

EVIDENTIALITY IN SPOKEN CATALAN. THE EVIDENTIAL MARKER *DIU QUE*

JORDI M. ANTOLÍ MARTÍNEZ¹

Universitat d'Alacant

jordi.antoli@ua.es

ORCID: 0000-0003-2273-653X

ANDREU SENTÍ²

Universitat de València

andreu.senti@uv.es

ORCID: 0000-0002-4470-0469

ABSTRACT

This study deals with an Catalan evidential marker without a written tradition, but mainly an oral one: *diu que* ('(s)he.says.that', 'it is said that'), a Romance correlate for *dizque* (Spanish) or *dice che* (Italian) (cf. Travis 2006, Cruschina 2015, Alcázar 2018). The spoken, dialectal and, to some extent, residual nature of this marker forces us to search for different sources in order to approach it. The study focuses on the oral recordings of *Museu de la Paraula* [Word Museum] —an ethnological archive with monological spoken texts— will be completed with the examination of the first results of the colloquial corpus *Parlars* —a dialectal and informal corpus with monological and dialogical spoken texts. The analysis of *diu que* and the corpus data show a partially grammaticalized construction with a reportative evidential value. A mirative extension can be also found, but not a pure epistemic meaning. Also, the rise of *diu que* has been seen as an example of grammatical constructionalization with a tendency towards more subjective meanings, from a quotative strategy to a reportative evidential marker. Related markers such as *que diu que* or the conventional formula to begin tales *això diu que era* have been attested.

KEYWORDS: Catalan, evidential strategies, reportative evidentiality, diction verbs, constructionalization, spoken corpus linguistics.

¹ This research was financed by the project *Gestión de la Información y Estructuración Lingüística* [Information Management and Linguistic Structuring] (GestInf), of the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities (FFI2017-85441-R) and by the project *Variación y cambio lingüístico en catalán. Una aproximación diacrónica según la lingüística de corpus* [Variation and Linguistic Change in Catalan. A diachronic approach according to corpus linguistics] (VARIABLELINGCA) also of the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities (FFO PGC2018-099399-B-I00).

² This work was additionally supported by the research group "Linguistic Variation in Catalan (VaLingCat)", University of Valencia (Ref: GIUV2017-397) and by the project *Elaboració d'un corpus oral dialectal del valencià col·loquial* [Preparation of a Dialectal Oral Corpus of Colloquial Valencian] (CorDiVal), funded by the Valencian Government (*Generalitat Valenciana*, Ref. GV/2017/094).

EVIDENCIALITAT EN CATALÀ ORAL. EL MARCADOR EVIDENCIAL *DIU QUE*

RESUM

Aquest estudi s'ocupa del marcadorevidencial *diu que*, que no té una gran tradició escrita en català, però que s'usa oralment i és equivalent al *dizque* de l'espanyol o *dice che* de l'italià (cf. Travis 2006, Cruschina 2015, Alcázar 2018). El fet que aquest marcadorevidencial siga prolífic especialment en registres orals, en els dialectes catalans i que estiga en decadència entre el jovent en dificulta l'estudi i, per això, cal buscar en diverses fonts per acostar-s'hi. Aquest article analitza els enregistraments orals del *Museu de la Paraula* —un arxiu etnològic amb textos orals monològics de valencians— i els primers resultats del *Corpus Parlars*, un corpus dialectal i col·loquial de textos orals monològics i dialògics del valencià. L'anàlisi de *diu que* i el conjunt de dades dels corpus mostren una construcció parcialment gramaticalitzada amb un valor evidencial reportatiu. També trobem un valor admiratiu o de sorpresa (*mirativity*) i certs matisos epistèmics pragmàtics. El sorgiment de *diu que* pot analitzar-se com un exemple de construccionalització gramatical que tendeix cap a valors més subjectius: des d'un verb per a indicar l'estil directe reportat fins al marcadorevidencial reportatiu. També es documenten altres marcadors relacionats, com ara *que diu que* i la fórmula rutinitzada per a encetar contes *això diu que era*.

MOTS CLAU: català, estratègies evidencials, evidencialitat reportativa, verbs de dicció, construccionalització, lingüística de corpus orals.

La felicitat *diu que* es multiplica
per cinc després de patir.
Si vols que surti el sol
abans s'haurà de fer de nit.
(David Carrabén, Mishima)

1. INTRODUCTION³

Romance languages boast a variety of resources to express the origin of information. They are mainly lexical resources, i.e. *evidential strategies* —in the words of Aikhenvald (2004). Unlike others, Romance languages lack morphemes with a primary evidential value, or expressed differently, they do not have an *evidential grammatical category*.

The discussion around what exactly is grammar and what is lexis has remained a constant in cognitive as well as functional linguistic models, which prefer to speak about a continuum rather than an actual distinction (Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004, Langacker 2011). In fact, the studies on evidentiality have revealed the existence of various constructions which cast doubts on this distinction (Squartini 2007, 2008; Pietrandrea 2007; Diewald & Smirnova 2010). A good example can precisely be found in the Catalan marker *diu que* ('(s)he.says.that', 'it is said that'), with the Romance correlates *dizque* (Spanish), *diz que* (Aragonese; *Endize* s.v. *diz que*), *disque* (Galician), *nachi* (Sardinian), *dice che*

³ Many thanks to the different anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions on earlier versions of this article. All errors and omissions are ours.

(Italian), *dicica* (Sicilian) or *cică* (Romanian). Therefore, this paper attempts to support the idea of a lexical-grammatical continuum in the study of evidentiality.

This construction results from the grammaticalization of a verb *dicendi*, *dir* ('say') with the complementizer *que* which has eventually –and to a greater or lesser extent depending on the language or dialect– become an evidential marker of an indirect reportative nature. Also Aikhenvald (2004: §4.8.4) exposed that verbs of saying grammaticalize into a reportative evidential in several languages. In fact, the example of *diu que* or *dizque* is being referred to as an *emergent evidential form* in the recent handbook of evidentiality directed by Aikhenvald (2018) (cf. also Alcázar 2018) (§2).

Semantic extensions can be found in this kind of constructions, as it is usual in different domains such as tense, aspect or modality (Squartini 2008). It can be difficult to find the primary meaning or to determine whether a pragmatic reading is also part of the core meaning. In this paper we analyze the meanings of *diu que* considering a semantic-pragmatic continuum in order to find out the main function of the construction and its relation with the contextual information. To sum up, this case study can provide information about the lexical-grammatical continuum, the evidential meanings developed and their relation with epistemic modality and mirativity.

The research made during the last few years has highlighted that Romance languages such as Catalan also use other more grammatical types of constructions to express evidentiality. Examples thereof are modal and evidential adverbs, which belong to a closed word class –and not to an open one, as is typical of what we usually see as lexis: *potser* 'maybe', *possiblement* 'possibly', *evidentment* 'evidently', *naturalment* 'naturally', etc. Added to this, a number of verbs have inferential evidential values derived from a reanalysis and grammaticalization process and which are far from being lexical elements (cf. Cornillie 2007; Squartini 2007, 2008). By way of example, the Catalan modal verb *deure* 'must' has developed inferential values within a grammaticalization process too (Sentí 2015, cf. González 2011). It is actually worth highlighting that the presence of grammaticalization in some dialects has entailed the loss of the original value, thus becoming an exclusively inferential marker (Sentí 2018). Albeit to a lesser extent, the Catalan modal verb *haver (de)* 'have to' has developed an inferential value as well (specific inference; Sentí 2017). Catalan also has verbal tenses which have acquired secondary evidential or modal values, including the future (Martines 2017b) and the hearsay or epistemic conditional (Martines 2017a, 2018).⁴

As is often the case cross-linguistically, SEEM verbs have developed (reportative and inferential) evidential values too –exemplified by constructions with the verbs *semblar* and *parèixer* 'seem' (Antolí 2015, 2017). The same holds

⁴ Other pragmatic evidential markers in Catalan have been studied by González (2011, 2014, 2015), Cuenca & Marin (2012) and Cuenca (2015).

true for markers coming from direct perception verbs such as *veure* ‘see’ and *dir* ‘say’ (Aikhenvald 2004: 271, Antolí 2017). In other words, a number of (semi)grammaticalized constructions exist —e.g. (*em*) *sembla que*, *pareix que* ‘it seems that’, *es veu que* ‘(lit.) it is seen that’, ‘it seems that’ or that under study in this article, *diu que*— which serve to modify the main event by adding an evidential value (or occasionally an epistemic one) to it:

- (1) *Sembla que* França i Anglaterra fan esforços perquè Itàlia i Alemanya es reintegrin al sistema de control. (CTILC2, Marià Manent, *El vel de Maia*, 1975)
‘It seems that France and England are making great efforts for Italy and Germany to return to the control system.’
- (2) n’hi ha subvencions pero, hasta ara, ara *pareix que* se ho volen apanyar una mica, hasta ara només havien sigut pes que tenien molta terra. (COD, Tamarit)
‘there are subsidies but, until now, now it seems that they want to fix it a little bit, so far the subsidies were only for those who had a lot of land.’
- (3) E *se veu que* hi ha molt d’interessos entre u batle de l’Alguer i un senyor que està per aquí. (COD, Pollença)
‘And it seems that there are a lot of interests between the Mayor of Alghero and a gentleman who lives around here.’
- (4) l’agüelo va morir de càncer o no sé què, fumae molt *diu que*. (*Museu*, MOH77-Vallibona-H22)
‘grandpa died of cancer or I don’t know what, he used to smoke a lot, they say.’

Many of these markers are used for reportative purposes, amongst them *diu que*. Focusing specifically on reportative evidentiality, the first issue that needs attention is the typology of reportative evidentials. In his already classical typology, Willett (1988: 96) not only draws a distinction between the three main evidentiality subcategories (sensorial, inferential and reportative) but also divides reportative evidentials into three groups, according to whether they refer to: a) second-hand evidence (hearsay), “the speaker claims to have heard of the situation described from someone who was a direct witness”; b) third-hand evidence (hearsay), “the speaker claims to have heard about the situation described, but not from a direct witness”; or c) folklore, “the speaker claims that the situation described is part of the established oral history (fairy tales, mythology, oral literature, proverbs and sayings)”, or that the information presented is general knowledge.

As for the grammatical expression of evidentiality, these three categories are not distinguished in all languages: a single marker may actually bring together two or three types of sources (Palmer 2001: 41-42). In the first circumstance, Aikhenvald states that:

if a language has two reportative evidentials, the most common distinction is that between reported (stating what someone else has said without specifying the exact authorship) and quotative (introducing the exact author of the quoted report). (Aikhenvald 2004: 177)

In accordance with this other typology, the “third-hand” and “folklore” categories proposed by Willett come to be included in the “reportative” category. Similarly, and focusing now on the non-grammatical expression of evidentiality, Cruschina and Remberger (2008: 110) adapt Willett’s classification to the reality identified during their examination of the grammaticalized forms derived from *say + that*⁵ and draw a distinction between second-hand evidentials (which bring together direct and indirect speech) and third-hand ones (which in turn comprise the hearsay and folklore values). Our study assumes the distinction between *quotative* and *reportative* – following Aikhenvald – but we also maintain the *third-hand* and *folklore* types as reportative value subcategories seeking to achieve a more accurate functional description of reportative markers.

The Catalan *diu que* is related to other markers and, of course, to the verb *dir* ‘say’. This verb essentially works as a quotative for reported speech, where the speaker simply reproduces the discourse of the source in direct or indirect speech:

- (5) Enric ve i *diu*: “Ah! Això és com amb, si as mig de sa plaça Catalunya a les sis de s’horabaixa no hi hagués ningú”, i, efectivament, és així, però és qui tothom és a Prica. (*Dialcat*, COD, Mallorca; Martí *et al.* 2007)

‘Enric comes and *says*: “Ah! This is like with, as if there were nobody in the middle of Catalunya Square at 6 pm”, and, indeed, it is like that, but what happens is that everybody is at Prica.’

The verb *dir* also shapes some impersonal constructions with a reportative function, namely: *diuen (que)* (‘they say that’) and *es diu que* (‘it is said that’). These partially grammaticalized constructions are characterized by an unspecific subject,⁶ the verb *dir* that has reduced its morphological flexibility (it appears only in the 3rd person – singular or plural – of the present tense), and a subordinate clause is selected to supply propositional information, especially in the case of *es diu que*. Semantically speaking, these constructions typically convey either a reportative meaning (6) or a folklore meaning (7):

- (6) *Diuen que* no, que hei ha més poca gent, i no ho sé com que jo és una co- és un ofici que no el visc. (COD, Ciutadella)

‘They say no, that there are fewer people, and I don’t know, because it is a thi(ng) that I... it’s a job that I haven’t experienced.’

- (7) *Es diu que* el dia de l’Ascensió, a migjorn, les fulles de les oliveres s’encreuellen. (CIVAL, *Coses típiques de la Marina, la meua comarca*, 1912)

‘It is said that on Ascension Day, at noon, the leaves of the olive trees form a cross.’

