



Verbs of thought and speech. Pragmaticalization paths across languages

Book of abstracts



Fundación  
**BBVA**



## Verbs of thought and speech. Pragmaticalization paths across languages

<i>Almossa, Amereh</i> .....	<b>3</b>
<i>Battaglia, Elena</i> .....	<b>5</b>
<i>Biasio, Marco</i> .....	<b>8</b>
<i>Bozza, Cristiana</i> .....	<b>11</b>
<i>Conte, Laura</i> .....	<b>13</b>
<i>De Rosa, Francesca</i> .....	<b>15</b>
<i>Garzón, Eveling &amp; Verano, Rodrigo</i> .....	<b>17</b>
<i>González Saavedra, Berta &amp; Pardal Padín, Alberto</i> .....	<b>19</b>
<i>Graf, Elena</i> .....	<b>22</b>
<i>Hernández García, Carmen</i> .....	<b>24</b>
<i>Iglesias Iglesias, Nely M.</i> .....	<b>26</b>
<i>Lacassain, Christelle</i> .....	<b>28</b>
<i>Lansari, Laure</i> .....	<b>31</b>
<i>Lewis, Diana</i> .....	<b>34</b>
<i>Modicom, Pier-Yves</i> .....	<b>36</b>
<i>Nádraská, Zuzana</i> .....	<b>39</b>
<i>Ortiz Ciscomani, Rosa María</i> .....	<b>42</b>

<i>Popescu, Cecilia Mihaela &amp; Duță, Oana Adriana</i> .....	<b>45</b>
<i>Ramos Sañudo, Ana María</i> .....	<b>48</b>
<i>Remberger, Eva Maria</i> .....	<b>50</b>
<i>Reuelta Puigdollers, Antonio R.</i> .....	<b>52</b>
<i>La Roi, Ezra</i> .....	<b>55</b>
<i>Ruhrmann, Christiane</i> .....	<b>57</b>
<i>Sanvido, Linda</i> .....	<b>59</b>
<i>Schneider, Stefan</i> .....	<b>61</b>
<i>Shefer, Hagit</i> .....	<b>64</b>
<i>Tsutahara Ryo &amp; Nomura May</i> .....	<b>66</b>
<i>Vives Cuesta, Alfonso &amp; Madrigal Acero, Lucía</i> .....	<b>68</b>
<i>Zeschel, Arne</i> .....	<b>71</b>

# Grammaticalisation of MA: 2ADRI: “I DON’T KNOW” in Arabic

Amereh Almossa

University of York (UK); Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University (Saudi Arabia)

The highly frequent construction I DON’T KNOW and its phonetic variants have received great attention in different languages. A growing number of studies have reported that this construction underwent linguistic changes through the grammaticalisation process e.g., in English (Pichler, 2013; Pichler & Hesson, 2016), Estonian (Keevallik, 2016), French (Doehler, 2016), Hebrew (Maschler, 2017), and in German (Helmer, Reineke, & Deppermann, 2016). However, this construction has not been studied in the context of spoken Arabic. This paper examines the *MA: 2ADRI:* construction “I DON’T KNOW” in Najdi Arabic (NA) in light of grammaticalisation, with an attempt to explore the functions of the phonetic variants' in the interactional situation.

A total of 700 *MA: 2ADRI:* tokens were extracted from a corpus of 17 hours of audio-recorded dyadic natural conversations with 60 native speakers of NA. Three different phonetic realisations are identified: full *ma: 2adri:* [ma: ʔadri:], semi-reduced *ma: dri:* [ma: dri:] and reduced *madri:* [madri:]. It is found that these three forms exhibit distinctive distributional patterns. The reduced is the most frequent variant, constituting roughly three-quarters of the total number of tokens. Drawing on the conversation analytic approach, multiple discourse-pragmatic functions of *MA: 2ADRI:* are attested. For the (inter)subjective meanings, it is used to signal subjective function of epistemic stance of uncertainty, as well as to express an intersubjective function of mitigating a potential face threat and act as a device for avoiding disagreement. For the textual domain, in addition to using the construction turn-initially and turn-finally to take and close the turn, it acts as a self-repair device when it occurs turn-medially to hold on the floor and functions as a topic-closer when it occupies the entire turn.

The statistical analysis reveals a significant association between the three forms of the construction and the functions. While the full phonetic form is strongly connected with the literal meaning that expresses a lack of knowledge, the reduced form is significantly associated with more discourse-pragmatic functions. Age appears to be a significant factor affecting the variation, whereas gender is not. Younger (aged between 16 to 20) and adult speakers (aged between 30 to 40) are significantly more likely to use the reduced form, while the older speakers (aged between 55 to 70) are significantly more likely to use the full form. This can be interpreted as an indication of

ongoing change led by the younger speakers towards greater use of the reduced form. Given the evidence of linguistic change in the reduced form including phonetic attrition, semantic bleaching and pragmatic strengthening, and its high frequency, the study suggests that the MA: 2ADRI: construction is undergoing grammaticalisation, with the *madri:* variant the most advanced form along the grammaticalisation cline (Traugott, 1989; Traugott & Trousdale, 2010).

#### REFERENCES

- DOEHLER, S. P. (2016). More than an epistemic hedge: French *je sais pas* 'I don't know' as a resource for the sequential organization of turns and actions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 148-162.
- HELMER, H., REINEKE, S., & DEPPERMANN, A. (2016). A range of uses of negative epistemic constructions in German: ICH WEIß NICHT as a resource for dispreferred actions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 97-114.
- KEEVALLIK, L. (2016). Abandoning dead ends: The Estonian junction marker *maitea* 'I don't know'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106, 115-128.
- MASCHLER, Y. (2017). The emergence of Hebrew *loydea/loydat* ('I dunno MASC/FEM') from interaction. In C. Fedriani and A. Sansó (eds.) *Pragmatic markers, discourse markers and modal particles: New perspectives*, 186, 37.
- PICHLER, H. (2013). *The structure of discourse-pragmatic variation* (Vol. 13): John Benjamins Publishing.
- PICHLER, H., & HESSON, A. (2016). Discourse-pragmatic variation across situations, varieties, ages: I don't know in sociolinguistic and medical interviews. *Language & Communication*, 49, 1-18.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C. (1989). On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language*, 31-55.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C., & TROUSDALE, G. (2010). Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization: How do they intersect. In E.C. Traugott and G. Trousdale, (eds.) *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*, 19, 44.

# Evidential and epistemic functions between syntax and discourse: the pragmaticalization of verbs of thought in spoken Italian

Elena Battaglia

Università della Svizzera italiana

Verbs of thought, especially English *I think*, have been subject to a considerable body of research, highlighting their epistemic stance-taking (Kärkkäinen 2003) and mitigating (Schneider 2007 on Romance languages) function, while their evidential load is lesser investigated (Hennemann 2012, De Hoop et al. 2018). Considered as instances of grammaticalization (Thompson/Mulac 1991) in their parenthetical use, they have been described as formulaic fragments within routinized patterns of stance-taking in interaction (Kärkkäinen 2012).

