On the interactional dimension of evidentials: The case of the Spanish evidential discourse markers

Bert Cornillie
University of Leuven, Belgium

Pedro Gras Manzano
Universiteit Antwerpen, Belgium[AQ: 1]

Abstract

Spanish has a series of evidential discourse markers that combine the lexical semantics of visual perception with reference to inference or hearsay, for example, *evidentemente* 'evidently', *por lo visto* 'visibly, seemingly', *al parecer* 'seemingly' and *se ve (que)* 'once sees that, apparently'. The main aim of this article is to examine the grammatical, semantic and interactional properties of these four evidential discourse markers in informal and formal spoken Spanish. From a semantic point of view, we study the evidential values expressed by these markers (i.e. direct evidence, reportative, inference) and discuss the correlations between them. From a functional point of view, we analyse the evidential markers on the basis of discourse-interactional criteria such as illocutionary force, position in the turn and kind of turn. From a grammatical point of view, we address the preferences in terms of person and TAM experienced by these evidential markers in discourse.[AQ: 2] The main result of our analysis is that, as far as the semantic and discourse properties are concerned, *evidentemente* differs from *por lo visto, al parecer* and *se ve que*. The former seems to refer primarily to shared thoughts, developing a reading that goes beyond any of the traditionally distinguished evidential values. The three other markers, by contrast, refer to indirect evidence, often combining the evidential values of reported knowledge and inference. In talk-in-interaction, the two types of markers behave differently: *evidentemente* does not enhance turn-taking, whereas the other markers leave room for the co-participant to give his or her view of the state of affairs.[AQ: 3]

Corresponding author:
Bert Cornillie, Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, University of Leuven, Blijde Inkomststraat 21, Box 3308, 3000 Leuven, Belgium.
Email: bert.cornillie@arts.kuleuven.be

Introduction

The study of evidentiality gained importance in the 1980s when typologists and descriptivists working on polysynthetic languages started to focus on how they marked source of information grammatically (cf. many contributions in Chafe and Nichols, 1986; Willett, 1988). Nowadays, some authors claim that the notion of evidentiality should be restricted to expressions belonging to an obligatory grammatical category (cf. Aikhenvald, 2004), whereas other authors consider evidential all lexical means that refer to source of information or knowledge, including expressions of opinion, perception verbs and mental state predicates (cf. De Saeger, 2007, Estrada, 2009; García Negroni, 2002; González Ramos, 2009; Hugo Rojas, 2011; Torrent, this issue).[AQ: 5] An alternative position consists in looking at how evidentiality is conveyed by context-dependent uses of grammatical forms such as tense markers, pronouns or complementizers (cf. Bermúdez, 2004, 2005; Escandell, 2010; Fernández, 2008; González Vergara, 2009, 2011; Rodríguez Ramalle, 2008; Schwenter, 1999; Squartini, 2007, 2008; among others).[AQ: 6][AQ: 7]

Now, many European languages have evidential markers that do not fit in the above-mentioned accounts. Such is the case of the following Spanish fixed expressions that stem from lexical units that denote direct evidence, especially visual perception: *evidentemente* 'evidently' (from the Latin verb *videre*), *por lo visto* 'seemingly' (lit. 'because of the seen'), *se ve que* 'it seems' (lit. 'one can see that') and *al parecer* 'seemingly' (lit. 'as it appears'):

(1)   […] *entonces*, ***evidentemente** no le conté lo de la muerte*, […]
        hence, **obviously** I didn't tell her about the murder
(2)   *Está muy bien. Era un distribuidor de primera línea, **por lo visto**.*
        it is really okay. He was a first class dealer, **apparently**
(3)   *y esto va a ser ... un festejo nazi. Por eso, **al parecer**, queda prohibido …*
        this will be … a nazi party. That is why, **apparently**, it has been forbidden
(4)   *… ¡la lata que dio hasta que encontró el lápiz! **Se ve que** dijo: 'Ya no me vuelve a pasar'.*

        … what a fuzz he made until he found his pencil! **He must have said**: 'this will not happen again'.

All four markers in (1)–(4) have undergone grammaticalization, albeit to a different extent.[AQ: 8] Also, all markers have gone through a process of semantic change: they do not refer to the direct perception of the speaker anymore, but convey an indirect evidence reading, which is inferential or hearsay-based. Although separate accounts of these evidential discourse markers exist, so far no integrated comparative study has been carried out. Moreover, since these expressions operate on the discourse level, it does not suffice to only focus on their form and meaning. Yet, their interactional functions have not received due attention so far. In this article, we use the term 'evidential discourse marker' because the expressions under examination not only refer to evidential values

but also crucially engage in discourse planning and speaker–hearer interaction. Starting from the semantic, grammatical and interactional analyses of these evidential discourse markers, we will argue that

1. Within the lexical class of evidential discourse markers, one can find markers that convey an inferential meaning contextually (*evidentemente*) and markers that encode indirect evidence (*por lo visto, al parecer, se ve que*), often without specialization of their meaning into a single evidential reading (i.e. hearsay or inferential).
2. The difference of meaning does not have special grammatical implications, but has clear interactional repercussions.
3. The expression of evidentiality by means of discourse markers is part of broader interactional strategies in which other lexical and grammatical expressions help make explicit the speaker's stance.

The article is structured in the following shape. In section 'Overview of the literature', we show why the four evidential discourse markers can be considered evidentials and will present the previous literature on the four markers. In section 'General aims and hypotheses', we will announce the general aims and hypotheses that justify our analysis. Section 'Methodology' gives insight into the methodology used for the analysis, and Section 'Results of the analysis and discussion' offers a detailed view of the qualitative and quantitative results obtained. In section 'Conclusion', we formulate our final conclusions.

Overview of the literature

For reasons of space, we cannot present an overview of the huge literature on grammatical and lexical evidentiality in this article (see Boye and Harder, 2009; De Haan, 2001; Dendale and Tasmowski, 2001). For the sake of the argument, we chose three of Anderson's (1986) criteria for evidentials as a starting point in that they help us determine the realm of evidentiality in European languages, which typically lack obligatory grammatical evidential markers (cf. Aikhenvald, 2004). Anderson (1986) offers the following cross-linguistic definition[1] of evidentials:

- Evidentials show the kind of *justification for a factual claim* which is available to the person making that claim.
- Evidentials are *not themselves the main predication* of the clause, but are rather a specification added to a factual claim *about something else*.
- Evidentials have the indication of evidence as their *primary meaning*, not only as a pragmatic inference. (p. 274–275; italics are ours)

Anderson's criteria do not only hold for grammatical evidentiality but can also account for lexical evidentiality. They are a useful analytic means for distinguishing between lexical expressions that are part of the (complex) predication and expressions that have an ancillary function and qualificational meaning. The former are (main) clauses themselves and, hence, do not qualify for evidentiality, for example, perception verbs, whereas the latter have scope over the whole proposition, for example, sentential adverbs involving vision.