We can also find a parenthetical use of the construction *diuen*, both sentence-finally without *que* (8) and in the middle of the sentence, interrupting

⁵ We will use the abstract form “Say+That” to refer to the construction under analysis independently of the specific language, in order to simplify the reasoning and the writing.

⁶ See Bel (2002: 1094-1095) for the syntactic behavior of such subjects.

the discourse (9), where *diuen que* seemingly assesses only the direct object (“un miracle”).

- (8) Es diumenges sí que hei ha molta gent. En quant a turisme, no n’hi ha tant com altres anys, *diuen*. (COD, Ciutadella)
 ‘On Sundays, there are actually plenty of people. As for tourism, there is not as much as in previous years, *they say*.’
- (9) Va n’hi haver una pesta de les famoses a Morella i se va pensar de pujar la Mare de Déu en romeria a veure si aixina aconseguien que passara la peste i va passar, *diuen que* un milacre. (COD, Morella)
 ‘There was a famous (really bad) pestilence in Morella and people thought about taking the Virgin Mary up on a pilgrimage in order to see whether they could get rid of the pestilence, and they did, a miracle, *they say*.’

Finally, the impersonal construction *diu que* is a hearsay marker. Unlike what happens in (5), the following examples contain no reported speech: the main function of *dir* consists in encoding an original proposition that belongs to another speaker. The construction *diu que* is subject to more syntactic restrictions, since it can only appear in third person singular (10). The possibility also exists for it to be dislocated and utilized parenthetically (11).⁷ It can indicate folklore too (12).⁸

- (10) [Talking about a shop, called Bolufer] –Bolufer ja ha acabat? –Allò *diu que* està molt vell. (*Parlars*, Benissa, dialogue)
 ‘–Has Bolufer [a shop] closed yet?’ –*It is said* to be very old.’
- (11) l’agüelo va morir de càncer o no sé què, fumae molt *diu que*. (*Museu*, Vallibona-H22)
 ‘grandpa died of cancer or I don’t know what, he used to smoke a lot, *they say*.’
- (12) Per què santa Marta porta poalet? Perquè *diu que* arreplegava les bales dels corsaris amb el seu poalet. (Antolí 2015a: 389)
 ‘Why does Saint Marta carry a bucket? Because *it is said that* she used to pick up the pirates’ bullets with it.’

As explained above, this paper revolves around this last construction, *diu que*, which is why we set aside the other constructions formed with a SAY verb. This reportative marker has also been documented and studied in Romance languages. Section 2 is dedicated to the equivalents of *diu que* in Romance languages and summarizes the state of the art, especially regarding the values expressed by this construction and the degree of grammaticalization that it has achieved. In turn, section 3 deals with the methodology based on the study of oral corpora that we are presenting; after all, *diu que* can be described as a marker typically belonging to the spoken language which enjoys great popularity in

⁷ This example corresponds to example (4), repeated here for convenience.

⁸ In relation to this use, *diu que* works as a stock phrase to introduce a narrative or tale (Antolí 2015: 397-400).

Valencian Catalan. Section 4 provides an analysis about the data corresponding to the oral corpora under study and the Catalan marker *diu que*. Finally, section 5 contains the discussion and a summary of the most important conclusions drawn, particularly in what concerns the relationship between *diu que* with the other languages, after which we also suggest a hypothesis about the formation of this construction from a diachronic point of view.

2. ROMANCE EMERGENT EVIDENTIAL FORMS WITH SAY VERBS. STATE OF THE ART

Many languages have developed a quotative or evidential marker from verbs such as *dir* 'say' (Aikenhevald 2004: §4.8). In the Romance context, a marker equivalent to *diu que* (or *Say+That*) appears in various languages. Special attention has been paid to it in American Romance languages, both in Brazilian Portuguese (Casseb Galvão's 2001) and in the Spanish of Colombia, Mexico, Bolivia and Ecuador (Travis 2006; Olbertz 2005, 2007; Babel 2009; Mora & Maldonado 2015; cf. a summary in Alcázar 2018: 729-733). It has also been studied in European Romance languages such as Romanian, Galician, Sardinian and Sicilian (Cruschina & Remberger 2008), Italian (Cruschina 2015) and Catalan (Antolí 2015).

Scholars tend to see the marker *Say+That* as an adverb stemming from the grammaticalization of evidentiality in languages which lack a grammatical system (Pietrandrea 2007, Cruschina & Remberger 2008,⁹ Miglio 2010). Firstly, a phonetic reduction has taken place in some languages; for instance, in Spanish, which has evolved from *dice que* to *dizque* or in Galician, which shows a similar evolution: *dise* (*di + se*) *que* > *disque*. Furthermore, Sicilian has experienced a change in the vowel quantity of /i/ during the passage from *dici ca* to *dicica*: the vowel harmony of /i/ in *dici* no longer exists in *dicica* (cf. Cruschina & Remberger 2008: 100).

Morphologically speaking, the construction under study has become an indivisible, invariable unit; or expressed differently, it admits no person, number, tense or mode inflection. The form *diu que* or *dizque* cannot be **deia que*, **dieu que* or **decíaque* o **decíanque*, etc.

In syntactic terms, the construction *Say+That* has undergone a variety of changes as well, even though they are not completely homogeneous across all Romance languages. The verb *say* (or *dir*) has generally lost the predicative capacity of main verbs in the construction *Say+That*; and the conjunction *that* (or *que*) does not introduce a subordinate clause anymore. In other words, a

⁹Cruschina & Remberger (2008) have described the grammaticalization of this construction in different Romance languages (Romanian, Sicilian, Sardinian, and Galician) following Heine (1993): phonological erosion; morphological decategorization; change in syntactic properties; and desemanticization.

reanalysis took place as a result of which the construction *Say+That* has become a more grammatical unit which modifies the sentence.¹⁰

The emergent construction shows different grammaticalization levels depending on the language, as revealed by some syntactic divergences. The unit *Say+That* is quite consolidated in most Romance languages: the particle *that* (or *que*) has stopped acting as a complementizer and simply forms part of the syntactic unit *Say+That* (or *diu que*) now. In such cases, the construction may behave as a parenthetical and appear in final position – and, needless to say, the subordinating conjunction (*que*) does not serve to introduce a subordinate clause, as in (13). It can be used in isolation too, for example, as the answer to a question (14). This is what happens in Sicilian:

(13) Sicilian. *Maria jè malata, dicica.* (Cruschina 2015: 19)

‘Maria is apparently ill.’

(14) Sicilian. –*Chi jè veru ca Maria av’a partiri pi l’America? – Dicica!* (Cruschina & Remberger 2008: 103)

‘–Is it true that Maria is going to leave for America? –Apparently!’

The verb *say* (or *dir*) or the conjunction *that* (or *que*) have kept some of their functions in other languages, though. Thus, the Italian *dice che* can only appear sentence-initially as in (15) and never postposed or isolated, as shown in (16). No mobility is allowed, except for a Hanging Topic movement, e.g. being preceded by the subject, as illustrated by (17):

(15) Italian. *Dice che era un bell’ uomo e veniva dal mare.* (Cruschina 2015: 7)

‘They say he was a handsome man and that he came from the sea.’

(16) Italian. **era un bell’ uomo, dice che.* (Cruschina 2015: 14)

(17) Italian. *Gli stipendi, dice che verranno dimezzati.* (Cruschina 2015: 14)

‘The salaries, they will apparently be halved.’

The *that* (or *ca, que...*) included in this construction no longer functions as such in Spanish, Galician and Sicilian; hence why another complementizer –either before or after– is needed when the main sentence verb introduces a subordinate clause, as in the following example:

¹⁰In accordance with generative grammar, *Say+That* would stand in a functional position, either in the nucleus or in the specifier (cf. Cruschina & Remberger 2008: 102-105, Cruschina 2015). There would have been an upward movement in the positions –and consequently a grammaticalization. Cruschina (2015) claims that the Italian construction *dice che* occupies the nucleus position in Speech Act Phrases (SAPs) and selects a subordinate clause introduced by the complementizer *che*. Instead, Sicilian *dicica*, like any other (evidential) adverb, has a position where it acts as a specifier of a functional (evidential) projection. This distinction mainly has to do with the different behaviors described in this section, as well as some others, such as the elision of complementizers in certain Italian dialects (cf. Cruschina 2015 for the complete explanation).

- (18) Sicilian. Vippi troppu assà, (ca) *dicica* (ca) jera fattu stari na pezza.
'I drank so much that *apparently* I was completely out of it.'

In contrast, Sardinian *nachi* and Romanian *cică* are not grammaticalized to the same extent, because the verb *say* has not lost all its syntactic functions: it can select another complementizer (*chi*) and a subordinate clause. The possibility even exists for the particle *nachi* to select an argument (cf. Cruschina & Remberger 2008: 104):

- (19) Sard. E *nachi* chi issa no b'andaiada nudda.
'And it is said that she didn't go there at all.'

Therefore, the new emergent form *Say+That* has become grammaticalized to a greater extent in Spanish, Galician and Sicilian, to a lesser extent in Sardinian, Romanian or Italian.

A number of differences also exist with regard to the scope of the evidential emergent form. In Sicilian and Galician, as well as in Bolivian and Ecuadorean Spanish (Olbertz 2005; Alcázar 2014, 2018), the equivalents of *diu que* act as a verbal modifier with an exclusively sentential scope. This led Cruschina & Remberger (2008) to suggest that the *Say+That* construction has gone through a grammaticalization process to become an adverbial unit —even though, as shown above, it is a less grammaticalized unit in Italian, Sardinian and Romanian. In other varieties, such as Colombian, Mexican and Panamanian Spanish, as well as in old European Spanish, the construction *dizque* has been analyzed as a *particle* (Travis 2006, Olbertz 2007, Alcázar 2018). Such cases show a particle with the type of syntactic distribution that characterizes parentheticals, i.e. relatively free and with a variable scope (predicate, constituent or sentential).

Finally, the emergent unit has also experienced a process of semantic change —an essential element in grammaticalization.¹¹ The *Say+That* marker has a primary indirect reportative value —and a folklore value on some occasions as well— in most of the Romance languages studied. This is the case of languages where the marker has become an evidential adverb (Ecuadorean and Bolivian Spanish, Sicilian, Galician), but it also shows this value in Sardinian, Italian,¹² Romanian, and other American Spanish dialects. Other (secondary) values also appear in some languages, though, as exemplified by American Spanish *dizque* or Brazilian Portuguese *diz que* (Casseb Galvão's 2001).

It is particularly common for *dizque* to have a quotative, epistemic or mirative value —in addition to the reportative evidential value— in some

¹¹ Cruschina & Remberger (2008) refer to a *bleaching* process —following Heine (1993). We will try to use Traugott's contributions to explain this phenomenon in section 5.2.

¹² The Italian construction *dice che* has an exclusively evidential nature. This is what Pietrandrea believes (2007: 43), because it admits an epistemic qualification that may (or may not) contradict the reported state of affairs: "Dice che era stanco, ma io non ci credo / e io ci credo" ['He says he was tired, but I do not believe that / and I believe that'].

American Romance varieties (cf. Alcázar 2018). *Dizque* may have an epistemic reading (dubitative, falsity, unintended consequences, nonvolitionality, uncontrollability) when the particle has a constituent or predicate scope in Colombian and Mexican Spanish; however, it has an evidential value with a sentential scope (Travis 2006, Olbertz 2007). Travis (2006) checked that *dizque* serves to downgrade the speaker's commitment to the information given or to distance oneself from the statement in Colombian Spanish. That is to say, in the words of this scholar, it carries out a *labeling function*. It can have a similar function in Bolivian Spanish (Babel 2009), and in Brazilian Portuguese too (Casseb Galvão's 2001).¹³ Nonetheless, other studies have reached the conclusion that the use of *dizque* in Mexican Spanish has a predominantly epistemic nature with mirative extensions (de la Mora & Maldonado 2015). In fact, one could hypothesize that the evidential value appears when another *que* precedes the Mexican marker and *que dizque* (evidential *que* + epistemic *dizque*) is used. In any case, Alcázar (2018: 733) reminds us that it could also be seen as an addition of two equally evidential elements, both *que* and *dizque* (evidential stacking). From a diachronic perspective, Miglio (2010) observes that the epistemic (and mirative) pragmatic function tends to prevail in American Spanish, according to the data provided by the diachronic corpora of Spanish (especially CORDE and CDE).

Taking the characteristics of this construction into account, we might apparently speak about an emergent evidential form, and consequently, about a purely evidential reportative marker, despite the possibility for it to keep a quotative value or some syntactic features of the original verb *say* (or *dir*) in several languages. And according to the literature, it may even develop mirative, inferential or epistemic semantico-pragmatic values. After dealing with the methodological aspects in the next section (§3), we will look at the specific case of Catalan and *diu que* in §4.

3. METHODOLOGY

In order to study the marker *diu que* in Catalan, we carried out a qualitative analysis with the objective of formally and functionally describing the construction. In order to achieve that goal, we have based our study on results of computerized corpora of contemporary Catalan language.