Building on this view, we provide a corpus-based analysis of the forms, the functions and, crucially, of the co-textual distribution of verbs of thought (strong/weak assertives and semi-factives) in Present-day Italian. We investigate possible evidence for pragmaticalization as a form of fixation/routinization at the discourse level, underlying the emergence of epistemic and evidential functions (henceforth EE) in compliance with the linear and temporal properties of spoken language, and finally discuss its consequences for the subjectivity/intersubjectivity interplay.

The empirical data for this research are drawn from the KIP Corpus of spoken Italian (70h). We analyzed instances of 1st person *penso* 'I think' (n=227), *credo* 'I believe' (n=176), *immagino* 'I guess' (n=53), *suppongo* 'I suppose' (n=9), and impersonal *mi sa* (n=71) 'it feels to me' according to the following parameters: syntactic status of the verb, pragmatic function of the clause in their scope, position of the verb, co-occurrence with co-textual cues to ongoing epistemic evaluation and evidential justification (e.g. inferential futures, hedges, discourse markers, textual arguments).

Our analysis first evaluates the degree of pragmaticalization of verbs of thought in Italian by looking at their parenthetical reduction. We find that in Italian the process is less widespread than in English. Verbs of thought are often followed by a complementizer and/or an embedded clause either in the indicative or in the subjunctive mood. However, syntactic status is not the only indicator of their pragmaticalization.

On the basis of the other parameters, in fact we suggest that they express EE in highly conventional ways. Moving beyond the syntax-semantics of the predicates, we identify and describe

recurrent patterns of co-occurrence featuring verbs of thought and their sequential environments as emergent EE strategies within complex, interactive constructions (Fischer 2010), which by the way allow for a finer-grained distinction between the two functions. For instance, the inferential value of verbs of thought rests upon the verbalization of relevant evidence in the co-text (ex. 1/2), distributed over several units or turns and prototypically indexed by discourse markers, whereas a purely conjectural co-text may undermine this interpretation.

Finally, we discuss “thinking” as an activity unfolding in dialogic exchanges, focusing on cases where the epistemic evaluation and its evidential justification are solicited and co-constructed to get to a shared conclusion (ex. 2). In this light, we claim that verbs of thought as prototypically subjective markers not only pragmaticalize into meta-comments to supply the speaker's stance, but actually enter conventional patterns of negotiation in precise locations, contributing to the online building and management of alignment (Kärkkäinen 2006) and intersubjective access to information (Nuyts 2001).

- 1) noi ne avremo penso per una ventina di minuti perche' poi l'esame e' diviso in due parti quindi  
'It will take us I think about twenty minutes because the exam is divided into two parts therefore'
- 2) TO999: immagino che l'austriaco di turno avra' il suo giro,  
'I guess that an Austrian guy has.FUT his clique,'
- 3) BO014: mh, si' esatto, esatto, si' (.) poi loro son molto chiusi quindi comun- molto insomma abbastanza, tendono ad avere il loro gruppetto loro, quindi si'.  
'yes, indeed, indeed yes (.) besides they're very reserved so anyway very well a bit, they tend to have their own clique, so yes.'

#### REFERENCES

- DE HOOP, H., FOOLEN, A., MULDER, G., & VAN MULKEN, V. (2018). I think and I believe: evidential expressions in Dutch. In A. Foolen, H. De Hoop & G. Mulder (Eds.), *Evidence for evidentiality*, Benjamins, 77-97.
- FISCHER, K. (2010). Beyond the sentence: Constructions, frames and spoken interaction. *Constructions and Frames*, 2, 185-207.
- HENNEMANN, A. (2012). The epistemic and evidential use of Spanish modal adverbs and verbs of cognitive attitude. *Folia Linguistica*, 46(1), 133-170.

- KÄRKKÄINEN, E. (2003). *Epistemic stance in English conversation. A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. Benjamins.
- KÄRKKÄINEN, E. (2006). Stance taking in conversation: From subjectivity to intersubjectivity. *Text & Talk*, 26 (6), 699-731.
- KÄRKKÄINEN, E. (2012). I thought it was very interesting. Conversational formats for taking a stance. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(15), 2194-2210.
- NUYTS, J. (2001). Subjectivity as an evidential dimension in epistemic modal expressions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33 (3), 383-400.
- SCHNEIDER, S. (2007). *Reduced Parenthetical Clauses as Mitigators: A corpus study of spoken French, Italian and Spanish*. John Benjamins.
- THOMPSON, S., & MULAC, A. (1991). A Quantitative Perspective on the Grammaticization of Epistemic Parentheticals in English. In E. C. Traugott, & B. Heine (Eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization* Vol. 2, Benjamins, 313-329.



# Self-Verifying Parentheticals, or When Performatives Undergo Pragmaticalization

Marco Biasio

University of Modena and Reggio Emilia

Since Urmson (1952) first sketched out his highly influential taxonomy of parenthetical elements, a great deal of research has addressed the topic both from a formal (viz. morphosyntactic, as in Griffiths 2015) and a functional (viz. semantic- and/or pragmatic-driven, as in Schneider 2007) perspective, in an attempt to provide a more rigorous and clear-cut definition of what ‘parentheticals’ really are (as opposed to, a.o., discourse markers, pragmatic markers, discourse particles, and the like; on the terminological problem see also Heine 2013) and which characteristics they should accordingly display (if any) in order to be labelled as such. The present contribution focuses on a specific aspect of the broader issue which has been rather neglected so far, i.e., the nature of the linguistic process that allows explicit performative verbs to be contextually used as procedural parentheticals, that is, those parentheticals that do not “[...] affect truth conditions or carry prepositional content”, but rather carry “[...] information as to how conceptual meaning is to be processed” (Grenoble 2004: 1955).

Interesting structural similarities bringing together parenthetical verbs, explicit performatives, and other types of discourse connectives that trigger conventional, rather than conversational implicatures (Rieber 1997) have been already noted in the pragmatic literature, cf. (1)–(3):

- 1) (I suppose that) your house is (, I suppose) very old (, I suppose).  
(Urmson 1952: 481)
- 2) (I admit) that’s... Impressively outside-the-box thinking (, I admit).
- 3) Barbara’s research is impressive; moreover (= I suggest that this is an additional consideration), she is a gifted teacher.  
(Rieber 1997: 54)

It is easy to see how most verbs addressed above can be rightfully considered prototypical members of either Austin’s ‘expositives’ or Searle’s ‘representatives’, i.e., hybrid verbs instantiating different lexical types of illocutionary acts built upon general locutionary verbs such as say or think (Moltmann 2017). These elements typically serve metacommunicative functions; they refer to what is or has been said about a state of affairs, thus (epistemically) committing the speaker(s) to the truth

of the corresponding proposition. Quite interestingly, however, similar functions can be fulfilled by other types of performatives, encompassing elements belonging to Searle's illocutionary classes of commissives, directives, and declarations; these verbs, as the examples (4)–(6) from Russian and Serbo-Croatian show, make reference to a state of affairs which is not given a priori but, rather, simultaneously reified through their uttering. Thus, they are more properly self-verifying;