The evidential discourse markers examined in this article meet Anderson's (1986) conditions and, as a consequence, can be considered evidential markers for the following reasons: (1) *justification for a factual claim*: they hint at some kind of knowledge, be it unspecified reasoning, hearsay or rumours, that justifies the claim; (2) *not the main predication*: evidential adverbials only add a dimension to the State of Affairs (SoA), but are not part of it, which makes them suitable for evidential marking; (3) *indication of evidence as their primary meaning*: evidential markers are elements with a primary semantic meaning of reference to source of information, which in the European languages consists of marking indirect evidence. Now, when a lexical unit may be used either as a perception verb (direct evidence) or as an indirect evidential marker, a distinction has to be made between different constructions belonging to this unit: for example, *ver* 'see': *no lo veo* 'I don't see it' versus *por lo visto* 'seemingly'. In the latter case, this particular construction of *ver* 'to see' expresses an evidential qualification that goes beyond perception and, in doing so, also undergoes selection restrictions (no other tense marking, for instance). In sum, Anderson's criteria hold for the description of evidential adverbials in Spanish. Yet, they do not refer to the role of evidential markers in discourse. Hence, this article will contribute to a better understanding of evidentiality by looking at the use of evidential markers in discourse.

In recent modality and evidentiality studies, the focus is increasingly on the speaker's interaction with co-participants, the asymmetry of knowledge and the role of modal and evidential markers in the organization of the turn (cf. Clift, 2006; Cornillie, 2010a, 2010b; Cornillie and Pietrandrea, 2012; Gipper, 2011; Hanks, 2012; Kärkkäinen, 2003; Nuckolls and Michael, 2012; Sidnell, 2012). Fox (2001) already presents this interactional turn claiming that (1) 'evidential marking is responsive to and constructive of the relationship between speaker and co-participant(s)' and (2) 'evidential marking is responsive to and constructive of the precise sequential location in which the utterance is produced' (p. 176). More recently, Hanks (2012) argues that evidentials 'fit into an argument strategy vis-à-vis the interlocutor, or into a typical conversational sequence' (p. 169). Moreover, Sidnell (2012) claims that in many cases, 'these [evidential] resources index a knowledge differential between speaker and recipient, rather than simply downgrading the speaker's claim to know' (p. 315). Hence, epistemic-evidential negotiations should not be seen apart from other discourse strategies such as complaining or telling and agreeing or sympathizing. Yet, Hanks (2012) and Sidnell (2012) do address the question whether speakers have recourse to specific expression types to engage in specific discourse strategies. In this article, we will combine the attention to different expressions with an interest into the interactional dynamics between speaker and co-participants in the sequence. Before we go on to discuss the data, let us first review the previous literature on the four evidential expressions under examination.

The completely grammaticalized adverb *evidentemente* 'evidently' has been attributed different evidential values: inference of the speaker (Reyes, 1996: 29), visual evidentiality and beyond (Hassler, 2005: 231, 2010) and an alternation of both visual evidence and inference (Henneman, 2013: 242). Also, Hassler (2005: 235, 241) points out that the use of *evidentemente* involves some kind of epistemic restriction, which goes accompanied by a loss of expressive force. The latter is observed through the combination with the confirmation particle *claro* and the high frequency with

cognition verbs. Yet, the epistemic restriction claim seems to be in contradiction with the evidential values since visual evidence is often attributed high epistemic commitment. Our alternative account consists in relating the claimed epistemic restriction to a specific type of speaker–hearer interaction, in line with Cornillie (2010a: 327).

With regard to *por lo visto* (lit. 'because of the seen', used as 'seemingly, apparently'), the literature stresses its advanced degree of grammaticalization (cf. 'completely grammaticalized discourse operator' in Martín Zorraquino and Portolés, 1999: 63.6). As for the evidential values, previous studies point to frequent inferential readings, although hearsay readings are also mentioned (González Ramos, 2005). Interestingly, the marker has shifted away from its visual origins and is, according to some authors, not felicitous in combination with direct evidence at the moment of speaking.[2] Furthermore, Martín Zorraquino and Portolés (1999: 63.6) observe a pragmatic dimension of irony and avoidance of taking responsibility, and González Ramos (2005) mentions an additional effect of questioning the content of the utterance. Furthermore, Estellés Arguedas and Albelda Marco (2014) detect specific prosodic patterns for the purely evidential and pragmatically enriched uses of *por lo visto* and *al parecer*. In this article, we will underpin the irony and lack of responsibility reading by looking at the turn and the sequence the marker appears in.

The adverbial phrase *al parecer* 'apparently' is considered semi-grammaticalized because it is still possible to say: *a mi parecer* 'in my opinion' and *al parecer de los asistentes* 'in the opinion of those present' (cf. Martín Zorraquino and Portolés, 1999: 63.6). Due to their definiteness (possessive *mi*, definite article *los*), the variants of *al parecer* convey the meaning of 'opinion' rather than referring to a conclusion. When it comes to evidential values, *al parecer* is seen as a hearsay marker, although it can also express inferences (González Ramos, 2005). This may have to do with the genres in which the marker shows up. In comparison with *por lo visto, al parecer* is more common in formal genres than in spontaneous speech. Our analysis will investigate whether specific interactional patterns correlate with hearsay and inferential readings.

Finally, the grammaticalized clause *se ve que* 'apparently', as far as we know, has not been dealt with previously. This construction undergoes grammaticalization (i.e. restrictions in person and tense) and semantic bleaching. In many contexts, *se ve que* does not refer to visual perception anymore, but involves a mental process. We will examine our corpus data as to whether the new readings are limited to inference or also include hearsay.

The above-mentioned markers have neither been examined on the basis of data stemming from talk-in-interaction nor has their role in the turn and sequence been researched.

General aims and hypotheses

In this article, we aim at offering a fine-grained analysis of the semantic, syntactic and discourse distribution of four Spanish evidential markers that refer to vision. We will examine the evidential readings conveyed by them (inferences, hearsay, ambiguous) and determine their discourse functions in talk-in-interaction, with special attention to their position in the turn and to their role in the sequence.