Catalan does not have a representative colloquial and dialectal corpus for the language as a whole (cf. Montserrat & Segura in press). Nevertheless, a variety of recording files or resources are available for us to study the spoken language, amongst which stands out *Corpus del Català Contemporani de la Universitat de Barcelona* [Corpus of Contemporary Catalan of the University of Barcelona] (CCCUB). One of its subcorpora is the *Corpus Oral Dialectal* [Dialectal Oral Corpus] (COD) which includes recordings for all the Catalan dialects.

¹³ An inferential value next to the epistemic one can also be found in Brazilian Portuguese.

However, there is no evidence of the marker under study in the later corpus –probably because it is not large or representative enough.

The Catalan marker *diu que* is essentially oral and typical of informal registers. Judging by the information available to us, it has an uneven vitality across the Catalan linguistic domain and depending on the different age groups, and in many areas –especially the urban ones– this marker has already disappeared or only remains as a common feature of the colloquial speech used by older speakers. Characteristics like those explain why documenting the marker *diu que* turns out to be so difficult. For the above reasons, we have based our study on the data obtained from the following sources: *Arxiu de la Memòria Oral Valenciana*, *Museu de la Paraula* and *Corpus Parlars*.

Arxiu de la Memòria Oral Valenciana, *Museu de la Paraula* [Archive of Valencian Oral Memory, Word Museum] is a collection of interviews with native Catalan-speaking individuals from some Valencian regions that pursued an anthropological goal and was prepared by the Valencian Ethnology Museum (of the Valencian Provincial Government). Despite not being a spoken language corpus specifically designed for linguistic research, it may prove useful because it contains over 300 oral interviews with speakers born before 1936, presented in an open source platform which makes it possible to carry out searches by form and which provides the literal transcript of the interview together with its video-recording. However, this tool has a number of limitations which influence the results obtained: a) the highly restricted age group –speakers born before 1936– prevents us to know if variation exists across age groups; b) the geographical provenance is very specific too, with an underrepresentation of the Northern and Southern regions of the Valencian territory;¹⁴ c) the textual typology adopted for the sample is the semi-scripted interview, starting from some issues of anthropological interest framed within the specific projects for which the recordings were obtained. This determines the uses where the marker can appear, insofar as monologue predominates in the sample. Added to these limitations, the existence of some deficiencies both in the transcription and in the data retrieval tool means that the search is inaccurate.

Secondly, we have exploited the first outcomes of a project still in progress, the Oral Corpus of Colloquial Valencian –*Corpus Parlars*. This oral corpus also contains oral texts from Valencian Catalan for the time being. *Corpus Parlars* has monologues but, unlike COD and *Museu de la Paraula*, it also includes dialogues between over-65 native Catalan speakers (i.e. born between 1925 and 1954).¹⁵ This

¹⁴ According to the authors, the geographical areas are: el Camp de Morvedre, el Camp de Túria, el Comtat, els Ports, l'Alcoià, l'Horta Nord, l'Horta Oest, l'Horta Sud, la Canal de Navarrés, la Costera, la Marina Alta, la Marina Baixa, la Ribera Alta, la Ribera Baixa, la Safor, la Vall d'Albaida, and the city of València.

¹⁵ The choice of informants was made following the relevant sociolinguistic variables. As far as possible, the speakers have not lived outside the village and their parents were also born in the same municipality, which ensures the representativeness of the local dialect.

project has as its aim to fill the gap mentioned above, and thus to create a computerized linguistic corpus of informal oral Catalan with an undertext alignment, a transcript and a morphological annotation which allows for linguistic analysis. Since it is still being developed and not all the transcripts are available, the data provided came directly from audio or video recordings.

4. THE CATALAN MARKER *DIU QUE*

As highlighted above (§2), the verb *dir* in Catalan has distinct uses and values. Along with the lexical meaning of the diction verb, it has generated constructions with a quotative and reportative evidential value by means of impersonalization or generalization strategies. We already explained in the introduction that this applies to the reflexive construction *es diu que*; the third-person-plural impersonal construction *diuen que*, with the verb conjugated in present or imperfect indicative; or to the construction around which this study revolves: *diu que*. At this point, we will leave aside the constructions *es diu que* and *diuen que* to delve deeper into the semantic and formal description of the verb *dir* with full meaning as well as of the construction *diu que* with a quotative value in section 4.1, so that these instances of reportative evidential values can be distinguished. Section 4.2 deals with *diu que* as a reportative evidential marker, both from a formal perspective (§4.2.1), and of semantic and pragmatic ones (§4.2.2, §4.2.3, §4.2.4). Finally, a variant —the construction *que diu que*— will be the focus of interest in §4.3.

4.1. The lexical and quotative values of the verb *dir*

The verb *dir* has a first semantic nucleus of a denotative nature where it describes the occurrence of a specific speech act. Through this value, the verb subcategorizes an argument with the role of a theme that expresses the reported discourse, either in direct speech (example 21) or in indirect speech (examples 20a and 20b). And it may likewise select a dative which serves to specify the interlocutor of the reported subject (in example 20a), pronominalized with the weak pronoun *li*). It may be conjugated in any verb tense, both perfective and imperfective (example 20b).

- (20) I entonces, una nit, una nit, anaren a casa de Calvo Sotelo [...], i anaren allí, i ix la dona, a per ell. I la dona li [20a] *va dir* que no, que no se n'anara! Que no se n'anara. I [20b] *deia*, que no passaria res. No passaria res. [...] Agarren i se l'amporten. Se l'amporten, i antes d'arribar al cementeri, en el cotxe, conforme anava, li pegaren uns tirs i el mataren. (*Museu*, MO62-Faura-H25)

'And then, one night, one night, they went to Calvo Sotelo's house [...] and they went there, and his wife comes out, after him. And his wife *told him* [20a] no! (told him) not to go! And he [20b] *said* that nothing would happen. Nothing would happen. [...] And then they take him away with them. They take him away with

them, and before arriving at the graveyard, in the car, on the way, they shot him several times and killed him.'

- (21) –Jo després vaig eixir d'escola i això, ací, me posí en... Bueno, mon pare era obrer, ja pa treballar i tal, [21a] *va dir*: "xe, si vols vindre a treballar, el tio Josep [21b] *diu que* te'n pots vindre amb mosatros". "Xe, jo, pare, jo no vullc anar a l'obra, no vullc anar a l'obra." "Ah, pos busca't faena." (*Museu*, MO32-Serra-H30)

'–Me, afterwards, I left school and then, here, I started to... Well, my father was a bricklayer, already to work and so on, [21a], he *said*: "geez, if you want to come and work, uncle Josep [21b] *says* that you can come along with us". "Geez, me, father, I don't want to go the construction site, I don't want to go the construction site." "Ah! Then go get yourself some job.'"

The value described above and shared by examples (20a-b) and (21a) is relatively different from that in (21b). This time, the verb does not describe an event; instead, it presents a more subjective value whereby the speaker identifies the source from which the uttered information was obtained. It is a quotative, a marker used to express that the information introduced (in direct or indirect speech) is reported, or expressed differently, that it has a second-hand origin.

The step which makes it possible to go from the full meaning of the verb *dir* to the quotative value can be understood by applying the notion of contextual invited inference to it (Traugott & Dasher 2002). The verb has lost some denotative content during this process, to such an extent that we could elide the reference to the source of the reported information without that entailing a loss of nuclear information in the utterance (the utterance remains viable in example 21: "xe, si vols vindre a treballar, te'n pots vindre amb mosatros"). Semantic subjectification is accompanied by a formal fixation of the construction: the verb appears conjugated in present indicative, even if a past speech act serves to transmit the information. This is in contrast with the use of the narrative present or a perfect tense that characterizes the verb with full meaning (examples 20 and 21). It finally deserves to be highlighted in relation to this construction that the verb can only subcategorize the object with the theme function which expresses the reported information. However, it admits neither the dative nor the adjuncts that could be found in the company of the verb with full meaning, as could be the predicative or circumstantial objects: these complements are possible in (20) "*va dir convençuda* [‘determined’] que no, que no se n’anara” or "*va dir a la porta de casa* [‘at the house door’] que no, que no se n’anara”, whereas they are not possible in (21) or lead to interpret that the verb is conjugated in narrative present: “el tio Josep *diu convençut* [‘determined’] que te'n pots vindre amb mosatros”, “el tio Josep *diu a la porta de casa* [‘at the house door’] que te'n pots vindre amb mosatros”.

It is worth stressing that the verb *dir* with full meaning (examples 22 and 23) or another speech verb (24) often appear combined with the quotative *diu (que)*, which marks the reported information, perhaps expressed as a parenthetical (24):

- (22) Jo, al meu sogre vaig anà, li vaig di d'eixir, i *va dir, diu*: "tu porta't bé en ella. No vull altra cosa". I aixina. (*Museu*, MOH75-Sorita-H32)
- 'Me, I went to my father-in-law's house, I told him to go out, and *he said, he says*: "be good to her. I don't want anything else". And so.'
- (23) I segons tinc entés jo del meu germà que *me dia, diu* que estigué lo menos set o huit anys en una casa i era tan bé, tan bé, tan bé que els cuidava, que eixe senyor diu que li regalà un piso. (*Museu*, MO65-Benifairó Valls-H28)
- 'Me, from what I've been told by my brother, who *told me, he says* that he spent at least seven or eight years in a house and he felt so much at ease, so much at ease, so much at ease that he looked after them, that, according to what he says, that gentleman gave him a flat as a present.'
- (24) [...] i després me vaig canviar de casa, perquè el meu home no volia que estiguera allí perquè no me deixàvem eixir, i ell, volia que ixira. Clar, normal. I tenia un amic que sa mare i son pare tenien vaques, i *va parlar en ell, diu*: "Xé Daniel", *diu*, perquè vaen nomenar que sa, sa mare estava mala, i no podia, no podia en la faena [i van llogar la informant]. (*Museu*, MO94-Sueca-D29)
- '[...] and then I changed home, because my husband didn't want me to be there because I was not allowed to go out, and he, he wanted me to go out. Of course, that's normal. I had a friend whose parents had cows, and he *talked to him, he says*: "Hey, Daniel", *he says*, because someone had mentioned that his, his mother was ill, and she could not, she could no do the housework [and they hired the informant].'

The marker exemplified above has been studied in Italian not only by Pietrandrea (2007: 55-57) but also by Giacalone and Topadze, according to whom:

the third singular form *dice* is frequently used in spoken Italian mostly as a marker of direct speech, but also of indirect speech, and is morphologically invariable and positionally mobile. (Giacalone and Topadze 2007: 27)

According to the aforesaid scholars, this provides evidence that a grammaticalization process has taken place. For illustrative purposes, one of the examples provided by Pietrandrea (2007: 55) is: "mah ha detto che che grosso grosso modo va abbastanza bene solo l'aorta dice che è un po' dilatata" ['well he (has) said that it's going well, more or less. Only the aorta, he says it is a little dilated']. The particle *dizque* can perform this same function in Spanish (Travis 2006).

The previous marker, quotative *diu (que)*, is formally very close to the reportative evidential one. Due to such similarity, this variant can be easily assimilated to the reportative marker (Crushina & Remberger 2008), or as a previous step in the grammaticalization process which leads to this second derived construction (Miglio 2010). An attempt will be made in section 5.2 to outline this connection from a diachrony and linguistic change perspective.

4.2. The reportative marker *diu que* in oral corpora

The marker *diu que* is documented in the corpora that we have compiled (*Museu de la Paraula* and first results of *Corpus Parlars*). Most of the 96 examples have a

purely reportative evidential value and represent the evidential marker *diu que* –81 examples out of 96 (84,4 %). Even so, there are still many with a value of transition between a quotative and a reportative evidential, more precisely 15 cases (15,6 %), which have also been collected in this study. Table 1 shows the results for each corpus:

Corpus	Quotative/Reportative transitional value	Evidential reportative value
<i>Museu de la Paraula</i>	13	72
<i>Corpus Parlars</i>	2	9
Total	15	81

Table 1. Examples of *diu que* documented in oral corpora

4.2.1. Formal description

This construction is formed by the third person singular of the present indicative (*diu*) and the conjunction *que*, and it usually modifies a sentence with a predicative verb in the present. It shows a higher grammaticalization level compared to the quotative use examined in §4.1 which becomes visible in a number of morphosyntactic and semantic features: a) impersonalization, whereas the verb required a [+human] subject in the previous construction, now we have an impersonal construction; b) semantic reanalysis, since the construction comes to be found in contexts where it introduces third-hand or folklore knowledge (using the typology created by Willett 1988), instead of information coming from second-hand sources; c) formal fixation, because the construct *diu + que* is reanalyzed as a grammatical unit. The construction components have undergone a decategorization and formal fixation process, as we already explained with instances from some Romance languages in §2. Regarding formal fixation, the morphology reveals that the verb form has become invariable, in the 3rd person singular of the present indicative; syntactically speaking, the verb form and the conjunction have been reanalyzed as a single grammatical unit –which becomes evident in the parenthetical realization– and have lost most of their previous properties as a verb and a conjunction, respectively.