- 4) Ponekad me gledaju na ulici čudno, ali kunem se (sic!) ako imam problem, popričam sam sa sobom i to uglavnom pomogne. (S-C.)  
[SRPKOR, Politika (25.10.2008.), poli081025.txt]  
'They sometimes look at me sideways in the street, but I swear, if I have a problem, I talk to myself and this generally helps'
- 5) Prošu bliže k delu. My ne na predvybornom mitinge! (RUS)  
'Please get to the point (lit. 'I ask to...'); we are not in a pre-electoral meeting!'
- 6) Net, u menja takoj asociaciji ne bylo. Pozvolju sebe sdelat' vid, čto ja nedostatočno informirovan. (RUS)  
[ГИКРЯ: <https://magazines.gorky.media/nz/2007/1/pravoslavie-naczionalnaya-bezopasnost-idemokratiya.html>]  
'No, I did not make such an association. I'll take the liberty to pretend I'm not informed enough'

Relying on a statistically representative sample of examples extracted from Russian, Serbian, and Croatian electronic corpora (a.o., NKRJa, HJK, SRPKOR), this paper aims at a) supporting the working hypothesis that the parenthetical use of both classes of performative verbs is triggered and informed by a general, ongoing process of pragmaticalization and b) that the parallel pragmaticalization of performatives in both Russian and Serbo-Croatian is not sensitive to their illocutionary force but, rather, to the contextual choice of verbal aspect (i.e., perfective vs. imperfective present).

#### REFERENCES

- GRENOBLE L. A. (2004) Parentheticals in Russian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36(11), pp. 1953–1974. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2004.02.008.
- GRIFFITHS J. (2005) Parenthetical Verb Constructions, Fragment Answers, and Constituent Modification. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 33(1), pp. 191–229. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-014-9256-6.

- HEINE B. (2013) On Discourse Markers: Grammaticalization, Pragmaticalization, or Something Else? *Linguistics* 51(6), pp. 1205–1247. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2013-0048.
- MOLTMANN F. (2017) Levels of Linguistic Acts and the Semantics of Saying and Quoting. In Tsohatzidis S. (ed.), *Interpreting J. L. Austin: Critical Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 34–59. DOI: 10.1017/9781316421840.003.
- RIEBER S. (1997) Conventional Implicatures as Tacit Performatives. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20(1), pp. 51–72. DOI: 10.1023/A:1005383403910.
- SCHNEIDER S. (2007) Reduced Parenthetical Clauses in Romance Languages: A Pragmatic Typology. In Dehé N., Kavalova Y. (eds.), *Parentheticals*. Amsterdam-New York: John Benjamins, pp. 237–258. DOI: 10.1075/la.106.13sch.
- URMSON J. O. (1952) Parenthetical Verbs. *Mind* 61(244), pp. 480–496. DOI: 10.1093/mind/LXI.244.480.

# Discourse markers out of verbs of thought and speech in Moroccan Arabic

Cristiana Bozza

Tuscia University; University of Bari Aldo Moro

It is widely attested that in a range of (un)related languages discourse markers (=DMs) often grammaticalize/pragmaticalize from verbs of thought and speech (see e.g. data in Kuteva et al. 2019). For instance, in investigating the most common verb-based DMs in French, Dostie (2004) highlights that several of them originated from both specifically cognitive verbs (in particular, verbs of knowledge and thought like *croire*, *comprendre*, *penser*, *savoir* and *sembler*), and from verbs which have (developed) cognitive meanings, such as verbs of perception (*écouter*, *entendre*, *regarder* and *voir*) and verbs of speech (*admettre*, *dire* and *parler*). The same goes for other languages, like Italian (Ghezzi&Molinelli 2014), and could be said for Moroccan Arabic (=MA) as well with regard to DMs based on verbs of cognition and perception, as shown in a very recent study by Bozza (2021). The present contribution aims at extending this previous work on MA to include items derived from *verba dicendi*, in order to get an insight on this particular type of deverbal DMs both in the specific case of MA, and more generally in relation to their correlates in other languages. In fact, a comparison of our findings with other related works could help to shed light on some cross-linguistic trends in terms of functional behavior of these DMs and also with respect to their grammaticalization/pragmaticalization. In particular, we will explore how and to what extent the semantics of the source lexemes affects the development of these DMs and their functions and uses as well. In this regard, in her above-mentioned work, Dostie argues that the fact that certain verbs are especially prone to produce DMs is due to some of their specific features, of which, in particular, those related to the cognitive dimension of the meaning play a role in their (poly)pragmaticalization. Besides, the issue of the emergence of a (sub)class of cognitive-based deverbal DMs will also be addressed.

## REFERENCES

- BOZZA, C. (2021) “*Šūf, yaʕni... fhəmti?* Segnali discorsivi da verbi di percezione e verbi cognitivi in arabo marocchino”, in Casalin, Federica, Miranda, Marina (a cura di), *Percorsi in Civiltà dell’Asia e dell’Africa I. Quaderni di studi dottorali alla Sapienza*, Roma, Sapienza Università Editrice, pp. 121-143.
- DOSTIE, G. (2004) *Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs. Analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique*, Brussels, De Boeck & Larcier.

- GHEZZI, C., MOLINELLI, P. (2014) “Italian *guarda, prego, dai*. Pragmatic Markers and the Left and Right Periphery”, in Beeching, Kate, Detges, Ulrich (eds.), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery. Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*, Leiden, Brill, pp. 117-150.
- KUTEVA, T. *et al.* (2019) *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization. Second, extensively revised and updated edition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

## Sulla pragmaticalizzazione in latino arcaico: il caso di *scilicet* in Plauto e Terenzio

Laura Conte

Università degli Studi di Palermo

Il presente studio descrive il processo di pragmaticalizzazione di *scilicet* ‘è evidente, certamente’ nella commedia latina di Plauto e Terenzio. L’analisi dei contesti d’uso e dei valori funzionali di *scilicet* si inquadra nell’ambito teorico della Functional Discourse Grammar (Hengeveld & Mackenzie 2008).