We want to test three main hypotheses in this article: (1) The four evidential discourse markers differ in terms of the indirect evidential values encoded. More specifically, it is expected that the data will show specific preferences for inference or hearsay; (2) since these discourse markers result from grammaticalization, the formal difference between these markers may correlate with specific grammatical and interactional features; (3) depending on the type of evidential value expressed, it is our hypothesis that specific lexical and grammatical expressions support the expression of the speaker's stance.

Our corpus analysis will show that the full-fledged adverb *evidentemente* differs from the adverbial phrases in two respects: when the adverb conveys an inferential reading, it only does so contextually and it has a specific discourse profile oriented on the co-participant. The data will indicate that there are no clear grammatical correlates with the specific evidential readings, but the interactional account proposed underpins previous observations concerning the epistemic restriction with *evidentemente* and the questioning of the content by *por lo visto*. It will be shown that all markers can be related to politeness and self-image strategies as well as attenuation. The interactional dimension indicates that evidential markers have different effects on speaker–hearer interaction and, thus, play a role in the development of the conversational sequence. Finally, the evidential discourse markers under examination readily combine with other modal expressions, without a clear differentiation between the markers as to which expressions they combine.

Methodology

The analysis is corpus-based. The data come from the *Corpus Oral de Referencia del Español Contemporáneo*, which includes Castilian Spanish data from the Madrid area. We have chosen this corpus because it has more than one million words and consists of a variety of spoken genres, that is, spontaneous conversation, radio and television interviews, and political debates, among others. Other spoken corpora are less suited, either because of being based on asymmetric interviews (*Macrocorpus de la Norma Culta*) or because they only contain a few occurrences (Briz and Val.Es.Co, 2002).**[AQ: 9]**

We retrieved 108 examples from the corpus, and we checked whether the context and the transcription were sufficiently clear. After having left side some 20 examples because of unclear contexts, we arrived at 19 examples of *evidentemente*, 28 examples of *por lo visto*, 22 examples of *al parecer* and 19 examples of *se ve que*.[3]**[AQ: 10]** The examples were inserted in a database and were subsequently labelled the semantic, grammatical and interactional properties.

As for the semantic features, we distinguish between six types of evidence:

1. Direct evidence (i.e. different types of perception);
2. Circumstantial inferences, that is, those inferential conclusions that are entirely based on circumstantial evidence;
3. Generic inferences, that is, those conclusions that are mainly related to thoughts and memory;
4. Reported discourse (specific source: for instance an entity in the context);
5. Reported discourse (unspecific source: rumours out there);
6. Ambiguous readings.

With regard to the grammatical features, we examine whether the evidential has wide scope (over the whole utterance) or narrow scope (over a single constituent) and whether the sentence type is a main clause, a subordinate (relative, adverbial) or a coordinate clause. We also study the lexical aspect of the verb in the utterance distinguishing between static verbs and non-static verbs. The grammatical aspect is addressed by means of the labels (1) imperfect, (2) perfect and (3) aorist. The temporal orientation is (1) present, (2) past or (3) future, and we distinguish between first, second and third person, both singular and plural.

As for the interactional features, we look at the turn and the clause describing the different positions of the marker:

1. Turn-initial;
2. Sentence-initial;
3. Sentence-medial (parenthetical);
4. Sentence-final;
5. Turn-final.

Then, we analyse the type of turn against the background of adjacency pairs:

1. Direct initiation (questions and directive acts);
2. Indirect initiation (evaluations and judgments);
3. Direct response (answers, alignments and refusals);
4. Indirect response (report on the evaluations);
5. Response initiation (answering with a question).

We also examine whether the evidential marker co-occurs with other modal or discourse markers: (1) epistemic markers, (2) evidential markers, (3) metadiscursive markers (*Bueno* 'well', …), (4) argumentation markers (*pues* 'then', *por tanto* 'so') or (5) communication and perception verbs (*dice que, vio que*, etc.). With regard to the speaker–hearer stance, we take into account the evaluation of the SoA by any of the speech participants and its relation with the marker. We differentiate between the following evaluations:

1. Opposition by the speaker in the turn which hosts the marker;
2. Opposition by the co-participant in the next turn;
3. Confirmation by the speaker in the turn which hosts the marker;
4. Confirmation by the co-participant in the next turn;
5. Not applicable.

Moreover, politeness and face have also been addressed. We distinguish between face-threatening acts to different types of participants or entities:

1. The evidential marker accompanies a SoA that threatens the face of the speaker (cf. 'self-image' or 'relational work' in Estellés Arguedas and Albelda Marco, 2014: 8);
2. The evidential marker qualifies a SoA that threatens the face of the co-participant (impoliteness);

3. The evidential marker goes with a SoA that threatens the face of another person (non-participants);
4. The marker shows up with neutral SoAs.

Moreover, we annotate the meaning effects such as (1) irony, (2) attenuation, (3) questioning of the source or (4) questioning of the content. Finally, we differentiate between genres and registers: (1) spontaneous conversation among adults, (2) spontaneous conversation among adolescents, (3) radio and television programme or (4) political discourse.

Let us now move on to presenting how we have implemented the above-mentioned criteria. The example of *evidentemente* 'evidently' in (5) comes from a radio interview in which two journalists talk about ethics and journalism. Speaker 3 (H3) explains in a very long turn the difficult situation of revealing details to relatives of a murdered girl:

(5) <H4> *Pero tú como periodista, una vez que tienes esos datos, ¿qué haces con ellos?*
          but you as a journalist, once you have these data, what do you do with them?
<H3> *Yo lo que hice fue … Yo hablé con ella; me parecía muy fuerte publicarlo porque yo no … yo no puedo … yo, a María Teresa la conocí en ese momento, yo … podía ser una más, yo no tengo ni idea;* <u>*me parece muy fuerte publicar que*</u> *la niña estaba muerta, violada, descuartizada, que es lo que … más o menos salió de ahí, ¿no?*
          me what I did was.. I talked to her, it seemed very daring to publish it because I I cannot … I … I got to know María Teresa at that moment, I … I could have been one more, I don't have a clue, <u>it seemed very daring to publish that</u> the girl was dead, raped, and torn into pieces, which is what … more or less came out, isn't?
          Entonces, yo lo que hice fue ponerme en contacto con la madre primero … que ya la … había habla<(d)>o con ella en otras ocasiones, entonces, **evidentemente** *no le conté lo de la muerte, pero yo pensé que si ella llamaba a la policía judicial la harían más caso que si llamaba yo, de parte de una vidente de la muchísimas que han llama<(d)>o, porque han llama<(d)>o … mogollón, la madre estaba ya angustiada, ¿no?. Efectivamente, ella … bueno, ella estaba pegada al teléfono a esa hora, era la una y media de la mañana; […]*
          Then, what I did was getting in touch with the mother first, … I had already talked to her on other occasions, hence, **obviously** I didn't tell her about the murder, but I thought that if she called the Criminal Investigation Department, they would listen to her better than if I called myself, one of the very many that called, because a lot of people called, the mother was really scared, wasn't she. Indeed, she …, well, she stuck to the telephone at that moment, it was 1.30 am.
[15 more lines …]
          <simultáneo> Pero podía haberlo …
                        But she could have
<H2> *O sea, que no publicaste* </simultáneo> *… No publicaste eso por humanidad …*
          So, you didn't publish … You didn't publish it for human reasons