One can check that decategorization has taken place because the verb *dir* does not act as the nucleus of the verb phrase and, accordingly: a) it can select neither an external argument (it adopts an impersonal format) nor an internal one, as opposed to the verb with full meaning; b) it admits no adjuncts; c) it may appear within a parenthetical construction, away from the place that it should occupy as the nucleus of the main sentence predicate and formally invariable, with the conjunction next to the verb; and d) it has other restrictions. Below can be found a more in-depth analysis of these characteristics.

One of the most important features associated with the grammaticalization of the construction *diu que* is its impersonal realization, unlike what happens in the case of the second-hand information marker that selects a [human] subject. Furthermore, the construction most commonly appears in initial position and with a sentential scope:

- (25) La rabera sabia on havia d'anar. *Diu que* els animals tenen més coneiximent que les persones. (*Parlars*, Xert, dialogue)
 'The herd knew where they had to go. *They say* (that) animals are wiser than humans.'

Nonetheless, we can often see the phenomenon through which the *topic* of the utterance precedes the marker *diu que*, matching what Cruschina and Remberger (2008) saw too. These focalized element tends to be the subject of the subordinate clause, which comes to occupy a prominent position in the discourse; the S may be the agent (example 26) or the cause (example 27).

- (26) [En el context d'un relat popular, el protagonista deixa un bou al corral d'una dona] El deixa al corral i eixa dona *diu que* tenia la xiqueta que estava malalteta. "Mare, jo vullc fetge de bou, que no cou." "Xica, però no podem fer això, si no és de nosaltres." "Pos és igual, pos jo vullc fetge de bou, que no cou." I li va donar tanta serenata que sa mare va agarrar i li va matar el bou i li va donar el fetge. (*Museu*, MOTO40-Ròtova-H37)
 '[In the context of a popular tale, the main character leaves a bull in a woman's stockyard] He leaves it in the stockyard and that woman *they say* that she had her little daughter, who was a little bit ill. "Mother, I want bull liver, which is not bitter." "We can't do that, my girl, if it's not ours." "Well, it doesn't matter, I mean, I want bull liver, which is not bitter." And she insisted so much that her mother decided to kill the bull and give her the liver.'
- (27) [...] p'ascaldar?, perquè el capell antes q'el cuc el forade se té q'ascaldar pa matar el cuc, entonses eixes basses *diu que* feen mosquits, i ahí se coneix que acomençaren [...] a reclamar hasta que la tingueren que tancar. (*Museu*, E-HM12-Moncada-D31)
 'to heat, because the cocoon must be heated before the worm makes a hole in it, to kill the worm, then *people say* that those pools cause mosquitos to appear, and it seems that there they began [...] to complain until they had to close it.'

Thus, "eixa dona" is not the subject of the verb *dir*, but of *tenir*, in (26). The natural sentence component distribution would have been "i *diu que* eixa dona tenia la xiqueta que estava malalteta"; and "entonses *diu que* eixes basses feen mosquits" in (27).

Secondly, as regards the possibility to select an adjunct, it deserves to be highlighted that we occasionally find cases where the construction is preceded by a circumstantial object (of place or time, to define the scene). Anyhow, as in the case of the S, it becomes clear that they complement the verb of the subordinate clause, and not the verb *dir*. We consequently find ourselves before an example of adjunct dislocation which can be explained as a discursive

strategy, perhaps to relativize a statement (example 28) or to establish a contrast (example 29).

- (28) –Quan era xicoteta sí, vaig estar molt mala de tos ferina, molt. Ací *diu que* no s’havia conegut ninguna tosferina com la meua. (*Museu*, MO64-Alfara-D19)
 ‘When I was little, yes, I was very ill with a whooping cough, very ill. Here *they say* that nobody had ever known a whooping cough like mine.’
- (29) [...] el meu marit no va testar, perquè es va morir de repent. [...] I hui *diu que* ja no està eixa llei però entones es veu que hasta els deu anys que havia faltat, que no havia faltat, no es podia donar l’herència. (*Museu*, MOTO41-Ador-D28)
 ‘[...] My husband did not make his will, because he died suddenly. [...] And today, *they say that* that law does not exist anymore, but then, apparently, the inheritance could not be given until ten years elapsed since he had died.’

Therefore, the circumstantial object used in (28) relativizes the utterance (“que no s’havia conegut ninguna tosferina com la meua”) thus defining the spatial scope in which the statement is valid; instead, it cannot be said to define the space within which the uttered belief is framed. Similarly, (29) does not describe the time to which the belief refers (“que ja no està eixa llei”); the time adverb actually situates the state of affairs previously described in the discourse.

Thirdly, as for the parenthetical realization, we must say that it is a variant of the *diu que* construction and not a different one, insofar as it can be considered semantically equivalent. Even though it mostly appears in initial position in the documented cases, it may also appear sentence-finally (30)¹⁶ or postposed to the verb in the main utterance (example 31). Note that the possibility to dislocate the verb together with the conjunction shows the degree of formal fixation in this marker. These cases additionally provide evidence that the conjunction *que* has lost the subordinating property:

- (30) i de l’agüelo no me’n recordo, l’agüelo va morir de càncer o no sé què, fumae molt *diu que*. (*Museu*, MOH77-Vallibona-H22)
 ‘and grandpa, I don’t remember him, grandpa died of cancer or I don’t know what, he smoked a lot, *they say*.’
- (31) El meu germà és eixe però el van matar el primer any de guerra que jo ja, no me’n recorde d’ell. Si no el tinguera en la foto no me’n recordaria, saps? Que el van matar tenia *diu que* 21 any, en la Casa del Campo. (*Museu*, MON219-Cocentaina-D25)
 ‘My brother is that one, but he was killed during the first year of the war, and me, I don’t remember him anymore. If I didn’t have him on the picture, I wouldn’t remember him, you know? I mean, he was killed, *they say*, when he was 21 years old, at the Casa del Campo.’

This last example stands out for being one of the few documented cases –two, to be precise– in which the marker *diu que* does not have a sentential scope, but that of a constituent.

¹⁶ This example corresponds to example (4), repeated here for convenience.

Finally, the marker *diu que* faces other restrictions which have also been identified in other Romance languages (cf. Cruschina 2015). By way of example, it cannot appear in a subordinate noun clause, as in (32) —it could only appear in the subjunctive with the full lexical meaning, as exemplified by (33). The evidential marker *diu que* cannot be modified by an adverb of time or manner either, and it is incompatible with the negation, as can be checked in (34) and (35). These sentences could only have a reported speech use (i.e. if we interpreted *dir* as a predicative verb), but not an evidential one:

- (32) *M'agrada que *diu que* vinga/ve.
 (33) M'agrada que *diga* que ve.
 'I like it when he says he is coming.'
 (34) *Sempre *diu que* treballa a la fàbrica d'ací al costat.
 'he always says that...'
 (35) *No *diu que* treballa a la fàbrica d'ací al costat.
 '...he works at the factory round the corner.'

Generally speaking, it is also incompatible with interrogative or imperative sentences; it cannot appear in the protasis of a conditional clause or with performative verbs. Modal adverbs usually behave like this (cf. Cruschina 2015). The above usage restrictions have some specific nuances, which will be analyzed below (examples 52 and 53).

In short, the characteristics described so far are typical of a verbal modifier or an evidential adverb which has become grammaticalized similarly to how it did in other languages like Spanish, Sicilian or Italian. Section 5.3 will deal with the characteristics of *diu que* compared to those of its Romance equivalents for the purpose of proving that it is a case of grammaticalization.

4.2.2. The function of this marker: Reportativity and intersubjectivity

From a functional perspective, the Catalan marker *diu que* acts as a marker of reportative evidentiality, more specifically of third-hand and folklore evidentiality (according to the typology presented in §1). There are some contexts linked to this last value where it appears as part of a construction that serves as the beginning of an ethnopoetic tale. We will discuss it in this section. The next section, §4.2.3, will show that no purely epistemic examples were found, although this notion may be contextually inferred. A reference to a possible mirative value will also be dealt with in section 4.2.4.

Within the reportative value, when we refer to third-hand evidence,¹⁷ it actually becomes necessary to distinguish two types of information without an

¹⁷ *Diu que* has been documented in Catalan lexicography. This is how DCVB (s.v. *dir*, I.1.a) presents it: “per indicar la manera general d’opinar o parlar la gent sobre un assumpte” [‘to show in general what people think or say about some issue’], “*Diu que* a França passen coses grosses”

explicit source: on the one hand, information with an indefinite source, or expressed differently, one whose source is known to the speaker, but which the latter does not make explicit because it is considered irrelevant (and therefore it would actually be third-hand knowledge); and, on the other hand, hearsay — in other words, a type of knowledge with an uncertain origin.

Examples (36) and (37) exemplify information that has been marked as coming from an undefined source, but they make it contextually clear that the speaker obtained the knowledge from direct witnesses (and, consequently, that it is in fact second-hand information). The speech act in (36) shows the speaker reformulating the discourse and replacing the marker *diu que* with the verb *dir* with an event meaning and an explicit subject: “la filla em va dir”. As for (37), the utterance “que un morter va pegar sobre l'albre” appears introduced by the reportative *diu que*. However, in the course of the enunciation, the speaker is forced to express the lack of knowledge about one of the narrative elements: “que no sé lo que és un morter”. Faced with the possibility that the information uttered might be seen as unreliable by the interlocutor, the speaker finds it necessary to explain that he is referring to second-hand information: “m'ho contava ma mare”. This means admitting that the speaker borrowed this information from a direct witness.

- (36) I vaig anar jo a l'enterro perquè aquell home em volia a mi, ja en els últims moments de la vida *diu que*, jo no estava però la filla em va dir: “Només que t'anomenava que a tu.” Feia: “José María, a on estàs? José María! I José María?” Vaig anar a l'enterro i com van traure la caixa, dic: “Mira, la caixa que vaig pintar jo.” (*Museu*, MOMO15-Fontanars dels Alforins-H28)

'I attended the burial, because that man loved me, already in the last moments of his life *apparently*, I was not present, but his daughter said to me: “He mentioned no one but you.” He said: “José María, where are you? José María! And (Where is) José María?” I attended the burial and as they brought out the coffin, I say, “Look, the coffin that I painted.”'

- (37) El meu germà és eixe però el van matar el primer any de guerra que jo ja, no me'n recorde d'ell. Si no el tinguera en la foto no me'n recordaria, saps? [...] *Diu que* un morter que no sé lo que és un morter, hu sentia dir a ma mare, que un morter va pegar sobre l'albre. (*Museu*, MON219-Cocentaina-D25)

'My brother is that one, but he was killed during the first year of the war, and me, I don't remember him any more. If I didn't have him on the picture, I wouldn't remember him, you know? [...] *They say that* a mortar, well, I don't know what a mortar is, I used to hear my mother talk about it, that a mortar hit the tree.'

These contexts are in sharp contrast with the concept of hearsay *strictu sensu* — of unknown source. This happens in example (38), where the reported speaker is identified (“m'ho contava ma mare”), but without the latter being a direct witness of the narrated events. The reported speaker acts as the transmitter of an

[‘*They say that* serious things are happening in France’]; or Mascaró, who suggests its use “to express that the noun clause transmits hearsay, or is placed in the mouth of others” (1986: 19).

intersubjective knowledge shared by a collectivity (which also becomes evident because the narration is described as a *xiste* ‘joke’, a genre typically associated with ethnopoetics). This intersubjective nature of the uttered information becomes visible in (39) by the fact that, after uttering the information “en Barcelona *diu que* tot és per al major”, the speaker asks the interlocutor a confirmatory question. With that question, the speaker stresses that the information in question is or should be shared by the interlocutor —general knowledge.

- (38) I la nit de bodes, què? Com s’ho feien? –Jo què sé lo què feen!! Tu ho saps?... pos moltes, una *diu que* se n’antornà, això m’ho contava, això seria un xiste, m’ho contava ma mare, una *diu que* es casà i correguent aquella nit se n’anaà correguent a sa casa, je, je... (*Museu*, MO25-Bétera-D15)

‘And the wedding night, what? How did they do it? –I do know what they did!! Do you (know)?... well, many, one girl, *they say that* she came back, so I was told, that would be a joke, my mother used to tell me, *they say that* one girl got married and she ran away that night, she ran away to her home, ha ha...’

- (39) Nosaltres tres també, el meu germà, la meua germana i jo també vam fer bolletes. Un paperet amb números: “Este número tal, este número per a lo altre...” I el més menut sempre trau ell primer, el més menut triava. Això que en Barcelona *diu que* tot és per al major, en Barcelona *no diu que* s’ho emporta tot el major? Ací no. Ací al menut nosaltres li donem a triar. Va triar la meua germana. I açò no va entrar en la partició, açò m’ho he quedat jo després. (*Museu*, MOM007-Aielo de Rugat-H35)

‘The three of us too, my brother, my sister and I, we also made tickets. A small piece of paper with numbers: “This number for one thing, this number for something else...” And the youngest one always takes the first ticket, the youngest one chose. That about, *they say*, everything is for the oldest one in Barcelona, *don’t they say* that the oldest one takes it all? Not here. Here we allow the youngest one to choose. My sister chose. And that didn’t come into the distribution, that I have kept for myself later.’