Etimologicamente, *scilicet* deriva dalla combinazione dell’infinito *scire* ‘sapere, conoscere’ e del verbo impersonale *licet* ‘è consentito, è lecito’ (cfr. Ernout-Meillet 1979:1061; Schrickx 2014:285). L’uso cristallizzato di *licet* impersonale con il significato ‘è consentito, è lecito’ si può spiegare ipotizzando che in specifici contesti d’uso il parlante selezioni il solo significato figurato del verbo *licēre*, ovvero ‘essere valutato discrezionalmente’ (cfr. Ernout-Meillet 1979:635), invece del significato letterale ‘essere messo in vendita’. La tendenza alla soggettificazione (cfr. Traugott 1989; Allan 2017; Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer 2007) e alla metaforizzazione del significato di *licet* (da un dominio semantico concreto ad uno astratto e più soggettivo) emerge più chiaramente nelle espressioni in cui compare un pronome personale, e.g. *per me licet* o *mihi licet*, generalmente tradotte con ‘è lasciato alla mia discrezione’. Il costrutto verbale *scire licet* > *scilicet*, letteralmente ‘si pensa di sapere’, codifica dunque il significato intrinsecamente soggettivo ‘è (mia) opinione’. L’evoluzione semantica in ‘è evidente, è lecito’ sembra quindi dipendere dall’associazione cognitiva del soggetto tra un evento o uno stato di cose che si pensa di conoscere o si reputa facilmente deducibile e ipotizzabile, e un evento o uno stato di cose che diviene evidente e naturale da acquisire. A seguito dell’opacizzazione dell’originario significato verbale e della decategorizzazione grammaticale, *scilicet* subisce un processo di grammaticalizzazione con lo sviluppo del significato avverbiale ‘evidentemente, certamente’. Più precisamente, *scilicet* assume la specifica funzione di avverbio modale epistemico a livello proposizionale; lo stesso valore epistemico conduce poi ad un processo di pragmaticalizzazione dell’elemento modale, cosicché *scilicet* inizia ad assumere funzioni pragmatiche a livello interazionale e discorsivo.

Secondo il criterio di stratificazione (*layering*), le diverse funzioni di *scilicet* si influenzano reciprocamente, coesistono nello stesso arco di tempo e si manifestano in contesti d’uso differenti (cfr. Bartolotta 2022). L’analisi delle 38 occorrenze di *scilicet* nella commedia latina arcaica permette

di individuare i tre principali usi di questo elemento lessicale: (i) come verbo principale della frase con l'originario significato 'è evidente', *scilicet* codifica un'ipotesi o un'opinione soggettiva del parlante in merito ad uno specifico stato di cose; (ii) a partire da una tendenza alla soggettificazione già manifesta nel valore verbale, *scilicet* viene usato come avverbio modale epistemico con il significato 'certamente', in grado di codificare il commitment del parlante in merito alla verità del contenuto proposizionale formulato al momento dell'enunciazione; (iii) *scilicet* viene usato come marcatore discorsivo con il significato 'sì', in grado di codificare una risposta affermativa del parlante al precedente enunciato imperativo o interrogativo dell'interlocutore (intersoggettificazione).

Le diverse interpretazioni linguistico-comunicative di *scilicet* in Plauto e Terenzio vanno dunque analizzate lungo un continuum 'evolutivo' individuabile nel processo di grammaticalizzazione del verbo in avverbio, prima, e di pragmaticalizzazione dell'avverbio epistemico in marcatore discorsivo, poi: *scilicet* assume un valore precipuamente pragmatico-testuale garantendo la fluidità e la coesione dell'intero atto comunicativo dei partecipanti alla conversazione.

#### REFERENCES

- ALLAN, R.J. (2017) The grammaticalization of Greek particles. A Functional Discourse Grammar approach. In P. Poccetti & F. Logozzo (eds.), *Ancient Greek linguistics. New approaches, insights, perspectives*, 103-118. Berlin & Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- BARTOLOTTA, A. (2022) Intensificatori e soggettificazione in latino: sulla grammaticalizzazione di *maxime*. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici (SSL)* 60 (1), in stampa.
- ERNOUT, A. & MEILLET, A. (1979 [1932]) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. Troisième tirage augmenté d'additions et de corrections Nouvelles par Jacques André. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- HENGEVELD, K. & MACKENZIE, J.L. (2008) *Functional Discourse Grammar. A typologically-based theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SCHRICKX, J. (2014) Latin commitment-markers: *scilicet* and *videlicet*. In S. Cantarini, W. Abraham & E. Leiss (eds.), *Certainty-uncertainty - and the attitudinal space in between*, 285-296. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SIMON-VANDENBERGEN, A. & AIJMER, K. (2007) *The Semantic field of modal certainty. A corpus-based study of English adverbs*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- TRAUGOTT, E.C. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: an example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 1. 31-55.

## The Italian *credo*. An epistemic marker of mitigation and vagueness

Francesca De Rosa

Università degli studi di Napoli “L'Orientale”

The so-called “frase-commento” (Lo Baido, 2019) It. *credo* (i.e. Eng. “I believe”), also known in linguistics as an example of parenthetical verb (see Urmson, 1952), is an Italian linguistic device characterized by suspensive intonation (Borgato & Salvi, 1995) and by the typical features of a “complement-taking mental predicate”, as pointed out in Van Bogaert (2011) with reference to spoken British English; namely syntactic mobility and a notable semantic bleaching matched with an increasing attitudinal value.

Observing data extracted by VoLIP, an Italian spoken corpus (e.g. VoLIP-NB1–Phone conversation: *ecco eh perche' in genere la domenica e' sempre un po' credo la giornata di pausa*; Eng. trad. “I see eh that’s why generally Sunday it’s like I believe day off”), in this paper we aim to show that *credo* has lost his semantic meaning in order to work like a discourse marker (i.e. epistemic marker, Bazzanella, 2006).

In this sense, our hypothesis is that It. *credo* is following the linguistic path of another verb of opinion, It. *penso*; (i.e. Eng. “I think”), a predicate that already showed to be liable to pragmaticalization (see Aijmer, 1997 for data on English and Swedish). As a matter of fact, this process seems to respond to the specific needs of the speaker for the purpose of communicating uncertainty (e.g. VoLIP-MC9–Radio conversation: *senti ti devo lasciare perché ho un collegamento credo da Roma grazie comunque di essere intervenuto e eh dovrebbe essere da Roma se non sbaglio da eh pronto?*; Eng. trad. “listen, I have to go because I have a phone connection I believe from Rome thank you anyway for participating eh it should be from Rome if I’m not wrong eh hello?”) in order to reduce her/his responsibility about her/his utterance (e.g. VoLIP-MA1–Face-to-face conversation: *credo # non lo so*; Eng. trad. “I believe # I don’t know”).

So, in this paper we want to analyze It. *credo* as a device of mitigation (Caffi, 2007), a pragmatic strategy here considered as strictly connected to approximation and vagueness (Flores-Ferrán, 2020).



## REFERENCES

- AIJMER, K. (1997) "I think. An English modal particle", in Swan, T., Westvik, O.J. (eds.), *Modality in Germanic Languages. Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1-47.
- BAZZANELLA, C. (2006) "Discourse markers in Italian: towards a 'compositional' meaning", in Fischer, K. (ed.), *Approaches to Discourse Particles*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, Elsevier, 449-464.
- BORGATO, G. & SALVI, G., (1995) "Le frasi parentetiche" in Renzi, L., Salvi, G., Cardinaletti, A., *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione, Vol. III, Tipi di frasi, deissi, formazione delle parole*, Bologna, Il Mulino.
- CAFFI, C. (2007) *Mitigation*, The Netherlands, Elsevier.
- FLORES-FERRÁN, N. (2020) *Linguistic Mitigation in English and Spanish. How Speakers Attenuate Expressions*, New York/London, Routledge.
- LO BAIDO, M.C. (2019) "Grammaticalizzazione, costruzioni e frasi commento in italiano parlato: uno studio empirico" in Moretti, B., Kunz, A., Natale, S., Krakenberger, E. (a cura di) *Le tendenze dell'italiano contemporaneo rivisitate*. Milano, Officinaventuno, 139-154.
- URMSON, J.O. (1952) "Parenthetical Verbs", *Mind*, v. 61 n. 244, 480-496.
- VAN BOGAERT, J. (2011) "I think and other complement-taking mental predicates: A case of and for constructional grammaticalization", *Linguistics* 49/2, 295-332.
- VoLIP, online Italian spoken corpus (<http://www.parlaritaliano.it/index.php/it/volip>).