In our database, the evidential value of *evidentemente* in (5) is labelled as 'ambiguous' in that it does not refer to any specific evidential value. By contrast, the speaker stresses that she takes into account something that the co-participant would consider self-evident and which the speaker supposes him or her to be reflecting on at the very moment of speaking. The adverb is used to make sure that the speaker has thought about the

importance of not telling all details to the relative, in line with the important social rule of confidentiality.

The sentence-medial position is most common with *evidentemente*. That is, the adverb appears most often in the body of the turn, which belongs to the direct response type. In this case, the speaker gives an answer to a clearly formulated question. The adverb co-occurs in the turn with other markers such as the tag *¿no?* and *efectivamente* 'indeed'. As far as the evaluation of the speech participant is concerned, we find a confirmation by the speaker in the turn which hosts the marker. The other sentences explain why she did not tell the complete story. Thus, the marker is part of a strategy involving face work ('self-image'). The sentences preceding the utterance with the evidential marker evoke a SoA that threatens the face of the speaker. The speaker's defensive reaction is in line with the label of 'epistemic restriction' (Hassler, 2005).

Let us now look at the discourse context of *por lo visto* 'apparently', which comes from a radio interview held in a Madrid radio station. The topic of the conversation is the bank director who has been caught with 15 kg of drugs. The speaker has recourse to an evidential marker after having concluded that the director was a key dealer:

(6)
<H2> *Sabes que ayer pillaron a un </simultáneo> ... un director de un banco con …*
   Do you know that yesterday they caught a bank director with …
<H3> *Sí.*
   Yes
<H2> *... kilo y medio de coca, ¿no?*
   with a kilo and a half of coca, you know
<H1> *Con quince kilos.*
   with 15 kilos
<H4> <simultáneo> *Quince, quince [kilos de cocaína]. Sí.*
     15, 15. Yes
<H2> *¡Ah, quince! Ah. Se me ... se me había corrido la coma.* <todos> <risas>
   ah, 15. I forgot the colon
<H1> <simultáneo> *Sí.* 'yes'
<H4> *Sí.* 'yes'
<H2> *Está bien, está bien quince, ¿no?*
   okay, it is okay. It's 15, indeed
<H4> *Está muy bien. Era un distribuidor de primera línea,* **por lo visto***.*
   it is really okay. He was a first class dealer, **apparently**
<H1> *Pero vamos, si es<palabra cortada> ... Yo he esta<(d)>o hablando con Fernando Sánchez Dragó sobre ... y creo que cualquier persona que piense un poco ... eso. Eh ... Yo le decía el otro día a u<palabra cortada> ... a una amiga vuestra, a una compañera, Sol Alonso y se ... decía: 'Pero, ¿tú estás loco ... Yo creo que tiene que haber carné de yonqui'.*
   but really, … I have been talking to Fernando Sánchez Dragó about … And I think that whatever person who thinks a bit … That … eh. I told a friend of ours, a colleague, Sol Alonso and she said.: 'but are you mad? … I think that there should be a junky card'

The evidential value of *por lo visto* 'apparently' in (6) is reported unspecified information (rumours) and its position is turn-final, which is not very common, as we will see.

The turn belongs to the direct response type in that the words of the preceding question are repeated affirmatively. The turn does not contain any other evidential or modal markers. The evaluation of the speech participant is less straightforward here because the turn-final evidential marker is not followed by another sentence, and in the next turn, the co-participant starts talking about another person. Hence, we label this category as 'non-applicable'. With regard to politeness, the speaker is talking about another person, whose face may potentially be threatened. Yet, we can also imagine that there is no personal relation with this person and conclude that there is no face work involved. In both cases, the speaker looks for a way to attenuate his or her strong assertion: the speaker presents a proposition, but the perspective given is based on impressions of others. Thus, the speaker invites the co-participant to give his or her own view on the SoA and, hence, to take the turn. Hence, the evidential phrase can play a role in turn-taking and, as a consequence, in the development of the sequence.

The analysis of *al parecer* 'apparently' is quite similar to the one applied to *por lo visto*. The context is a spontaneous conversation in the Madrid area. The topic of the talk in (7) is a neonazi gathering in Madrid and its prohibition:

(7)
<H4> <simultáneo> *Diecinueve …*
        Nineteen
<H1> *… quemando </simultáneo> papeleras y quemando basureros y eso. Va a menos.*
        burning paper bins and burning garbage bins and so. It is decreasing
<H3> *De todas maneras, lo que sí que … ha ido a más en Europa <vacilación> eh … han sido los brotes de xenofobia …*
        that's true, but what is rising in Europe, are the signs of xenophobia
<H1> *Aquí no han llega<(d)>o aún, ¿no?*
        they have not arrived yet here, haven't they.
<H4> *Sí, pero Madrid se iba a convertir el domingo, o se va a convertir, ya veremos, en una … van a venir todos los nazis de Europa, por lo visto, o neonazis y esto va a ser … un festejo nazi. Por eso, **al parecer**, <simultáneo> queda prohibido …*
        Yes, but Madrid would become next Sunday, will become, we will see, a … All European nazis, apparently, will come, or neonazis and this will be … a nazi party. That is why, apparently, it has been forbidden.
<H3> *¡Qué horror! </simultáneo>*
        how awful
<H4> *… desde la delegación <simultáneo> del gobierno, pero …*
        by the local representatives of the government
<H3> *¡Qué miedo, los yuyus! </simultáneo>*
        How scary, these yuyus
<H2> *¡Los yuyus!* <risas><risas>
        The yuyus!