As evidenced by the examples above, *diu que* only marks the reported information in indirect speech in Catalan, never in direct speech, unlike what can be checked in South American Spanish (Travis 2006) or in Sardinian (Cruschina & Remberger 2008).

Along with the second- and third-hand evidence subcategories, Willett (1988: 96) identifies the folklore subcategory —as we already mentioned in the introduction. And although Catalan lexicography does not record this value, the sample obtained shows that it is common. More precisely, following the characterization of ethnopoetic genres devised by Oriol (2002), the marker introduces narrations belonging to the popular oral tradition (namely, legends as in 40 and folktales as in 41), proverbs (example 42) and, in general, all the knowledge that shapes a community’s system of beliefs broadly speaking (examples 43 and 44).

- (40) A vore, quan arribes a Sollana, Sueca, Cullera, això tot era una pantà enorme, no? És... I la zona esta d’ací baix, les arenes són més sòlides, permetixen més el pas. El,

este pas que hi havia, el rei Jaume *diu que* va travessar ahí. (*Museu*, MOTO08-Xeraco-H40)

'Let's see, when you arrive in Sollana, Sueca, Cullera, all that was a huge reservoir, wasn't it? It is... and this area down here, the sands are more solid, they allow people to go across. The, this pass that there was, King James, *they say*, crossed it here.'

- (41) [El conte de Cigronet] Hasta que per fi un dia va anar i la xiqueta li va dir a un xic, a un xic que n'hi havia li va dir, *diu que* li va parlar, va dir que ella era una xiqueta, un caçadoret que anava, un home que anava caçant per ahí, un xic. I entonces el xic eixe li va dir: "Com és això?" (*Museu*, MOTO19-Beniarjó-D28)

'[Little Chickpea] Until one day, finally, the girl came and said to a boy, to a boy who was there, she said to him, *they say* that she spoke to him, she said that she was a girl, a hunter who was, who was hunting around, a boy. And then that boy said to her: "How is that?"'

- (42) [...] ficaves el ferro, tapaves en el carbó, i clar, el aire pues anava calfant-ho tot. Però havies d'estar molt *ojo avisor!* Clar, la pràctica... Poques vegades t'equivocaves, però algunes vegades t'equivocaves, eh? Que passava! Però, miraves, "ença falta un poquet". Clar, la pràctica *diu que* fa mestres (*Museu*, MO43-Pobla Vallbona-H29)

'[...] You put the iron in, you covered it with the coal, and of course, well, the air gradually heated everything. But you had to be very *alert!* Of course, practice... You made mistakes few times, but sometimes you made mistakes, eh? It did happen! But, you looked, "it still needs a bit more time". Of course, *they say that* practice makes perfect.'

- (43) Escolte, i vosté no sap d'algun beuratge que els donaren a les dones p'adelantar el part, o pa parir millor, o...

–Home, sí que sentia que n'hi havia algo, però jo d'això no, no, no sé quina classe de cosa era ni res. Sí, algo sí. No sé, algo me sone, algo me sone que *diu que* la despulla, la despulla, perquè aquí ho puc dir tot, no?

–Clar

–La despulla de serp, quan venie el temps que les serps se despullaen, la despulla que quadae, *diu que* allò bollit o no sé lo que passave, no sé on la degueren aplicar o lo que fore, *diu que* allò adelantae el part. Jo no sé si és verdat o mentida. (*Museu*, MOH69-Herbés-H26)

'Listen, and don't you know about any beverage that they gave to women to induce an early birth, or to give birth in an easier way, or...

–Well, I did hear (that) there was something, but about that I don't, no, I don't know at all what kind of thing it was. Yes, there was something. I don't know, something sounds familiar to me, I think I remember that *they say that* the skin, the skin, because I can say everything here, right?

–Of course

–The skin of a snake, when the time came for snakes to slough off their skin, the skin that remained, *they say that* if you boiled it or I don't know what happened, I don't know where they had to apply it or what it was, *they say that* it induced an early birth, I don't know whether it was true or a lie.'

- (44) –El caldo, la gallina tenia que ser d'algun color o...?

–No, una gallina, igual tenia roja que blanca o però per, havia de ser gallina perquè, *diu que* la gallina té més, més grassa, té més, més substància que'l, que'l pollastre. I era gallina, sí. (*Museu*, MON229-Beniarrés-D15)

'–The stock, the hen had have a specific color or...?'

–No, a hen, it didn’t matter if it was red or white or but for, it had to be a hen because, apparently, the hen has more, more fat, it has more, more substance than the, than the cock. And it was a hen, yes.’

Special attention needs to be paid to contexts such as those exemplified in (45) and (46):

- (45) Eixe cuento n’hi han moltes versions per ahí, però este cuento és tan original, bé perquè el meu agüelo ha añadit coses, o se les ha inventades, lo que siga, però en fi, és molt d’Oliva. Diu: *Això diu que era una família de set rabosetes, però una estava coixeta. Es varen reunir un dia totes les rabosetes i varen dir: “Ens podíem fer una caseta. Aixina quan vinga l’hivern i baixi el rabosot de la muntanya, no ens puga menjar.”* (Museu, MOTO33-Oliva-H33)

‘That tale, there are many versions of it around, but that tale is so original, either because my grandad has added things, or has made them up, whatever (it is), but anyway, it is very typical of Oliva. It goes like this: *That they say it was a family of little vixens, but one was lame. All the vixens got together and they said: “We could build ourselves a little house. In that way, when winter comes and the big (bad) fox comes down from the mountain, he won’t be able to eat us.”*’

- (46) I mon pare a voltes per a acabar, que volia contar-nos un cuento, diu: *“Això diu que era un home polit i gros, que es tira un pet i cau de tò.”* (Museu, MOTO21-Almoines-H43)

‘And my father sometimes to finish, that he wanted to tell us a tale, he says: *“That they say it was a clean and big man, who farted and fell flat on his face.”*’

The preceding examples show *això diu que era* working as a conventional formula to start narrations from popular oral tradition, and more precisely, folktales (example 45) and surprise tales (example 46).¹⁸ This is in keeping with the remark made by Aikhenvald (2004: 379), according to whom the textual genre may influence the choice of an evidential, manipulated with a stylistic aim. The opening and closing formulas have a discursive function: they help distinguish this artistic discourse from the rest of the communication (Ben-Amos 1971: 10). With such formulas, “one can simultaneously express, as is usual in the genre, the vagueness and the distancing with regard to the time location of events” (Peraire 1999: 260). This function additionally determines the position that it occupies in the discourse, since it appears opening the narration now, as opposed to the closing formulas.

From a formal perspective, it is worth highlighting that these formulas follow a conventional pattern, with a deictic element that has a cataphoric value which refers us back to the narration (*això*) as an S, an evidential marker (which marks folklore: *diu que*), a presentational structure (*era*, which places the action in an undetermined past time) and, optionally, a locative complement (about the constitution of other formulas in Catalan, see the study by Peraire 1999: 149-150).

¹⁸ The surprise tale is “a parody of the folktale genre made with the aim of surprising or disturbing children” and, according to the same author, it may replicate the structure of the beginning of a marvelous or formulistic folktale (Oriol 2002: 68).

Thus, the construction *això diu que era*, where *diu que* acts as an evidential nucleus, arises by analogy with the structural patterns found in such constructions.

4.2.3. An epistemic value?

The relationship between evidentiality and epistemic modality has been widely studied. It is cross-linguistically common to find evidential markers with epistemic extensions — as well as epistemic markers with evidential extensions. In the specific case of reportative markers, they have developed a variety of epistemic extensions “from distancing or weakening a claim to outright rejection of the truth of the reported proposition” (Wiemer 2018: 95). A good example thereof can actually be found in the constructions derived from SAY-verbs.

The marker *diu que* with a reportative meaning does not have an associated epistemic pragmatic value in most of the corpus cases examined. The speaker does not usually express his point of view about the state of affairs or the information; he uses *diu que* to transmit hearsay instead. This becomes visible in the following examples. In (47), the speaker gives us the propositional information — the status as civil guards of two people — and modifies it with *diu que* as hearsay. No downgrading of the epistemic commitment takes place, because they did not share that reported information at the time (“no s’ho creíam”). The speaker in (48) provides indirectly obtained information (hearsay) — “que hi havia un metge que tallava part de la vulva per a facilitar el part” [‘that there was a doctor who cut part of the vulva to make birth easier’]— and then considers it true — “de fet, no demanen ajuda al metge precisament perquè no tinga ocasió d’usar les tisores” [‘in fact, they don’t ask the doctor for help precisely to prevent him from having the chance to use the scissors’].

- (47) I una vegà, allí en la quadrilla, hi haven dos que *diu que* eren guàrdia civils i mosatros no s’ho creíam i va i aquells se’n venen en mosatros [...] i resulta que sí que eren guàrdia civils. (*Parlars*, Suera, monologue)

‘And one time, there in the group, there were two guys who *they say that* they were civil guards and we didn’t believe it and then, they come with us [...] and it turns out that they were indeed civil guards.’

- (48) Mira, [riure nerviós], el, la, al primer part, clar que no saps de què van les coses i això, pues entonces hi havia un metge que *diu que* tallava, tallava en les tisores i això tallava pa fer... i, i esta última hora, no vàem avisar al metge, estava la dona que fea de comadrona i això, i quan ja anava a nàixer vaen quidrar al, al metge però al metge no li vaen donar temps ni agarrar l’estisora? ni res i va nàixer molt bé. (*Museu*, MON232-Fageca-D27)

‘Look, [nervous giggle], the, the, in the first birth, of course you don’t know how things go and all that, well, there was a doctor then who *they say that* he cut, cut with the scissors and that he did that to make... and, at that last moment, we didn’t fetch the doctor, there was the woman who worked as a midwife and that, and when it was about to be born, we called the doctor, but the doctor had no time to take the scissors or anything and it was born without any problems.’

Even so, there are some cases in which the dubitative or epistemic value may be contextually inferred from the reportative evidential value. In such cases, although *diu que* keeps the evidential value, the uncertainty becomes reinforced, since the speaker questions the truth of the reported information. The speaker adopts this strategy to distance himself from the state of affairs, to downgrade his commitment to the information. The presence of epistemic overtones in grammatical evidential markers is quite common (e.g. Floyd 1999). Thus, when he is asked in (49) for accurate information that he does not have — he explicitly admits not remembering it — the speaker marks the information with the marker *diu que*, thus dissociating himself from it:

- (49) –Se’n recorda quants treballadors n’hi havien en la seua època?
 –Pues en la meua època *diu que* n’hi havien uns sis-cents.
 –Molts treballadors...
 –Jo no me’n recorde, jo tenia el [número] mil nou-cents vint-i-sis quan vaig entrar a Payá. (*Museu*, MOJ174-Ibi-D43)
 ‘–Do you remember how many workers there were when you were there?
 –Well, when I was there, *they say that* there were about six hundred.
 –Many workers...
 –I don’t remember, I had number one thousand nine-hundred and twenty-six when I joined Payá.’

However, the most frequent cases are those where *diu que* behaves as a reportative evidential and the epistemic positioning becomes explicit in the context. In such environments, the speaker wants to avoid the responsibility for the uttered information. By way of example, the speaker in (50) says “*jo no ho sé*” and that in (51) claims “no sé, algo me sone” (see underlined).

- (50) –Però diu que altres dones sí que tenien desitjos, què passava [...]?
 –Hi havia que sí. Ai, que *diu que* després els ixia el desig, jo no hu sé. Jo no sé.
 –Una taqueta o alguna cosa?
 –Una dona tenia ací com si fóra una botifarra, i *diu que* açò seria algun desig. (*Museu*, MON227-Planes-D26)
 ‘–But you say that other women did have caprices, what happened [...]?
 –There were some who did. Oh, that *they say that* the wish appeared (on their babies) later, I don’t know about that, I don’t know.
 –A little birthmark or something?
 –One woman had something that looked like a sausage, and *they say that* it would be a wish/whim/caprice.’
- (51) –Home, sí que sentia que n’hi havie algo, però jo d’això no, no, no sé quina classe de cosa era ni res. Sí, algo sí. No sé, algo me sone, algo me sone que *diu que* la despulla, la despulla, perquè aquí ho puc dir tot, no?
 –clar
 –La despulla de serp, quan venie el temps que les serps se despullaen, la despulla que quadae, *diu que* allò bollit o no sé lo que passave, no sé on la degueren aplicar o lo que fore, *diu que* allò adelantae el part. Jo no sé si és verdat o mentida. (*Museu*, MOH69-Herbés-H26)

‘-I mean, I did hear there was something, but I don’t know about that, no, I don’t know what kind of thing it was or anything. Yes, I knew something. I don’t know, something sounds familiar to me, something sounds familiar to me that *they say that* the skin, the skin, because I can say everything here, right?