2nd Person of Verbs of Speech in Parenthetical Clauses:  
Patterns of Pragmaticalization in Ancient Greek and Latin?

Eveling Garzón & Rodrigo Verano  
Universidad de Salamanca / Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Verbs of speech prototypically undergo paths of grammaticalization. Their frequent use in reference to the speaker's or the interlocutors' discourse production leads them to assume pragmatic roles in interaction, triggering processes of syntactic and semantic change that may ultimately end in conventionalization. First-person forms have received a great deal of attention in this regard in various languages (cf. in Greek: Lujan 2005, Verano 2015; in Latin: Mikulová 2021, Taous 2017). Less work has been done on the pragmatic developments of second person forms in their different uses (cf. in Greek: Verano 2014). Subordinate clauses with 2nd person verbs of speech in interaction, however, show crosslinguistic patterns of pragmaticalization. In many languages, these clauses detach from their primary semantic values and take on functions related to intersubjectivity and evidential modality (Narrog 2012), as they depart from the syntactic frame of their matrix sentences and become parenthetical or extraclausal constituents (Kaltenböck, Heine & Kuteva 2011).

This paper approaches subordinate modal clauses featuring 2nd person verbs of speech in ancient Greek and Latin texts. This analysis focuses on the constructions *ὡς* (also *ὡσπερ*) *λέγεις* / *φής* in their different configurations in Ancient Greek (data from archaic to post-classical periods) and *ut dicis* in archaic and classical Latin. The analysis shows a variational spectrum ranging from constructions fully integrated in the matrix sentence with primary semantic function (e.g. 1 and 2), to other functional prototypes, in which the value of evidential modality prevails over other semantic traits (e.g. 3 and 4).

1) Pl. *Phaed.* 68c.

Πάνυ, ἔφη, ἔχει οὕτως ὡς λέγεις.

“Certainly,” said he, “it is as you say.” (trans. Fowler)

2) Cic. *N.D.* 1.81

Nobis fortasse sic occurrit ut dicis.

“Very likely we Romans do imagine god as you say.” (trans. Rackham)

3) Eur. *Hel.* 1276

Θε. ταύτης ὁ μόχθος, ὡς λέγεις, θάπτειν πόσιν.

Theoklymenos: According to you, the work of burying her husband belongs to her (trans. Oates & O'Neill).

4) Sen. *Ben.* 5.18.1

Qui filio beneficium dat, ut dicis, et patri eius dat.

“According to you, he who gives a benefit to a son, gives it also to his father.” (trans. Basore)

Thus, the main research questions posed by this paper are the following: (i) to identify the paths that the forms under scope undergo as they assume pragmatic and discourse functions; (ii) to explore the pragmaticalization status of such forms, that is, whether the roles they play in context can be considered fully conventionalized; (iii) to establish whether there are nuances of communicative relevance in these constructions; that is, to identify what intention the speaker has when quoting his interlocutor; and (iv) to contrast the results obtained between these two classical languages.

#### REFERENCES

- KALTENBÖCK, G., HEINE, B. & KUTEVA, T. (2011) “On Thetical Grammar”. *Studies in Language* 35, 852-897.
- LUJÁN, E. R. (2005) El estudio de la ‘autocorrección’ como procedimiento de análisis sintáctico y su aplicación a las lenguas de corpus. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 35 (1), 77-92.
- MIKULOVÁ, J. (2021) Pragmatic uses of ‘I say’ in Latin. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 22 (1), 34-68. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.18002.mik>.
- NARROG, H. (2012) *Modality, Subjectivity, and Semantic Change. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TAOUS, T. (2017) The *dico* form: An autonomous marker. *Journal of Latin Linguistics*, 16 (2), 219-237. <https://doi.org/10.1515/joll-2017-0007>
- VERANO, R. (2014) La heterorreformulación en los diálogos platónicos. *Estudios Clásicos Anejo* 2, 153-160.
- VERANO, R. (2015) *La reformulación discursiva en griego antiguo. Un estudio sobre la República de Platón*. Doctoral dissertation. Universidad de Sevilla.

# Know, think and seem in ancient Greek and Latin: a comparative overview of pragmaticalization in ancient languages

Berta González Saavedra & Alberto Pardal Padín  
Universidad Complutense de Madrid / Universidad de Salamanca

For some years now, verbs from the semantic fields of knowledge, opinion and appearance have been related to the emergence of discourse markers with different values, especially subjective values by means of which the speaker expresses his/her commitment to the discourse (Traugott 2010, Narrog 2012). In fact, it has been seen that there are parallels between the languages of the world and that these verbs are the origin of some discourse particles which mark this type of evidentiality (Aikhenvald 2005: 271-274).

In this sense, comparative studies of these types of verbs in which the speaker coincides with the subject (knowledge and opinion verbs) or with the experiencer (verbs equivalent to 'seem') are particularly interesting, considering that they express different degrees of commitment to the state of affairs reported in the discourse.

In this present paper we present the data referring to the main verbs meaning 'know', 'think' and 'seem' in Greek and Latin, which are οἶδα, οἶμαι and δοκεῖ and *scio*, *puto* and *videtur* respectively. However, we must not lose sight of the fact that the study of these phenomena in classical languages is problematic because of the nature of the corpus: on the one hand, it is a closed corpus, in which the textual material available is limited to what the transmission has preserved and we do not always find the texts we would need (dialogical texts in all periods) and, on the other hand, also related to the nature of the texts, we are dealing with works of highly elaborate literature, from which Greek and Latin scholars extract the data, without having native speakers to consult regarding the interpretations.

Despite these methodological problems, it is possible nonetheless to find passages where these verbs develop pragmatic meanings, both in purely parenthetical instances, as in (1-2), or in subordinate sentences that function as disjunct satellites (3-4).

- 1) *iussi adparari prandium, amica expectat me, scio* ("I've ordered breakfast to be prepared; my girlfriend awaits me, **I know**", Plaut. *Men.* 599)
- 2) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἀγροίκως γε οἶμαι λοιδορήσειαν ("But they wouldn't, **methinks**, rebuke him harshly", Pl. *Phdr.* 268d)

- 3) ὁ θάνατος τυγχάνει ὄν, **ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ**, οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ δυοῖν πραγμάτοιιν διάλυσις, τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος (“Death happens to be, **to my view**, nothing else but the separation of two things, soul and body”, Pl. *Grg.* 524b)
- 4) interea, **si videtur**, concedite istuc. (“In the meantime, **if it seems fine**, step aside”, Plaut. *As.* 645)

In order to test to what extent these experiential verbs (Dahl and Fedriani 2012) develop pragmatic uses, we have extracted the passages where referring to some extent to the speaker, whether it is a 1st person singular (οἶδα, οἶμαι, *scio, puto*) or a 3rd person with a dative experiencer (*videtur, δοκεῖ*), in a corpus made of Plautus, Seneca the Younger and Tacitus for Latin and Plato, Aristophanes and Lucian for Greek. These examples have been analysed according to syntactic and formal (morphological/phonological) aspects:

- a) syntactic analysis attending specially to the syntactic integration of the verb in the clause and the elision of its arguments.
- b) morphological and phonological analysis of the forms in order to check if there is any attrition process.

