'must + Infinitive' arose in Catalan and evolved from the XII to the XVI centuries.

Jordi Suïls Subirà and Salomé Ribes delve into the study of evidential markers in Gascon Occitan. The authors describe the *se* marker (that introduces direct and indirect interrogatives), the enunciative *que* as well as *plan*, *be* and *ja* in contexts more complex than has been described before. They trace the grammaticalisation of enunciative *que* until its bleaching to a simple declarative. They also establish a connection with certain similar usages in Catalan.

Victoria Vázquez Rozas analyses the speaker's stance or mental state towards a clause introduced by Spanish *creo* 'I believe' and *pienso* 'I think' and traces the divergent evolution of these constructions by assessing semantic and pragmatic differences. The author uses a corpus of theater texts from the CORDE database.

**References**

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. “Evidentiality in typological perspective.” A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon eds. *Studies in evidentiality*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2003. 1-31.
- Boye, K. “Evidence for what? Evidentiality and scope.” *STUF* 63 (2010): 290-307.
- Brugman, C. M. & M. Macaulay. “Characterizing evidentiality.” *Linguistic Typology* 19, 2 (2015): 201–237.
- Cornillie, B. “Evidentiality and epistemic modality: On the close relationship between two different categories.” *Functions of Language* 16 (2009): 44–62.
- Diewald, G. & E. Smirnova eds. *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton. 15–58.
- Faller, M. “Remarks on evidential hierarchies”. In D. I. Beaver, L. D. Casillas Martínez, B. Z. Clark & S. Kaufmann eds. *The construction of meaning*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 2002. 37–59.
- Hengeveld, K., M. L. Braga, E. de Melo Barbosa, J. Silveira Coriolano, J. Jezuíno da Costa, M. de Souza Martins, D. Leite de Oliveira, V. Maciel de Oliveira, L. Gomes Pereira, L. Santana, C. Luiz do Carmo Santos & V. dos Ramos Soares. 2012. “Semantic categories in the indigenous languages of Brazil.” *Functions of Language* 19, 1 (2012): 38–57.
- Hengeveld, K. & M. M. Dall'Aglio Hattner. “Four types of evidentiality in the native languages of Brazil.” *Linguistics* 53, 3 (2015): 479-524.