-of course

-The skin of a snake, when the time came for snakes to slough off their skin, the skin that remained, they say that if you boiled it or I don’t know what happened, I don’t know where they had to apply it or what it was, they say that it induced an early birth, I don’t know whether it was true or a lie.’

On some occasions, the marker *diu que* may be accompanied by the doubt conjunction *si*. This conjunction is not introducing a typical conditional sentence, but a clause with the event which is a hearsay. It is a kind of epistemic meaning (like *maybe*):¹⁹

(52) A: Ací havien moltes sabateries i ara no sé si en quedarà una o dos, si en queden.

B: una va tancar ja

A: eh, per això dic jo que...

B: *diu que si* ja s’ho deixen (*Parlars*, Benissa, dialogue)

‘A: There used to be many shoe shops here and now, I don’t know if there is only one of two left, if (there are) any.

B: One of them (has) already closed.

A: ah! That’s why I say that...

B: *they say that if* they might leave it now...’

Below (53)²⁰ can be found another example of the proximity to a dubitative value of *diu que* where it appears within an interrogative sentence (of a confirmatory type [GIEC]):²¹

(53) Això que en Barcelona diu que tot és per al major, en Barcelona no *diu que* s’ho emporta tot el major? Ací no. Ací al menut nosaltres li donem a triar. (*Museu*, MOMO07-Aielo de Rugat-H35)

‘That about, *they say*, everything is for the oldest son in Barcelona, *don’t they say* that the oldest one takes it all? Not here. Here we allow the youngest one to choose.’

A connection may consequently exist between the indirect origin of the information (with the marker *diu que*) and a pragmatic nuance of context uncertainty in these cases.

The link between reportative evidentiality and an epistemic value could probably be explained as a pragmatic inference (Traugott & Dasher 2002): the reported information may be uncertain. This conversational inference is due to

¹⁹ This use is not attested in the Catalan dictionaries, but it is very similar to this entry (DIEC2 s.v. *si*, 1.2): “Introduint proposicions que fan de complement d’un verb que expressa dubte, interrogació. *Jo no sé pas si vindrà. Pregunta-li si ho sap.*” [‘Introducing clauses that are the complement of a verb expressing doubt or interrogation. *I don’t know whether (s)he will come at all. Ask him whether he knows that*’].

²⁰ This example corresponds to example (39), repeated here for convenience.

²¹ The marker *diu que* cannot be found in other kinds of interrogative sentences.

the fact that the speaker uses a marker of indirect access to the information (like *diu que*), because he has not directly witnessed the state of affairs and, therefore, the information is less reliable. As suggested by Cornillie (2009), when the speaker and other participants do not share the information, it is likely to be unreliable. Hence why, in some cases, like the last examples examined, a pragmatic value of uncertainty may be inferred in the marker *diu que* (epistemic modality). This could be understood as the beginning of the semantic change REPORTATIVE EVIDENTIALITY > EPISTEMIC MODALITY. This change has not become consolidated in Catalan, though. The equivalents of *diu que* in the other Romance languages may have an epistemic value too (cf. for Spanish, Kany 1944: 171, Travis 2006, Olbertz 2007, Miglio 2010). A special mention deserves to be made of the association which takes place in Colombian Spanish between the sentential scope of *dizque* and the evidential value, and the constituent scope and the epistemic value, according to Travis (2006). In Colombia, *dizque* with a reduced scope may have a *labeling* value in which, rather than coding the third-hand information, it suggests that it cannot be attributed to the speaker, as in (54). Furthermore, *dizque* sometimes even conventionalizes a clearly dubitative, highly subjective value in sentences with a first person subject. The marker no longer indicates the provenance of the information in such cases; instead it serves to code “a variety of notions associated with false beliefs, unachievable goals, and uncontrollability” (Travis 2006: 1290). An example thereof can be found in (55):

- (54) ... en medio de la confusión y de la angustia, caí en manos de una mujer bioenergética que a la vez era *dizque* sofróloga. (Travis 2006: 1287)

‘... in the confusion and distress, I fell into the hands of a female bio-energy doctor who was also a *dizque* sophrologist.’

- (55) A media cuadra de la casa había una tienda. La atendían unos viejitos de pelito blanco. Yo *dizque* les compraba pan y dulce y les pagaba con esas laticas. Creía que ellos pensaban que eran monedas. Pero me daban el pan y el dulce para ayudarme. (Travis 2006: 1290)

‘Half a block away from the house there was a shop. It was run by a white-haired old couple. I, *dizque*, I bought bread and candy from them and I would paid them with those little tin plates. I believed they thought that they were coins. But they gave me the bread and candy to help me.’

Nevertheless, in contrast with these cases from Colombia (Travis 2006) or Mexico (Olbertz 2007), not a single purely epistemic or dubitative case has been documented in Catalan, and we find no uses with a first person subject either. As seen above, the Catalan marker *diu que* usually has a sentential scope and the epistemic value may be available as a context-dependent pragmatic inference. As a matter of fact, in the two examples of *diu que* with a scope limited to a constituent, it clearly seems to perform an evidential function with an associated epistemic pragmatic value:

- (56) Set, però jo no els ha conegut. El meu germà és eixe però el van matar el primer any de guerra que jo ja, no me'n recorde d'ell. Si no el tinguera en la foto no me'n recordaria, saps? Que el van matar tenia *diu que* 21 any, en la Casa del Campo. (*Museu*, MON219-Cocentaina-D25)

'Seven, but I didn't know them. My brother is that one, but he was killed during the first year of the war, and me, I don't remember him any more. If I didn't have him on the picture, I wouldn't remember him, you know? I mean, he was killed, *they say*, when he was 21 years old, at the Casa del Campo.'

- (57) –QUÈ LI DIEN A VOSTÉ? –Ei, pues clar, “Ai, pues mira, antes de comprar, en alcohol fes-te el, el mugronet, fes-lo, fes-lo passant pa que s'endurisca, perquè si nos después es fan grietes no sé quantos”, i en un cotenpolet [cotó en pèl] en alcohol el mugró, anant-lo passant, anant-lo passant, antes de comprar. Pa que estaguera *diu que* més fort, pa quan tingueres que donar a mamar.” Coses d'eixes. (*Museu*, MON223-Almudaina-D27)

'–WHAT DID THEY TELL YOU? –Geez, well, of course, “Eh, well look, before buying, with alcohol put it on your (little) nipple, do it, do it rubbing it so that it becomes hard, because otherwise cracks appear, I don't know how many”, and with a little piece of cotton wool, the nipple, rubbing it, rubbing it, before buying. So that it could be, *they say that*, harder, for when you had to breastfeed.” Things like those.'

4.2.4. The mirative value

Along with the epistemic value, some attention has been recently paid to the mirative value derived from the reportative markers with SAY verbs. This grammatical category –mirativity–

marks both statements based on inference and statements based on direct experience for which the speaker had no psychological preparation, and in some languages hearsay data as well. What these apparently disparate data sources have in common [...] is that the proposition is one which is new to the speaker, not yet integrated into his overall picture of the world. (DeLancey 1997: 36)

In this sense, it expresses a positioning of the speaker which goes beyond what can be described as surprise strictly speaking: “Although the admirative is traditionally defined as a mood expressing surprise, it is also used to express irony, doubt, reportedness, etc.” (Friedman 1986: 180).

This value has been identified in the marker *diz que* of Brazilian Portuguese (Aikhenvald 2004) and in the equivalents of South-American Spanish varieties, more specifically in the Spanish of Colombia (Travis 2006) or Mexico (de la Mora & Maldonado 2015, Olbertz 2007, who refers to it as an irony marker). Miglio (2010) even provides evidence thereof in diachrony and places its origin in the 17th century, in parallel to the emergence of the epistemic value. Based on these works, the mirative value has appeared in a variety of studies about the Spanish *dizque* (Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2013, Alcázar 2018).

When it comes to Catalan, no examples of *diu que* with a mirative value are recorded in the reference corpus of this study. The reason for this circumstance can be found in the actual characteristics of the corpora: the mirative marker is

only possible in a dialogical context, and therefore does not usually appear in the interview genre – the type of text collected in *Museu de la Paraula*. Furthermore, the still limited size of the corpus *Parlars* explains why no examples have been found yet. Notwithstanding the above, it is worth mentioning that the marker *diu que* shows mirative extensions in contemporary Catalan and, more precisely, we have examples thereof in the following contexts, taken from real conversations with speakers of the Catalan variety under study:

- (58) [En el context d'un àpat, el parlant s'adona que l'interlocutor, un altre comensal, ha menjat molt] –Què *diu que* t'has quedat amb fam? (attested;²² Antolí 2015)
 '[In the context of a lunch, the speaker realizes that the interlocutor, another diner, has eaten a lot] –What *do they say* that you are still hungry?'
- (59) A: –Jo sóc de tindre relacions llargues. Ara acabe d'eixir d'una relació d'un any amb un xic.
 B: –Un any, *diu que!* Això no és res! (attested)
 'A: –I'm one of those who has long relationships. I've just left a one-year-long relationship with a boy.
 B: –One year, *she says!* That is nothing!'

The ironic confirmatory interrogative in (58) allows the speaker to express admiration for the interlocutor's veracity; note that the information which appears marked with the mirative is inferred by the speaker; it results from observing a specific situation. Instead, the speaker in (59) shows surprise about an opinion expressed by the interlocutor, who describes a one-year sentimental relationship as "long". In this context, the speaker resorts to an exclamative sentence with the marker *diu que* which focalizes the quantified Noun Phrase "un any", moved to the left of the sentence (which illustrates the concept of *mirative fronting*; Cruschina 2011). In addition to suggesting that the evaluation made by the interlocutor is unexpected, the speaker expresses his opposition towards that opinion.

4.3. The combination of *que* + *diu que*

A variant of the marker at hand is the form *que diu que*. Some of the occurrences show the combination of a *que* with the construction *diu que*. In most cases, it is simply an adjective clause which has been modified with the evidential marker *diu que*, as in (60). In other cases, e.g. (61), we find ourselves before a subordinating *que* which connects a verb like *em sona (que)* [it sounds familiar to me.../I seem to remember that...], *he sentit dir (que)* ['I've heard people say (that)'] with the subordinate clause marked with *diu que*. Finally, some examples contain *que diu que* in initial position, without depending on any verb, i.e. without subordination, as the introducer of an independent sentence, as illustrated by (62):

²² An *attested example* refers to examples personally witnessed by the authors.

- (60) Diuen que com, em van dir a mi, diu: “Ella es va quedar en, com si...”, eixe túnel que *diu que* veuen. Eixe túnel que diuen que veuen. (*Museu*, MOMO06-Bèlgida-D35)
 ‘They say that as, I was told, they say: “She was in, as if...” that tunnel which *they say* that they see. That tunnel which they say that they see.’
- (61) Jolivert també he sentit dir jo, que es posaven jolivert per baix, per la vagina, que *diu que* es posaven jolivert. (*Museu*, MON223-Almudaina-D27)
 ‘Parsley, I have also heard people say too, that they put parsley down there, around the vagina, that *they say* that they put parsley.’
- (62) –Era tindre el crio, sí. I en, i en un contenpolet [cotó en pèl] en alcohol es feen el, el peçó, el peçonet pa’ que...
 –pa que estiguera més...
 –... més fort. *Que diu que* si no es feien grietes i no sé què. (*Museu*, MON223-Almudaina-D27)
 ‘–Just after after having the baby. And with, and with a little piece of cotton wool soaked in alcohol, they applied it to the nipple, the (little) nipple, so that...
 –so that it could be me...
 ... harder. *That they say that*, otherwise, cracks appeared and I don’t know what.’

The insubordinate *que* has been regarded as a quotative or reportative evidential in Catalan (Corr 2018) and in Spanish (Spitzer 1942; Etxepare 2008, 2010; Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2013, 2014; Gras 2016; Corr 2018). As for Spanish, Demonte & Fernández-Soriano (2013) consider that the insubordinate *que* is a reportative evidential and that it can have no epistemic values. In their analysis of the form *que dizque*, Mora & Maldonado (2015) argue that the conjunction *que* provides the evidential meaning, the epistemic value corresponding to *dizque*. However, according to the data for Catalan –a language in which, as explained above, *diu que* does not conventionalize an epistemic value– the form *que diu que* clearly seems to be an evidential marker both jointly and separately. In fact, as suggested by Alcázar (2018: 733) for the Spanish *que dizque*, “in an alternative interpretation [with respect to Mora & Maldonado 2015] of *que dizque*, both could be viewed as evidentials. Evidential stacking is a familiar phenomenon”.