The evidential value of *al parecer* can be reported information (rumours), but here, in combination with *por eso* 'hence', it can also be inferential. The position is sentence-medial and the turn type is a direct response: it is an alignment to the question/statement of the previous turn (cf. 'Aquí no han llegado aún, no'? 'they have not arrived yet here'). In the same turn, we find various other markers: the imperfect in *Madrid se iba a*

convertir 'Madrid would turn in' and evidential *por lo visto* 'apparently', which both hint at reported speech, and the argumentative marker *por eso* 'hence'. There is no evaluation of the speech participant: exclamative *¡Qué horror!* 'how awful!' is not an evaluation of the prohibition, but rather an evaluation of the gathering. In terms of politeness, the sentence with *al parecer* is neutral, but the speaker attenuates his or her statement by using the marker.

Finally, *se ve que* gives an inferential reading in example (8). The co-participants are talking about a boy who always forgets or loses his belongings. The inferential conclusion by *se ve que* is related to his anger about not finding them. The speaker expresses a subjective induction, without involvement of other sources of information:

(8)
<H1>*He llamado a Jesús y se lo he dicho, digo, mira, digo: 'Aquí te dejo las notas, digo esta noche las … cuando vengas'.*
I have called Jesus and I have told him. I say, look, I say: 'Here you have the marks, I say, tonight … when you come'.
<H2>*A ver si se espabila, mujer. Yo en mi clase tengo uno que también es así, bueno, muy niño, muy niño, y el otro día resulta que viene su padre y luego al día siguiente hablando conmigo y dice: 'No sé qué habrá pasa<(d)>o con un estuche que … que ha venido sin el estuche y sin las pinturas de esas del Danone de esas de regalo'. Digo: 'Pues si a mí no me ha dicho nada el niño'. O sea que se va a casa y … y no dice 'pues me falta esto' y luego ya, me hizo gracia, porque al día siguiente le faltaba un lápiz, ¡la lata que dio hasta que encontró el lápiz! **Se ve que** dijo: 'Ya no me vuelve a pasar'. Su padre, su madre, yo diciéndole: 'Cuando pierdas algo nos lo dices en el momento'.*
Let's see whether he will be more attentive, woman. In my group, I had one who is also like that, well, a kid, really a kid, and the other day it his father comes and then the day after when talking to me he says: 'I don't know what happened with the poster box … he came without box and without paintings which Danone gives for free'. I say: Well, the kid hasn't told me anything. So, he goes home and he doesn't tell 'this is lacking' and then I had to laugh, because the day after he didn't find his pencil, what a fuzz he made until he found his pencil! **He must have said**: 'this will not happen again'. His father, his mother, me telling him: 'when you lose something, you tell us immediately'.
<H1>*Claro*. 'right'

In (8), the evidential value of *se ve que* is circumstantial inference because it is an inter-pretation of preceding utterances. The position is sentence-initial in the body of the turn, which belongs to the indirect response type. There is no clear question and no clear answer. Rather, the co-participant offers a report on the situation. The evidential phrase co-occurs with other markers such as *digo* 'I say', overt quotes and the conjectural future *habrá pasado*. We also find *claro* 'of course' in the next turn, which shows that there is a confirmation by the co-participant in the next turn. In this fragment, we did not label any politeness or meaning effects.

Results of the analysis and discussion

In this section, we will pass on to the presentation of the results. For reasons of space, we will not give any more examples. Instead, we will describe the tendencies observed in the

Table 1. Evidential values.

	Direct evidence	Circumstantial inference	Generic inference	Specific reported speech	Unspecific reported speech	Ambiguous	Non-evidential meaning
Evidentemente	0	4	0	0	0	15	0
Por lo visto	0	2	1	11	5	9	0
Al parecer	0	2	0	7	7	6	0
Se ve que	0	4	0	0	1	3	11

corpus focusing on the semantic (5.1.), syntactic (5.2.) and interactional (5.3.) features of the evidential markers under examination.

Semantic profile

With semantic profile, we refer to the evidential values that the adverbials encode. Table 1 presents their distribution.

The main observations are that (1) the lexical markers examined in the article do not convey direct evidence; (2) the clearly inferential readings are only a minority of cases; (3) *evidentemente* does not express reported speech, but most often hints at the existence of some kind of knowledge with the co-participant, albeit without referring to a clear source of information. In some contexts, however, we observe an inferential reading; (4) *por lo visto* and *al parecer* shift between hearsay values and ambiguous indirect evidential ones, which also include hearsay, but can also be inferential. Hence, the hearsay value is by far the most common one, which confirms previous analysis of *al parecer* and points to more hearsay readings with *por lo visto* than previously acknowledged; (5) *se ve que* only expresses evidentiality in fewer than half of the corpus occurrences (8 evidential cases vs 11 non-evidential ones), but if it does, inferential readings are most common. Since this evidential construction can be considered to be still undergoing a process of grammaticalization, the question arises whether there is a path of semantic change from inference to hearsay readings.

Grammatical profile

For the analysis of the grammatical features, we have taken into account three elements: the scope of the marker, the type of the clause in which the marker appears and the grammatical properties of the verb (aspect, tense and person). As shown in Table 2, all four markers have wide scope over the utterance in the majority of cases. Only sporadically, *evidentemente* and *al parecer* have narrow scope over part of the utterance. In the case of the former, it is an adjective that is in the scope of the marker.

Table 3 presents the type of sentence which the markers appear in. As we will explain, there are quite a few differences between the evidential expressions:

The following observations can be made: (1) *evidentemente* shows a clear tendency to qualify main clauses. (2) *por lo visto* and *al parecer* appear more often in other clauses,

Table 2. Scope.

	Narrow scope (single constituent)	Wide scope (the utterance)	NA
Evidentemente	3	15	1
Al parecer	1	21	0
Por lo visto	0	28	0
Se ve que	0	8	11

Table 3. Sentence type.

	Main	Relative	Adversative	Coordinated	Subordinate (adverbial)	NA
Evidentemente	10	2	0	0	5	2
Al parecer	5	7	5	3	0	2
Por lo visto	12	7	3	6	0	0
Se ve que	7	0	0	1	0	11

such as relative, adversative or coordinate clauses. This tendency is most clear with *al parecer* (15 cases in secondary clauses vs 5 in main clauses), but less so with *por lo visto* (16 secondary clauses vs 12 main clause uses). The fact that these markers often appear in utterances that justify a previous assertion adds to their functional profile of attenuation markers. (3) As the *se ve que* construction includes a complementizer, it is no surprise that it shows up exclusively in initial position. Hence, the particular grammatical properties of the marker seem to restrict its combinatorial power.