The result of the parameters allows for a comparison of the data of ancient Greek and Latin in order to identify common processes in both languages and, eventually, pragmaticalization processes (Diewald 2011).

After identifying the processes followed by each verb, we check the correspondences between these verbs in Greek and Latin by studying these verbs in Latin translations of the New Testament Greek Texts (especially *Evangelia*).

#### REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD, A. (2005) *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DAHL, E. & FEDRIANI, C. (2012), «The argument structure of experience: Experiential constructions in Early Vedic, Homeric Greek and Early Latin», *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 110(3), 342-362. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.2012.01313.x>
- DIEWALD, G. (2011) «Grammaticalization and pragmaticalization». In Heiko Narrog and Bern Heine (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, 450-62. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- NARROG, H. (2012) *Modality, Subjectivity, and Semantic Change. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TRAUGOTT, E.C. (2010) (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. In K. Davidse, L. Vandelanotte & H. Cuyckens (eds.), *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, 29–74. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

# Discourse strategies as triggers for the pragmaticalization of verbs of thought and speech: Evidence from Slavic

Elena Graf

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Discourse strategies as triggers for the pragmaticalization of verbs of thought and speech: Evidence from Slavic

As in many languages of the world, verbs of thought and speech constitute in Slavic a productive source for the emergence of a significant number of discourse markers. Thus, such prototypical verbs of thought like russ. *dumat'*; ukr. *dumaty*; poln. *myśleć* 'think' or verbs of speech like russ. *govoritIPF'/skazatPF'*; ukr. *govorytyIPF/skazatyPF*; poln. *mówićIPF/powiedziećPF* 'say', 'tell' give rise to a vast array of discourse markers with different pragmatic meanings. Their functions in Slavic encompass the text and discourse structuring (e.g. resumption, quotative usage, etc.), meta-commented speech, interpersonal management, the marking of politeness, mitigating, but also the expression of various emotive attitudes of the speaker/writer, cf. (1)-(3).

- 1) Russ. *Delaj, kak xočeš', no ja govorjutell-IPFV.1SG tebe, čto étot čelovek proizvodit na menja vpečatlenie ottalkivajuščee.* (M. Bulgakov. *Master i Margarita*)  
Do as you like, but I'm telling you that this man makes a repulsive impression on me.  
(M. A. Bulgakov. *Master and Margarita*)
- 2) Pol. *Wiesz know-IPFV.2SG, często mi się śni.*  
You know, I dream a lot.
- 3) Ukr. – *A ja ne bojus' – Pomaxala [Stepka] rukavyčkaju i pryskoryla xodu.*  
– *Podumaješ think-PFV.2SG, – čvirknuv kriz' zuby Dmytro.* (Mykola Zarudny, *Na bilomu sviti*)  
– *And I'm not afraid! – [Stepka] waved her glove and sped up.*  
– *Who cares! – Dmytro gritted his teeth and returned.*

When considering the pathways of the development of such discourse markers from different verbs of thought and speech, certain discourse strategies seem to play a special role in the process of their pragmaticalization. Thus, similar to the so-called “flagged” intra-sentential code-switching” (Poplack 2004: 593), discourse markers can undergo a way of change from the overt, unintegrated units which the speaker uses with a rhetorical effect of underlining the very act of thinking or

speaking by means of the full-content items to the linguistic elements with a reduced semantic content, whose pragmatic functions unfold primarily through their use in situative contexts of communication. Thus, the development of discourse markers out of verbs of thought and speech is accompanied by the shifts from propositional to textual and/or (inter)subjective function.

Based on the examples of the development of discourse markers in Russian, Ukrainian and Polish, the current contribution touches on cases of such change which could be motivated by some discourse strategies.

#### REFERENCES

- POPLACK, S. (2004). Code-Switching. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K.J. Mattheier, P. Trudgill: *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society* (2nd ed.). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 589-596.



# Verba dicendi in Classical Greek: an analysis of the first-person singular

Carmen Hernández García  
Universidad de Sevilla

Speech verbs detected in conversational interaction have been studied from multiple perspectives and theoretical frameworks (Polovina 1988). In the field of classical languages, it comes as no surprise, for example, that *verba dicendi* in the imperative mood have been the object of pragmatic and functional research, as is the case for εἰπέ μοι “tell me”, which is to be interpreted as a parenthetical and whose interactional function is primarily given by its verbal mood (Zakowski 2014, López-Romero 2021).

Notwithstanding the above, in Ancient Greek some cases can be found of speech verbs in the indicative mood that perform a fully interactional function, due to the fact that they are inserted in directive speech acts (Risselada 1993), as it is for Ar. Ran. 171: Οὔτος, σὲ λέγω μέντοι, σὲ τὸν τεθνηκότα (“Hey, to you I say, yes, to you, the dead man”). Here one finds a form of address hosted in a turn that is found infelicitous, followed by a self-repair mechanism, that operates as a reinforcement of the summon (Schegloff 2013). Funnily enough, this self-repair mechanism is preceded by the speech verb λέγω “say”, which also shows a somewhat unusual predicative frame. In other words, it is typically constructed with a second person dative- semantically, a recipient-, insofar as its direct object refers to the content of a speech act. In this case, however, its direct object is σὲ, the accusative personal pronoun of the second person singular. As it would not be plausible to think of a trivalent construction of the verb (Agent + Object + Object Complement), this must be regarded as a performative utterance (Ramos Guerreira 2007). Furthermore, it should be noted that the first grammatical person has been mostly associated with declarative speech acts (Ramos Guerreira 2012), hence the importance of these odd examples.

The aforementioned phenomena are the starting point for this paper. It sets out to analyse the cases within the classical Greek drama in which an interactional function can be ascribed to a first-person singular verb in the indicative mood (λέγω, φημί, αὐδῶ, καλῶ, φωνῶ, etc.). It will focus on the instances where the speech verb is ancillary to the summon device. An analysis will be carried out to determine whether the shift towards a higher index of (inter)subjectivity (Traugott 2010) can be related to the change in the syntactic-semantic, and thus argumentative, structure of these verbs (Diewald 2011).

Accordingly, it will seek to ascertain, on the one hand, whether there is a preference for any particular speech verb for this interactional function and, if so, what the prototypical predicative frame in this context is. On the other hand, it intends to pinpoint the conversational mechanisms these verbs reinforce. Finally, it will account for the kind of turn they are inserted into and in which position, as well as the design of the turn itself.