The conclusion that we draw in this case is therefore that the union of *que* with *diu que* constitutes the addition of two similar evidential markers.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1. The marker *Say+That* in Romance-language speaking countries

The marker *Say+That* behaves like most of the equivalents in the other Romance languages (Table 2 shows it clearly). In Catalan, *diu que* can express a quotative value when it is possible to identify the author of the speech act in the discourse. It can also express a reportative evidential value, or expressed differently, it marks the origin of the information as hearsay or with an uncertain origin, or as a shared and known piece of information. Unlike what happens in Colombian

Spanish, the other Romance varieties, including Catalan, develop neither a *labeling function* nor a dubitative value, as can be seen in Table 2. Nevertheless, we do find cases where an epistemic inference is pragmatically allowed. *Diu que* perhaps represents a strategy to downgrade the speaker's epistemic commitment and, accordingly, to distance himself from the reported information, in these cases.

	Quotative		Reportative Evidentiality		Labeling	Dubitative
	Direct speech	Indirect speech	Hearsay	Folklore		
American Spanish	+	+	+	+	-	-
Colombian Spanish	+	+	+	+	+	+
Sardinian	+	+	+	+	-	-
Romanian	-	+	+	+	-	-
Galician	-	+	+	+	-	-
Sicilian	-	+	+	+	-	-
Italian	-	+	+	+	-	-
Catalan	-	+	+	+	-	-

Table 2. Functions performed by the counterparts of *diu que* in the Romance context

5.2. From the quotative value to the evidential one

The scarcity of historical data in written texts makes it hard to provide empirical support for the diachronic study of the construction *diu que* in Catalan (Antolí 2015: 392-397). We have already explained that this probably has to do with the spoken, dialogical nature of the marker and, thus, with the fact that it hardly ever or never appears in written formal language. Even so, the synchronic study of the marker may provide evidence about its possible origin. In fact, the study of informal language is an ideal environment to find the pragmatic motivations involved in the process of semantic change.

Examining oral texts makes it possible to carry out a thorough analysis of the different constructions existing around the verb *dir* and the way in which speakers use them. As shown in §4.1, the corpus includes many ambiguous cases which reflect an evident proximity between the quotative marker and the reportative one. One of them is the following example:

- (63) [L'informant es refereix al viatge de noces dels seus pares] ells contaven... Mon pare diu: "el millor hotel que havia!" A Porta Celi. Allí havia un hotel. Diu que anaren a allí i ho passaren de lo més bé. Que això el Porta Celi después d'això seria el sanatori. [...] Pues allí, allí, anaren. Sempre ho ha sentit dir a mon pare. Ui! Allí estiguaren de

lo més bé. *Que diu que* era en aquell temps era un hotel de lo més, de lo més bé!
(*Museu*, MO55-Petrés-D33)

'[The speaker is referring to his parents' honeymoon] they told... My father says: "the best hotel available" In Porta Celi. There was a hotel there. He says that they went there and had a really good time. That the Porta Celi would be the sanatorium after that. [...] Well, they went there, there. I have always heard my father say it. Wow! We had a really good time there. (That) *he says that* it was one of the best hotels at the time, one of the best!'

In the preceding example, the references available "ells contaven", "mon pare diu", "ho ha sentit dir a mon pare" lead us to assume that the verb *diu* and the first *diu que* which appears (underlined) are quotatives with an elided subject (*mon pare*). They consequently mark information known from a second-hand source. However, the last *que diu que* (in bold) refers us back to a general kind of knowledge, shared by a collectivity, rather than to a specific individual experience; it could be interpreted as a reportative too. With the form (*que*) *diu que*, the hearer might either interpret that there is a second hand (the source who had said that information) or understand that it is an impersonal use (reportative). This example illustrates the possibility to pass from an elided subject (quotative reading) to a non-existent or impersonal subject (reportative reading). Discursively speaking, when subject elision takes place, the subject becomes irrelevant and it is very often hard to recover.

In short, according to our hypothesis, the origin of the marker *Say+That* lies in the quotative use of *say (that)* and not in the other markers with the verb *say (es diu que or diuen que)*, as Miglio (2010) had also suggested in relation to Spanish. All things considered, these ambiguous contexts could give proof of semantic change in diachrony, as bridge contexts (Heine, Claudi & Hünemeyer 1991; Heine 2003): QUOTATIVE > REPORTATIVE (undefined origin) > HEARSAY / FOLKLORE. This hypothesis is based on the data obtained from the contemporary language, and should be validated through diachronic studies. Some data on the diachronic development of the evidential marker in Catalan are given in Antolí (2015).

This semantic change hypothesis can also be analyzed as a case of conventionalization of an invited inference: it allows us to mark the event as information of undefined origin or hearsay. Both the quotative value and the reportative one share (the fact) that the speaker has had no direct access to the information; in other words, following the proposal of Cornillie, Wiemer and Marín Arrese (2015), the source of evidence is [-personal] in both cases. The information does not come from the speaker, who wants to distance himself from the responsibility (reliability) of the information given instead. This is the element which becomes strengthened with the reportative marker. The reported information may consequently be understood as information known to the people and to the human environment, as hearsay.

Semantic change is often accompanied by a trend towards more abstract and more attenuated values (Langacker 2000) as well as subjective ones (Traugott

& Dasher 2002). This also holds true for the marker *diu que*, which becomes less relevant (it is no longer a predicative, but a sentential modifier) and more subjective. The evidential marker takes another step forward in the subjectification of the construction, insofar as the speaker stops reporting the information objectively to hide the second hand or directly marks that information as hearsay.

As opposed to Spanish *dizque*, we have seen that the epistemic value of *diu que* does not become conventionalized and can only appear in specific contexts (§4.2.3). We have actually documented a mirative value, though (§4.2.4). Therefore, it seems that the reportative evidential value is the basis from which these two meanings may arise. Alcázar (2018: 740) wondered what relationship existed between the scope of the construction and the coexistence of evidential, epistemic, and mirative meanings. The data for Catalan thus reveals that the construction *diu que*, with an almost systematically sentential scope, does not clearly display an epistemic value; it may actually have a mirative use instead.

5.3. A case of lexicalization or grammaticalization?

The evidential marker under examination has been seen as a case of lexicalization by several authors, amongst them Olbertz (2007), but others regard this phenomenon as an example of grammaticalization (Alcázar 2014, Cruschina 2015).²³ The analysis of this marker consequently lies amid this debate because, saying that it is a case of lexicalization (“recruitment of linguistic material to enrich the lexicon”, Hopper & Traugott 1993: 127) or, conversely, of grammaticalization (“The creation of grammatical categories”, Lehmann 2004: 183) basically means stating that evidential adverbs form part of lexis or grammar. And, of course, this also relates to the grammatical consideration of these types of markers or constitutes an *evidential strategy* –in the words of Aikhenvald– as we already explained in the introduction.

The diachronic analysis with a constructional perspective developed by Traugott & Trousdale (2013) may prove useful to resolve this deadlock. According to this proposal, the process of semantic change is likely to lead to constructionalization, or to put it in another way, to the creation of a new construction (a pair of form and meaning). The constructionalization may be grammatical or lexical. A typical grammatical constructionalization (vs. lexical) involves an increase in productivity and schematicity and a decrease in compositionality. This is precisely what happens in the case of *diu que*.

²³ As other authors had already suggested (Miglio 2010, Alcázar 2018), the hypothesis about the contact with Amerindian languages in the emergence of *dizque* must be considered one of many avenues for the development of the marker, not the only one, in the light of so much historical documentation (Miglio 2010) or dialectal one in various European languages that had no contact with America, as is the case of Catalan.

The construction *diu que* has an increased productivity: a) pragmatic-semantic expansion; b) syntactic expansion; and c) frequency expansion. Firstly, this is a case of semantic-pragmatic extension. The construction *diu que* becomes involved in pragmatic inferences. Despite not conveying an extremely subjective meaning, reportative evidentiality transmits a new meaning which is more subjective than the lexical meaning of the verb *dir*. And some pragmatic epistemic values have been attested too. As we have just seen, more subjective nuances arise over time, including the mirative use. Evidence has also been found of syntactic expansion, since the form *diu que* may not only appear sentence-initially but also after the subject, or at the end of the sentence — as a parenthetical.²⁴

Secondly, schematicity increases. A new schema (*diu que* with an evidential meaning) has been created from the SAY-verb.

Finally, the constructionalization of *diu que* implies less compositionality: a) decreased semantic compositionality; b) fixation of syntactic order; and c) loss of syntactic properties both of the verb *diu* and of the complementizer *que* and chunking, as seen in §4.2.1.²⁵

We already referred to the existence of different degrees of grammaticalization (or grammatical constructionalization) across the Romance-language-speaking domain in §2. The American varieties of Spanish which have developed epistemic values (Colombia, Mexico) or semi-compulsory uses (Bolivia) place *dizque* at the most grammaticalized end of the Romance-language-speaking spectrum. In fact, *dizque* may appear together with another *que*, followed by a second conjunction (*dizque que*, *dizque si*, with doubt overtones) which introduces the subordinate clause (Travis 2006). The same applies to Sicilian *dicica*: it can combine with another conjunction *ca*, because the one in *dicica* has stopped working as such. Sicilian additionally shows a high degree of grammaticalization: it has phonetic reduction; it permits isolation and a parenthetical use. The case of the Catalan *diu que* studied here would probably lie in an intermediate position, since it also presents a parenthetical use and may have a constituent scope; it cannot appear in isolation, though. As for Italian *dice che*, it would be less grammaticalized than the Catalan expression, because it admitted neither isolation nor a sentence-final position, amongst other reasons. And finally, some features identified in Sardinian and Romanian also reveal a lower degree of grammaticalization, since they keep a number of verbal properties.

In this sense, we agree with Cruschina (2015) when he places Sicilian *dicica* at a more grammaticalized stage than Italian *dice che*. Catalan might accordingly be placed at an intermediate stage.

²⁴ Due to the methodological reasons mentioned, it is impossible for us to document increases in frequency.

²⁵ A similar case can be found in the grammatical constructionalization of the Catalan adverb *potser* ‘maybe’, which comes from the modal periphrasis *poder* (‘may’) + Infinitive (cf. Sentí 2018b).

5.4. Summary

Contemporary Catalan knows the impersonal marker *diu que* with a reportative evidential value, in parallel to what has already been studied in many other Romance languages –especially Spanish, Portuguese or Italian. This construction shows a certain degree of grammaticalization reflected in morphosyntactic and semantic features such as impersonalization or formal fixation. A special mention must be made in this respect of the possibility to find the marker dislocated within a parenthetical construction, either sentence-finally or postposed to the verb of the main utterance. Our analysis about it leads us to conclude that the properties of this construction justify its categorization as a verbal modifier.

As for its usage context, *diu que* is an essentially spoken reportative marker, typical of informal registers, the use of which has been steadily declining in recent years: territorially (it has disappeared or its use is residual in urban environments) and by age groups (it survives within groups of an advanced age, whereas it is less common or simply absent in the discourse of young generations). These variables make it difficult to obtain a sufficient, representative sample of the whole Catalan-speaking domain, so much so that this marker is not recorded in the reference corpus (CCCUB). Taking these factors into account, we decided to focus our research on Valencian varieties and to recover the sample of a corpus created for anthropological study purposes –*Arxiu de la Memòria Oral Valenciana, Museu de la Paraula*— despite the limitations that this entails (resulting from the textual typology of the sample included therein, and of the geographical origin and age of the recorded speakers). And *Corpus Parlars*, a computerized corpus of informal spoken Catalan that is still being developed. We have obtained a total of 81 cases of the marker *diu que* with a reportative value, and another 15 examples with an ambiguous interpretation that may have a quotative reading as well.

From a functional perspective, the marker *diu que* acts as a marker of reportative evidentiality in Catalan. All the same, a more in-depth examination allows us to conclude –following the distinction drawn by Willett (1988)— that this marker introduces third-hand information: both hearsay strictly speaking (from an unknown source) and information which the speaker knows through second-hand access, but whose source he does not deem it necessary to specify. And it introduces folklore too. The formal fixation and functional specialization which characterize this last use give rise to a conventional formula to begin narrations belonging to popular oral tradition: *això diu que era*, highly frequent in the corpus.

Even though it is well known in South American Spanish, the sample obtained does not include clear cases of the dubitative or epistemic value that appears in the bibliography of Spanish *dizque*. We can nonetheless actually conclude that such an interpretation probably stems from the reportative

evidential value —particularly in some facilitating contexts. It deserves to be stressed in this respect that *diu que* often coexists with the *que* that has a quotative value in the *que diu que* construct. Despite the fact that scholars have even considered that each one of the constituents provides a different evidential and epistemic nuance in other languages like Spanish, the data obtained in our study in Catalan —where this epistemic or dubitative value does not have a visible presence— leads us to infer that both elements share a reportative value.

Neither was it possible to document the impersonal construction *diu que* with a mirative value —widely studied in the constructions *dizque* of South American Spanish or *diz que* of Brazilian Portuguese— in the reference corpora used for this research, probably because of the characteristics and limitations of these corpus.

We have provided some “attested” examples in Catalan all the same. Such examples of *diu que* with a mirative value appear in contexts where, in addition to surprise, the speakers expresses other nuances: an ironic attitude towards the observed reality or an opposition to the interlocutor’s view.