The four markers show similar tendencies in the verbal morphology of the verbs qualified by an evidential value. If we omit the preference of *al parecer* for static verbs, we can state that evidential markers do not seem to undergo any restriction (see Table 4). The four markers usually combine with imperfect verb forms (Table 4), present tense (Table 5) and third person singular and plural (Table 6). This distribution shows that speakers dealing with actual SoAs which are related to the speech context indicate that they do not have direct evidence for their statements. On the other hand, the third person verb forms illustrate that these SoAs do not involve the speech participants. In this respect, *evidentemente* once gain shows a different pattern in that this marker also combines with first and second person verb forms. Since evidential markers usually do not qualify sentences with speaker subject, the distribution of *evidentemente* illustrates that this marker has another function beyond evidentiality.

Interactional profile

The four markers display rather similar interactional properties. First, they all have a clear preference for an utterance-medial position. Turn-initial and turn-final positions are at stake in only a minority of cases, as shown in Table 7. Once again, the discourse

Table 4. Lexical and grammatical aspect.

	Static verb	Non-static verb	NA	Imperfect	Perfect	Aorist	NA
Evidentemente	8	7	4	14	1	1	3
Al parecer	18	1	3	18	1	0	3
Por lo visto	14	13	1	19	6	2	1
Se ve que	3	5	11	4	1	3	11

Table 5. Temporal orientation.

	Present	Past	Future	NA
Evidentemente	13	3	0	3
Al parecer	15	4	0	3
Por lo visto	17	9	1	1
Se ve que	4	4	0	11

Table 6. Person.

	1 sg	2 sg	3 sg	1 pl	2 pl	3 pl	NA
Evidentemente	1	2	10	1	1	2	3
Al parecer	0	0	16	0	0	3	3
Por lo visto	0	1	16	0	0	10	1
Se ve que	0	0	6	0	0	2	11

sg: singu.lar; pl: plural.

Table 7. Discourse position.

	Turn-initial	Utterance-initial	Utterance-medial	Utterance-final	Turn-final	NA
Evidentemente	0	3	14	1	1	0
Al parecer	0	2	19	1	0	0
Por lo visto	1	5	20	1	1	0
Se ve que	1	3	3	1	0	11

position can be explained by their function. The parenthetical use, for instance, correlates with the secondary nature of evidential elements and their justifying function.

In order to describe the interactional dynamics, we also look at the type of turn the markers appear in. The evidential markers under examination usually appear in the response part of the adjacency pair. The response can be direct, but is more frequently indirect, as shown in Table 8.

Again, the fact that the evidential markers show up in the reactive part of the adjacency pair correlates with their function: they introduce another view, which the speaker can

Table 8. Turn type.

	Direct initiation	Indirect initiation	Direct response	Indirect response	Response initiation	NA
Evidentemente	0	1	7	11	0	0
Al parecer	2	1	7	10	0	2
Por lo visto	1	6	9	10	2	0
Se ve que	0	0	1	7	0	11

Table 9. Co-occurrence with modal and evidential expressions.

	Epistemic	Metadiscursive	Grammatical evidential	Lexical evidential	Combination	NA
Evidentemente	5	1	1	1	3	8
Al parecer	4	1	1	3	5	8
Por lo visto	3	0	3	9	3	11
Se ve que	0	0	0	0	5	14

Table 10. Utterance evaluation.

	Opposition speaker	Opposition recipient	Confirmation speaker	Confirmation recipient	NA
Evidentemente	0	0	13	4	2
Al parecer	0	0	5	6	11
Por lo visto	2	3	6	6	11
Se ve que	0	0	3	1	15

take from previous discourse or which he or she can come up with by means of inferential reasoning starting from his or her own knowledge.

Another element of the interactional profile of the evidential markers concerns their possible co-occurrence with other lexical or grammatical elements that express evidentiality and modality, as shown in Table 9.

The non-obligatory nature of the expression of evidentiality in languages such as Spanish may explain why speakers have recourse to several, simultaneously used, lexical and grammatical mechanisms to qualify their assertions. The data show that there are no specific combinations of evidential discourse markers and preferred expressions, which may confirm their functional flexibility.

Moreover, the evidential markers under examination introduce most often assertions that are evaluated positively in the conversation, as shown in Table 10. There is an interesting difference between *evidentemente*, on the one hand, and *al parecer* and *por lo visto*, on the other, in that the former goes accompanied by more speaker confirmations than the latter.

Table 11. Politeness effects.

	Threatens speaker's face	Threatens non-participants' face	Neutral SoAs	NA
Evidentemente	5	4	6	4
Al parecer	1	8	13	0
Por lo visto	1	7	19	1
Se ve que	0	0	8	11

SoAs: states of affairs.

Table 12. Meaning effects.

	Irony	Attenuation	Question source	Question content	NA
Evidentemente	2	0	0	0	17
Al parecer	0	21	1	0	0
Por lo visto	4	19	1	3	1
Se ve que	0	4	0	0	15

Evidential markers enable assertions for which the speaker has no direct evidence and for which he or she seeks more information from the speech participants. Thus, evidential markers add to the development of the sequence.

Another revealing dimension is the relation of the evidential markers with politeness. Some accounts link the use of indirect evidentiality to face-saving strategies which aim at countering face-threatening actions (González Ramos, 2005). *Evidentemente* receives the label of 'epistemic restriction' (Hassler, 2005: 235, 241). Here, we will link the latter with face-saving strategies. As can be observed in Table 11, although in the majority of cases evidential markers are used in face-neutral utterances, evidential markers indeed appear in utterances that may threaten the face of a third person in a considerable number of cases. Once again, *evidentemente* seems to deviate from this pattern in that it is often used as face-saving strategy by the speaker. The adverb is part of the speaker's defensive stance, which can be interpreted as 'epistemic restriction'.

Beyond the social dimension of face, the attenuating function is prominent with evidential markers *al parecer, por lo visto* and *se ve que*. As observed in Table 12, it is far more frequent than the other meaning effects mentioned in the literature such as irony, the questioning of the source and the questioning of the speaker's own content. Hence, it can be stated that there is a relation between the use of indirect evidential markers and the expression of attenuation of the speaker's responsibility. Once again, *evidentemente* is different: no attenuation is attested.

Finally, our analysis also reveals interesting differences between the four evidential markers in terms of the spoken genres they appear in (Table 13).[AQ: 11]

On the one hand, *al parecer* and *evidentemente* show up predominantly in formal genres of Spanish. *Por lo visto*, by contrast, is slightly more frequent in conversations, which leads us to conclude that the expression is less marked for register. Finally, the *se*

Table 13. Genre.