#### REFERENCES

- DIEWALD, G. (2011) Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions, *Linguistics* 49/2, 365–390.
- LÓPEZ-ROMERO, M. (2021) Parentéticos en Sófocles: el caso de los verbos de lengua en imperativo, *Forum Classicorum*, 347-354.
- POLOVINA, V. (1988) The basic verba dicendi and their cohesive role in spoken conversational language, *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* Vol. 38 ¼, 193-200.
- RAMOS GUERREIRA, A. (2007) La complementación de dicere. Sobre causatividad, incorporación de instrumento y metalenguaje, M. E. Torrego, et al. (eds.) *Predicativa II*, 151-178.
- RAMOS GUERREIRA, A. (2012) Relaciones entre persona del predicado y actos de habla en latín, *Lingüística XL. El lingüista del siglo XXI*, 193-200.
- RISSELADA, R. (1993) *Imperatives and other directive expressions in Latin. A study in the pragmatics of a dead language*, J.C. Gieben,
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A. (2013) Ten operations in self-initiated, same-turn repair, M. Hayashi, et al. (eds.) *Conversational Repair and Human Understanding*, Cambridge University Press, 41- 70.
- TRAUGOTT, E. (2010) (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment, K. Davidse, et al. (eds.) *Subjectification, Intersubjectification and Grammaticalization*, De Gruyter, 29-74.
- ZAKOWSKI, S. (2014) εἰπέ μοι as a Parenthetical: A Structural and Functional Analysis, from Homer to Menander, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 54, 157-191.

## Procesos de pragmaticalización de verbos de pensamiento en dos construcciones fraseológicas del alemán

Nely M. Iglesias Iglesias  
Universidad de Salamanca

En mi propuesta, parto de dos construcciones fraseológicas del alemán (ingl.: ‘constructional idioms’; cfr. Taylor 2016), cuyos enunciados comienzan respectivamente con los verbos de pensamiento y/o creencia *denken* (esp.: ‘pensar’) y *glauben* (esp.: ‘creer’): [Ich DENKEN, mich VERB+DET+N{ACCIÓN ANIMAL INCONGRUENTE}], así como [Ich glaub, mich VERB+DET+N{ACCIÓN ANIMAL INCONGRUENTE}]. Se trata de interjecciones (impropias), con una clara función intensificadora, que expresan asombro o extrañamiento, perplejidad, incluso incredulidad por parte del hablante ante una situación dada. Dichas construcciones se actualizan prototípicamente en instancias como las de los siguientes ejemplos de uso:

- 1) Lorenzo Sposato stand nur wenige Sekunden auf der Bühne, da machte es bei Dieter Bohlen schon Klick: “Ich kenne dich!” Der Italiener nahm letztes Jahr bei “Deutschland sucht den Superstar” teil. “Ich dachte, mich tritt ein Pferd, so geil war's”, erinnerte sich der Pop-Titan. Doch im Recall schied Lorenzo aus, weil er einen Popsong singen musste und nicht sein Steckenpferd, die Klassik, präsentieren konnte. (SkE: German Web 2018 (deTenten 18): 1301325; <https://www.kreisbote.de/kino-tv/supertalent-finale-auf-rtl-ging-witz-von-dieter-bohlen-zu-weit-zr-10885631.html>)
- 2) In der Zelle ist eine Überwachungskamera, nun hat einer von der Wache in die Kamera geschaut und gerufen: Um Himmels Willen, ich glaub mich tritt ein Pferd, eine Frau in der Zelle. Nun wollten alle in der Kamera sehen, wie sich diese Schönheit gewaschen hatte, und nackt im Raum herumtanzte. (SkE: German Web 2018 (deTenten 18): 4410562; <http://gnadenkinder.de/board/printthread.php?s=2ac7a0451eb8f21c464f4a4e3c1a7475&t=52502&pp=10&page=1>)

La primera parte de sendas construcciones fraseológicas corresponde a la oración principal que se reduce al pronombre de primera persona del singular como sujeto y la forma flexiva correspondiente del verbo de pensamiento y/o creencia, seguido – a modo de oración completiva – de un pronombre personal, también de primera persona de singular, en acusativo con función de

complemento directo, y tras el que aparece el sujeto de la oración (inversión habitual y normativa en alemán), con unos rasgos prosódicos muy particulares.

El denominador común de ambas construcciones fraseológicas es que el hablante opta por verbalizar su estado emocional, es decir, su asombro o extrañamiento, perplejidad o incredulidad, a través de una acción no creíble, incongruente y absurda, realizada prototípicamente por un animal, como *Ich dachte, mich/Ich glaub, mich tritt ein Pferd/laust der Affe/knutscht ein Elch/...* (esp.: Pensé/Creo que me patea(ba) un caballo/me despioja(ba) un mono/me besuquea(ba) un alce/...). Por tanto, se puede observar que en las construcciones fraseológicas objeto de estudio, en ambos casos, los rasgos semánticos de los verbos de pensamiento y/o creencia se han ido difuminando. Junto a este proceso de pragmaticalización, ambas construcciones además destacan por su alto grado de productividad y/o creatividad en lo que se refiere al fenómeno de la incongruencia lingüística en el alemán actual.

#### REFERENCES

- IVORRA ORDINES, P. & MELLADO BLANCO, C. (2021) Más tontos que el novio de la Chelo. La intensificación de la estulticia en foros y chats por medio de comparaciones creativas: Una aproximación desde la Gramática de Construcciones. *Estudios Románicos* 30, 39–58.
- LÓPEZ MEIRAMA, B. & IGLESIAS IGLESIAS, N.M. (en prensa) The construction [a todo Nsing] in Spanish. In E. Wiesinger et al. (eds.), *Constructions in Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MELLADO BLANCO, C. (ed.) (2021) *Productive Patterns in Phraseology and Construction Grammar. A Multilingual Approach*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- MELLADO BLANCO, C., HOLZINGER, H., IGLESIAS IGLESIAS, N.M. & MANSILLA PÉREZ, A. (eds.) (2021) *Muster in der Phraseologie. Monolingual und kontrastiv*. Hamburgo: Verlag Dr. Kovač.
- MELLADO BLANCO, C. & IGLESIAS IGLESIAS, N.M. (en prensa) Traducir y descubrir construcciones. In I. Holl et al. (eds.) *Nuevas orientaciones en los estudios de traducción e interpretación del/al alemán*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- TAYLOR, J.R. (2016) Cognitive linguistics. In K. Allan (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Linguistics*. Londres / Nueva York: Routledge, 455-469.

## Wonder: An instance of pragmaticalisation? From lexical cognitive senses to discursive strategies

Christelle Lacassain

Wonder belongs to the broad category of mental verbs, more specifically to two subclasses of mental verbs, namely cognitive verbs and emotive verbs. We may find it in sentences expressing either a mental process ([1-3]) or an affective stance ([4-5]), licensing a wide range of complements, mainly preposition phrases (e.g. about-PP, at-PP) and various types of finite clauses (e.g. if-clauses, Wh-clauses, that-clauses).