Albeit from a synchronic approach, our study has served to identify some evidence about how this reportative evidential might have arisen. In accordance with the proposal made, the origin of the reportative marker lies in the quotative *diu (que)* (unlike what other authors have suggested for *dizque* in Spanish), based on contexts where the reported subject is elided. This context is likely to have been the starting point for the process of (grammatical) constructionalization, insofar as it contains the ambiguity needed for the construction to be reinterpreted as impersonal and with a third-hand value. Taking this value as a reference would also allow us to understand the extension of the construction through which it will be able to introduce folklore as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AIKHENVALD, A. (2004), *Evidentiality*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- ALCÁZAR, A. (2014), «On the grammaticalization of *dizque*», in *Perspectives in the study of Spanish Language Variation*, Arias, A. E., Gutiérrez, M. J., Landa, A. & Ocampo, F. (eds.), Santiago de Compostela, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, 19-45.
- ALCÁZAR, A. (2018), «Dizque and other emergent evidential forms in Romance languages», in *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, Aikhenvald, A. Y. (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 725-740.
- ANTOLÍ MARTÍNEZ, J. M. (2015), *L'evidencialitat en català antic: estudi de corpus i acostament segons la gramàtica cognitiva* (PhD dissertation), Alacant, Universitat d'Alacant.
- ANTOLÍ MARTÍNEZ, J. M. (2017), «El verb *semblar* en català antic», *Caplletra. Revista de Filologia*, 62, 205-229.
- BABEL, A. M. (2009), «*Dizque*, evidentiality, and stance in Valley Spanish», *Language in Society*, 38, 487-511.

- BEL, A. (2002), «Les funcions sintàctiques», in *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, Solà, J., Lloret, M. R., Mascaró, J. & Pérez Saldanya, M. (eds.), Barcelona, Empúries, 1077-1150.
- MONTSERRAT, S. & SEGURA, C. (in press), «El corpus *Parlars*. Elaboració d'un corpus oral i col·loquial del català valencià», *Zeitschrift für Katalanistik*, 33.
- BEN-AMOS, D. (1971), «Toward a definition of folklore in context», *Journal of American Folklore*, 84, 3-15.
- CASEB GALVÃO, V. C. (2001), *Evidencialidade e gramaticalização no português do Brasil: Os usos da expressão diz que*, Araraquara, UNESP.
- CORNILLIE, B. (2007), *Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in Spanish (Semi)Auxiliaries*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- CORNILLIE, B. (2009), «Evidentiality and epistemic modality: On the close relationship between two different categories», *Functions of Language*, 16(1), 44-62.
- CORNILLIE, B., MARÍN-ARRESE, J. & WIEMER, B. (2015), «Evidentiality and the semantics-pragmatics interface. An introduction», *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 29, 1-17.
- CORR, A. (2018), «'Exclamative' and 'quotative' illocutionary complementisers in Catalan, European Portuguese and Spanish», *Languages in Contrast*, 18(1), 72-101.
- CRUSCHINA, S. (2011), «Fronting, dislocation, and the syntactic role of discourse-related features», *Linguistic Variation*, 11(1), 1-34.
- CRUSCHINA, S. (2015), «The expression of evidentiality and epistemicity: Cases of grammaticalization in Italian and Sicilian», *Probus*, 27(1), 1-31.
- CRUSCHINA, S. & REMBERGER, E.-M. (2008), «Hearsay and reported speech: Evidentiality in Romance», *Revista de Gramática Generativa*, 33, 95-116.
- CUENCA, M. J. (2015), «Evidentiality (and epistemicity) in Catalan parliamentary debate», *eHumanista/IVITRA*, 8, 362-382.
- CUENCA, M. J. & MARÍN, M. J. (2012), «Discourse Markers and Modality in Spoken Catalan: The Case of (*és*) *clar*», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44, 2211-2225.
- DIEC2 = Institut d'Estudis Catalans. *Diccionari de la llengua catalana*, segona edició [online]. [Access date: 2018-2019]. Available at: <<https://dlc.iec.cat>>.
- DE LA MORA, J. & MALDONADO, R. (2015), «*Dizque*: Epistemics blurring evidentials in Mexican Spanish», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 85, 168-180.
- DELANCEY, S. (1997), «Mirativity: the grammatical marking of unexpected information», *Linguistic Typology*, 1, 33-52.
- DEMONTÉ, V. & FERNÁNDEZ-SORIANO, O. (2013), «Evidentials *dizque* and *que* in Spanish. Grammaticalization, parameters and the (fine) structure of Comp», *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto*, 8, 211-234.
- DEMONTÉ, V. & FERNÁNDEZ-SORIANO, O. (2014), «Evidentiality and illocutionary force. Spanish matrix 'que' at the syntax-semantics interface», in *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish; Diachronic, Variationist, and Typological Perspectives*, Dufter, A., & de Octavio de Toledo, Á. S. (eds.), Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 212-234.
- DI EWALD, G. & SMIRNOVA, E. (2010), «Evidentiality in European languages: the lexical-grammatical distinction», in *Linguistic realization of evidentiality in European languages*, Diewald, G. & Smirnova, E. (eds.), Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter, 279-308.
- Endize* = NAGORE, F. (dir.) (1999), *Endize de bocables de l'aragonés*, Huesca, Instituto de Estudios Altoaragoneses.

- ETXEPARE, R. (2008), «On quotative constructions in Iberian Spanish», in *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The multifunctionality of conjunctions*, Laury, R. (ed.), Amsterdam, John, Benjamins, 35-77.
- ETXEPARE, R. (2010), «From hearsay evidentiality to samesaying relations», *Lingua*, 120, 604-627. Retrieved from: <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.07.009>>.
- FRIEDMAN, V. A. (1986), «Evidentiality in the Balkans: Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Albanian», in *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, Chafe, W. & Nichols, J. (eds.), Norwood, Ablex, 168-187.
- GIEC = INSTITUT D'ESTUDIS CATALANS (2016), *Gramàtica de la llengua catalana*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans.
- GOLDBERG, A. & JACKENDOFF, R. (2004), «The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions», *Language*, 80(3), 532-568.
- GONZÁLEZ, M. (2011), «Indirect evidence in Catalan: A case study», in *The pragmatics of Catalan*, Payrató, Ll. & Cots, J. M. (eds.), Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton, 146-172.
- GONZÁLEZ, M. (2014), «Evidentiality, intersubjectivity and salience in Spanish and Catalan markers *claro/clar* and *la verdad/veritat*», *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 11(3), 411-436.
- GONZÁLEZ, M. (2015), «From truth-attesting to intensification: The grammaticalization of Spanish *la verdad* and Catalan *la veritat*», *Discourse Studies*, 17(2), 162-181.
- GRAS, P. (2016), «Entre la codificación y la inferencia. Los valores citativos de *que* inicial átono en español», in González Ruiz, R., Izquierdo Alegria, D. & Loureda Lamas, O. (eds.), *La evidencialidad en español: teoría y descripción*, Madrid/Frankfurt am Main, Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 201-226.
- HEINE, B. (1993), *Auxiliaries. Cognitive forces and grammaticalization*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- HEINE, B., CLAUDI, U. & HÜNNEMEYER, F. (1991), *Grammaticalization: A conceptual Framework*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- HOPPER, P. & TRAUGOTT, E. C. (1993), *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- KANY, C. (1944), «Impersonal *dizque* and its variants in American Spanish», *Hispanic Review*, 12, 168-177.
- LANGACKER, R. (2000), *Grammar and conceptualization*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- LANGACKER, R. (2011), «Grammaticalization and Cognitive Grammar», in *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, Heine, B. & Narrog, H. (eds.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 79-91.
- LEHMANN, C. (2004), «Theory and method in grammaticalization», in *Grammatikalisierung. Special issue of «Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik»*, DIEWALD, G. (ed.), 32, 152-187.
- MARTÍ, M. A., DURAN J., PEREA, M. P. (2007), «HistoCat y DialCat: extensiones de un analizador morfológico para tratar textos históricos y dialectales del catalán», *Procesamiento del Lenguaje Natural*, 39, 279-280.
- MARTINES, J. (2017a), «El condicional com a marcador epistèmic i evidencial en català antic: el condicional evidencial reportatiu amb verbs de dicció», *Zeitschrift für Katalanistik/Revista d'Estudis Catalans*, 30, 19-51.
- MARTINES, J. (2017b), «L'émergence des futurs épistémiques romans. L'exemple du catalan médiéval du XIII^{ème} siècle», in *Le futur dans les langues romanes*, Barnzini, L. (ed.), Berna, Peter Lang, 133-167.

- MARTINES, J. (2018), «Entre la morfologia, la semàntica i la pragmàtica: el condicional evidencial reportatiu amb verbs de percepció en català antic», *Anuari de Filologia. Estudis de Lingüística*, 8, 259-285.
- MIGLIO, V. (2010), «Online Databases and Language Change: the Case of Spanish *dizque*», in *Corpus Linguistics Applications: Current Studies, New Directions*, Gries, S. Th. & Davies, M. (eds.), Amsterdam, Rodopi, 7-28.
- OLBERTZ, H. (2005), «*Dizque* en el español andino ecuatoriano: Conservador e innovador», in *Encuentros y conflictos: Bilingüismo y contacto de lenguas*, Olbertz, H. & Muysken, P. (eds.), Madrid/Frankfurt, Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 77-94.
- OLBERTZ, H. (2007), «*Dizque* in Mexican Spanish: The subjectification of reportative meaning», *Rivista di Linguistica*, 19(1), 151-172.
- ORIO, C. (2002), *Introducció a l'etnopoètica*, Valls, Cossetània Edicions.
- PALMER, F. R. (2001), *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- PERAIRE, J. (1999), «Funcions discursives dels marcadors d'integració lineal en les Rondalles d'Enric Valor», in *Valoriana. Estudis sobre l'obra d'Enric Valor*, Salvador, V. & van Lawick, H. (eds.), Castelló, Universitat Jaume I, 139-164.
- PIETRANDREA, P. (2007), «The grammatical nature of some epistemic-evidential adverbs in spoken Italian», *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 2, 39-64.
- RAMAT, A. G. & TOPADZE, M. (2007), «The coding of evidentiality: a comparative look at Georgian and Italian», *Rivista di Linguistica*, 19(1), 7-38.
- SENTÍ, A. (2015), «Subjectification and attenuation in the conceptual schema of the Catalan modal verb *deure* with evidential meaning», *eHumanista/IVITRA*, 8, 517-543.
- SENTÍ, A. (2018), «El verb modal *deure* al segle XIX: modalitat deòntica, evidencialitat inferencial, (inter)subjectivitat i mirativitat», *eHumanista/IVITRA*, 14, 646-672.
- SENTÍ, A. (2018b), *A semantic network of modal micro-constructions in Catalan: grammatical and lexical constructionalization*, Presentation at 10th International Conference on Construction Grammar, Paris, Sorbonne Nouvelle University.
- SPITZER, L. (1942), «Notas sintáctico-estilísticas a propósito del español *que*», *Revista de filología hispánica*, 4(2), 105-126.
- SQUARTINI, M. (2007), «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.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C. (2010), «Revisiting subjectification and intersubjectification», in *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, Davidse, K., Vandelanotte, L. & Cuyckens, H. (eds.), Berlin/New York, De Gruyter Mouton, 29-70.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C. & DASHER, R. (2002), *Regularity in Semantic Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C. & TROUSDALE, G. (2013), *Constructionalization and constructional changes*, Oxford, OUP.
- TRAVIS, C. (2006), «*Dizque*: a Colombian evidentiality strategy», *Linguistics*, 44, 1269-1297.
- WIEMER, B. (2018), «Evidentiality and modality», in *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*, Aikhenvald, A. Y. (ed.), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 85-108.
- WILLET, T. (1988), «A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality», *Studies in Language*, 12(1), 51-97.

TEXTUAL REFERENCES

CCCUB = *Corpus del Català Contemporani de la Universitat de Barcelona* [online]. Available at: <<http://www.ub.edu/ccub/>>.

CIVAL = Acadèmia Valenciana de la Llengua. *Corpus Informatitzat del Valencià* [online]. Available at: <<http://cival.avl.gva.es/>>.

COD = *Corpus oral dialectal* [online]. Available at: <<http://www.ub.edu/ccub/corpusoraldialectal-cod.html>>.

Dialcat = *Corpus oral dialectal* (selected texts) [online]. Available at: <<http://stel.ub.edu/dialcat/>>.

CTILC = Institut d'Estudis Catalans. *Corpus textual informatitzat de la llengua catalana* [online]. Available at: <<https://ctilc2.iec.cat/>>.

Museu = *Arxiu de la Memòria Oral Valenciana, Museu de la Paraula* [online]. Museu Valencià d'Etnologia. Available at: <<http://www.museudelaparaula.es/web/home/info.php>>.

Parlars = *Parlars. Corpus oral del valencià col·loquial* [online]. Valencia: Universitat de València. Available at: <<http://www.uv.es/corvalc>>.