	Conversation	TV and radio	Academic discourse	NA
Evidentemente	2	15	0	0
Al parecer	2	18	2	0
Por lo visto	6	22	0	0
Se ve que	6	2	0	11

ve que construction is more frequent in spontaneous conversations, which suggests that the expression is marked as belonging to the informal register.

Conclusion

In this article, we have stressed the need for a discourse approach to evidential markers. This is all the more necessary in a language as Spanish without a grammatical system of obligatory evidential markers. We have argued that Anderson's (1986) conditions still hold. The lexical evidential markers that we have examined in this article (1) are a justification for a factual claim, (2) are not the main predication and (3) have reference to knowledge as their primary meaning.

The main results of the analysis are the following. From a semantic point of view, our account of *al parecer* and *por lo visto* has shown that it is often hard to delineate a specific evidential value of markers that combine hearsay and inference. Notwithstanding the ambiguous readings, the hearsay reading of *al parecer* is confirmed, and we have found more hearsay with *por lo visto* than expected. On the other hand, *evidentemente* has developed an evidential reading that goes beyond the traditional typology of values, although we can still find inferential readings in specific contexts. As for *se ve que*, the evidential inferential meaning is still developing and coexists with the lexical meaning of direct perception. In sum, hypothesis 1 on the different readings is confirmed.

As for the grammatical analysis, the evidential markers share most of the features (wide scope, predominantly sentences in third person and present tense). There are differences in terms of main and secondary clauses. *Por lo visto* and *al parecer* show a preference for introducing secondary information, which is in line with the justifying function evidentiality, whereas *evidentemente* is found more often in the main clause. Hence, hypothesis 2 concerning specific grammatical properties is only partially confirmed.

As for the interactional dimension, sentence-medial position in response turns is the unmarked option. For *por lo visto* and *al parecer*, this position is included in an attenuation strategy with face-saving for third persons, whereas, interestingly, with *evidentemente*, attenuation is not attested and the polite dimension is concerned with saving the speaker's face. Hence, *evidentemente* has a different profile than the other markers studied, which corroborates the interactional dimension of hypothesis 2.

We can push this topic one step further and hypothesize that there is a 'complementary distribution' of face-threatening SoA and attenuation in the organization of the sequence. Using *evidentemente* with face-threatening SoA is then a pre-emptive strategy to keep

the turn. The speaker takes into account the shared intentionality (Tomasello, 2003) of speech participants and the consequences for turn-taking. He or she wants to avoid the co-participant's objection. The frequent confirmation by the speaker is in line with this. Using evidential adverbial phrases such as *por lo visto* and *al parecer*, by contrast, is an attenuation strategy that involves turn-taking. The absence of face-threatening SoA for speech participants leads to more interaction: the speaker does not know everything and leaves room for the co-participant's view of the SoA.

The role of both types of markers in the sequential organization of the conversation is different: hinting at shared knowledge leads to longer turns (turn-keeping) and attenuation leaves the floor to other views, hence fosters shorter turns in interaction (turn-taking). We can confirm Fox's (2001) point on the relation between evidential marking and the relationship between speaker and co-participant(s) in conversation. With regard to the evidential values, from this analysis we can conclude that hearsay seems to fit well in the process of turn-taking. It should be further examined whether inferences do worse in similar discourse settings.

Finally, with regard to hypothesis 3, a variety of expressions accompany the different evidential discourse markers, which does not allow us to trace specific combinations. Hence, this hypothesis is not confirmed. The fact that both evidential and epistemic expressions combine with the four markers under examination supports our decision to go beyond the semantics and syntax of non-grammatical evidentiality so as to focus on the discourse strategies related to this functional category.

Funding

Notes

1. Anderson's (1986) definition of evidentiality belongs to Chafe and Nichols' (1986) thematic volume on evidentiality, which is mainly concerned with the grammatical description of evidential markers observed in Native American languages, but also contains functional typologies and definitions that can be applied to European languages.
2. Martín Zorraquino (2013: 122) argues that (in her peninsular variety of Spanish) *?Mañana, por lo visto, lloverá* 'Tomorrow, apparently, it will rain' is not felicitous, whereas *Mañana, al parecer, lloverá* 'Tomorrow, it seems, it will rain' is. Yet, in other varieties, the *por lo visto* example does not sound problematic. Utterances such as *Por lo visto no va a venir* are quite common when someone does not show up at the time of the appointment (Sansiñena p.c.).
3. Since *obviamente*, which is quite close to *evidentemente*, only appeared twice, we have not included this adverb in our study.

References

Anderson L (1986) Evidential, paths of change, and mental maps: Typologically regular asymmetries. In: Chafe W and Nichols J (eds) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 273–312.[AQ: 13]
Bermúdez F (2004) La categoría evidencial del castellano: Metonimia y elevación de sujet. *Boletín de lingüística* 22: 3–31.

Bermúdez F (2005) Los tiempos verbales como marcadores evidenciales. El caso del pretérito perfecto compuesto. *Estudios Filológicos* 40: 165–188.

Boye K and Harder P (2009) Evidentiality: Linguistic categories and grammaticalization. *Functions of Language* 16(1): 9–43.

Chafe W (1986) Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. In Chafe W and Nickols J (eds) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 261–272.**[AQ: 14]**.

Chafe W and Nichols J (eds) (1986) *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Clift R (2006) Indexing stance: Reported speech as an interactional evidential. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 10(5): 569–595.

Cornillie B (2007) *Epistemic Modality and Evidentiality in Spanish (Semi) Auxiliaries. A Cognitive-Functional Approach*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton.**[AQ: 15]**

Cornillie B (2009) Evidentiality and epistemic modality: On the close relationship of two different categories. *Functions of Language* 16(1): 44–62.**[AQ: 16]**

Cornillie B (2010a) An interactional approach to evidential and epistemic adverbs in Spanish conversation. In: Diewald G and Smirnova E (eds) *The Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 309–330.

Cornillie B (2010b) On conceptual semantics and discourse functions: The case of Spanish modal adverbs in informal conversation. *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 8(2): 300–320.

Cornillie B and Pietrandrea P (2012) Modality at work. Cognitive, interactional and textual functions of modal markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 441(5): 2109–2115.

De Haan F (2001) The cognitive basis of visual evidentials. In: Cienki A, Luka BJ and Smith MB (eds) *Conceptual and Discourse Factors in Linguistic Structure*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, pp. 91–106.

Dendale P and Tasmowski L (2001) Introduction: Evidentiality and related notions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 339–348.

De Saeger B (2007) Evidencialidad y modalidad espistémica en los verbos de actitud proposicional en español. *Interlingüística* 17: 268–277.

Escandell MV (2010) Futuro y evidencialidad. *Anuario de lingüística hispánica* 26: 9–34.

Estellés Arguedas M and Albelda Marco M (2014) Evidentials, politeness and prosody in Spanish: A corpus analysis. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(1): 29–62.

Estrada A (2009) Ethos y pedagogía. El marcador de evidencialidad 'a ver' en la clase magistra. *Lingüística* 22: 61–80.

Fernández S (2008) Generalizaciones y evidencialidad en español. *Revue Romane* 43(2): 217–234.

Fernández Sanmartín A (2006) *La expresión de la modalidad epistémica en español conversacional*. MA Dissertation, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain.**[AQ: 17]**

Fox B (2001) Evidentiality: Authority, responsibility, and entitlement in English conversation. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 11: 1–29.

García Negroni MM (2002) En todo caso: Atenuação, polidez e evidencialidade. *Letras de Hoje* 37(3): 93–121.

Gipper S (2011) *Evidentiality and intersubjectivity in Yurakaré: An interactional account*. PhD Dissertation, Radboud Universiteit, Holland.

González Ramos E (2005) Cómo eludir responsabilidades sobre lo dicho: los signos *por lo visto* y *al parecer* (analogías y diferencias en su empleo actual). *Español Actual* 84: 153–158.

González Ramos E (2009) La expresión de la opinión personal: a propósito del signo complejo evidencial *en mi opinion*. *Interlingüística* 18: 553–563.

González Vergara C (2011) Estrategias gramaticales de expresión de la evidencialidad en el español de Chile. *Alpha* 32: 149–165.

González Vergara C and Pablo L (2009) Estrategias de expresión de la evidencialidad en la argumentación oral en sala de clases. *Revista Signos* 71: 295–315.[AQ: 18]

Hanks W (2012) Evidentiality in social interaction. *Pragmatics and Society* 3(2): 169–180.

Hassler G (2005) El uso evidencial de los adverbios modales. In: Cuartero-Otal J and Berd W (eds) *Algunos problemas específicos de la descripción sintáctico-semántica*. Berlin: Frank & Timme GMBH, pp. 229–244.

Hassler G (2010) Epistemic modality and evidentiality and their determination on a deictic basis: The case of Romance languages. In: Diewald G and Smirnova E (eds) *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 223–248.

Henneman A (2013) *A Context-Sensitive and Functional Approach to Evidentiality in Spanish or Why Evidentiality Needs a Superordinate Category*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Hugo Rojas E (2011) Las formas de segunda persona singular como estrategias evidenciales. *Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada* 49: 143–167.

Kärkkäinen E (2003) *Epistemic Stance in English Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kotwica D (2013) Los valores del significado de la partícula evidencial al parecer: la atenuación y el efecto de disociación. In Cabedo A, Aguilar M and López-Navarro E (eds) *Estudios de lingüística: investigaciones, propuestas y aplicaciones*. Valencia: University of Valencia, pp. 403–410.[AQ: 19]

Martín Zorraquino MA (2013) La polifonía en algunos signos adverbiales disjuntos que matizan la aserción en español actual (*desde luego* y *sin duda; por lo visto* y *al parecer*. In: Gévaudan P, Vahram A and Detges U (eds) *Modalität und Polyphonie*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg-Verlag, pp. 103–130.

Martín Zorraquino MA and Portolés J (1999) Los marcadores del discurso. In: Bosque I and Demonte V (eds) *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa, vol. III, pp. 4051–4214.

Michael L (2008) *Nanti Evidential Practice: Language, Knowledge, and Social Action in an Amazonian Ssociety*. PhD Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, TX.[AQ: 20]

Nuckolls J and Michael L (2012) Evidentials and evidential strategies in interactional and socio-cultural context. *Pragmatics and Society* 3(2): 181–188.

Pietrandrea P (2007) The grammatical nature of some epistemic-evidential adverbs in spoken Italian. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 19(1): 39–64.[AQ: 21]

Reyes G (1996) *La Pragmática Lingüística: el estudio del uso del lenguaje*. Barcelona: Montesinos.

Sidnell J (2012) 'Who knows best?': Evidentiality and epistemic asymmetry in conversation. *Pragmatics and Society* 3(2): 294–320.

Squartini M (2004) Disentangling evidentiality and epistemic modality in romance. *Lingua* 114(7): 873–889.[AQ: 22]

Squartini M (ed) (2007a) Evidentiality between lexicon and grammar (Special issue). *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 19: 1–390.[AQ: 23][AQ: 24]

Squartini M (2007b) Investigating a grammatical category and its lexical correlates. *Italian Journal of Linguistics* 19(1): 1–6.

Squartini M (2008) Lexical vs. grammatical evidentiality in French and Italian. *Linguistics* 46(5): 917–947.

Tomasello M (2003) *Constructing a Language: A Usage-Based Theory of Language Acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Torrent A (**IN PRESS**) Evidentiality and lexicalisation in the Spanish phraseological system: A study of the idiom a *fe mía* (and its variants). *Discourse Studies* 17(2).

Traugott EC (2007) Discussion article: Discourse markers, modal particles, and contrastive analysis, synchronic and diachronic. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6: 139–157.[AQ: 25]

Van der Auwera J and Plungian VA (1998) Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79–124.[AQ: 26]

Willett T (1988) A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12: 51–97.

Author biographies

Bert Cornillie is assistant professor of Spanish linguistics at the University of Leuven (Belgium). He has published in international journals and volumes on modality and evidentiality. He has also edited books and special issues of journals on discourse-grammatical phenomena such as (inter) subjectivity, modal auxiliaries, modal particles and discourse markers. Currently, he is involved in several research projects (e.g. GOA project 12/007 'The multiple functional load of grammatical signs', awarded by the Research Council of KU Leuven, and two projects funded by the Research Foundation Flanders). He served as the conference manager of Societas Linguistica Europaea (SLE) from 2008 to 2013. Since 2010, he is the coordinator of the Leuven Research Group FunC (Functional and Cognitive Linguistics: Grammar and Typology).

Pedro Gras Manzano holds a PhD in Spanish Linguistics from the University of Barcelona. Currently, he is assistant professor of Spanish Linguistics at Universiteit Antwerpen and visiting professor at KU Leuven. His main research interests are Construction Grammar, Interactional Linguistics and insubordination. He is particularly interested in the pragmatic aspects of grammatical constructions within the framework of interactional linguistics. He has also worked extensively on Spanish as a foreign language and on legal Spanish. He is an often solicited reviewer and guest lecturer.