- 1) Scarlet went to look through the glass doors, wondering about the relationship between distance and responsibility. (BNC)
- 2) Left alone in her office, Claudia signed letters to her supplies, wondering what Dana was doing and, more importantly, where she was. (BNC)
- 3) I knew the joy of the world and wondered at it like a child. (BNC)
- 4) Lissa glared at him. 'Your arrogance is so potent, I wonder that you don't bottle it.' (BNC)

Moreover, wonder can also be used as a discourse marker, in parenthetical constructions or in exclamatory sentences, for instance. In its cognitive sense, wonder can have the discursive function of reporting (2) or can be used as a discourse marker of quoted thought (6), then resembling the quoting verbs of speech such as say. It can also be viewed as a marker of politeness at the beginning of requests (9). As for emotive wonder, it can acquire a discursive dimension, expressing either probability, near-certainty (7), or doubt, incredulity (8).

- 5) Pete blushed. Why is he blushing, Marion wondered. And why isn't he saying anything? (BNC)
- 6) 'For two miles across the dunes, [...] there are walks for naturists. Lovely places. Really lovely. Would you, I wonder, would you walk with me? Just a short way? We would be quite alone.' Julia shook her head. (BNC)
- 7) 'Greg was working on some kind of deal in Italy not long before he... before the accident. It's quite conceivable they were involved in it and he met Maria as a result.

He swept her off her feet, I shouldn't wonder.' His lip curled in a bitter smile. 'He was very attractive to women, was Greg.' (BNC)

- 8) 'But some day – some day I'll travel, and meet people, and know things, and then I shall write a true book – a book of experience.' 'You'll be famous, Gay.' 'I wonder! I don't care about that.' (BNC)
- 9) 'Please don't run off,' said the man calmly. 'I'll not harm you. I was wondering if you could help me? [...] Could you show me the way out?' (BNC)

Few studies have been devoted to the verb wonder and its various meanings and discursive functions. How and why has wonder come to be such a polysemic and multifunctional verbal unit? The present study addresses this multifaceted question in both an enunciative and cognitive perspective, and sets out to accomplish three main goals: first, to identify the discursive uses of wonder, both in its cognitive and emotive senses, by presenting a thorough analysis of the different types of sentences in which it is used; second, to shed light on the parameters and factors that allow for the varied discursive functions of wonder, as it is not in itself a discourse marker; third, to determine whether wonder can be analysed as an instance of pragmaticalisation in some contexts. These aims are achieved using a qualitative, corpus-based analysis, which helps to understand to what extent different grammatical codings embody specific ways of viewing the scene. It turns out that syntax is motivated by meaning and pragmatics: the syntactic constructions contribute to both conveying particular meanings and carrying out precise discursive functions that are adapted to the speaker's intentions.

#### REFERENCES

- BRINTON, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English: Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- BRINTON, L. J. (2017). *The Evolution of Pragmatic Markers in English. Pathways of Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- DIK, S. C. ([1989] 1997). *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*, K. Hengeveld (ed.), 2nd ed., Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- DIRVEN, R. (ed.). (1989). *A User's Grammar of English: Word, Sentence, Text, Interaction*, Frankfurt am Main/Bern, Verlag Peter Lang.
- FITZMAURICE, S. (2004). Subjectivity, intersubjectivity and the historical construction of interlocutor stance: From stance markers to discourse markers, *Discourse Studies* 6/4: 427-448.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. & MATTHIESSEN, C.M.I.M. ([1985] 2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 4th ed. revised, London/New York, Routledge.

- KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, C. (2005). La construction de la relation interpersonnelle : quelques remarques sur cette dimension du dialogue, *Cahiers de la linguistique française*, n° 16 : 69-88.
- LEVIN, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations. A Preliminary Investigation*, Chicago/London, The University of Chicago Press.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C. (1982). From propositional to textual end expressive meanings: Some semantic-pragmatic aspects of grammaticalization, W. P. Lehmann & Y. Malkiel (eds.), *Perspective on Historical Linguistics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins: 245-271.

## Say/dire as sources of discourse markers in English and French: diverging pragmaticalisation paths

Laure Lansari  
Université Paris Cité

Speech verbs are likely to pragmaticalise into discourse markers in many languages of the world (Dostie 2004). A closer look at discourse markers containing speech verbs in English and French nonetheless reveals a major difference between the two languages: while there exist many discourse markers containing *dire* in French (*disons, on va dire, j'allais dire, pour ainsi dire*, etc. see Rouanne & Anscombe 2016 for an inventory), there are far fewer discourse markers with *say* in English (*say, let's say*). We thus hypothesize that *say* and *dire* do not follow exactly the same pragmaticalisation paths and that *dire* is much more likely to pragmaticalise into discourse markers than its English counterpart.

The first aim of this paper is to try to account for this divergence. We argue that despite common semantic features the two verbs are rather dissimilar in language use. Semantically speaking, each verb is the most neutral speech verb (with no positive or negative connotation) and the most frequent speech verb in each of the languages concerned (Gómez-Jordana & Anscombe 2015, Nita 2006). Another common point is that both verbs express a variety of meanings, from objective meanings (where *say/dire* are roughly equivalent to *utter*) to more subjective ones (where *say/dire* mean *express an opinion*) (Franckel 2015 for French, Goossens 1982 for English). Yet, a contrastive usage-based analysis (Nita 2006) has revealed that in some contexts *say* is much more frequent than *dire*, notably in reported speech where *say* is massively used while French favours a variety of speech verbs (*déclarer, affirmer*, etc.). Conversely, as far as discourse markers are concerned, the verb *say* is far less productive than *dire*. While *dire* has pragmaticalised into various discourse markers that have received a lot of scholarly attention in French studies, discourse markers with *say* are scarce (Lansari 2020). In English, the most common discourse marker that has pragmaticalised from a speech/thought verb is *I mean* (Schiffrin 1987) and its high frequency may have prevented discourse markers based on *say* from developing.

The second aim of this paper is to illustrate our point with a contrastive case study. Based on comparable web corpora of the TenTen family available on Sketch Engine (<https://www.sketchengine.eu/>), we compare *on va dire* with its possible equivalents in English. We argue that *on va dire* builds a complex intersubjective consensus in which the speaker's viewpoint



may remain vague because of the indefinite pronoun “on”. The corpus data show more precisely that *on va dire* has two main discourse functions. It may serve an exemplification function, in which case it is very close to *let’s say*. Or, more frequently, it may be used as a metalinguistic device commenting on a specific formulation. In this latter function, we posit that its closest pragmatic equivalents are *kinda/sorta*: like *on va dire*, these so-called “vague” markers, which are on the rise in informal registers (Maniez 2017), enable speaker stance to remain intentionally unclear, which may lead to euphemistic and ironic uses:

- 1) Comment dire euh...j'ai limité les dégats! On va dire &quot;moyen&quot; (donc pas catastrophique comme je m'y attendais) en espérant que ça passe.
- 2) Intended as a response to Nora Ephron's book *I Feel Bad About My Neck, I Feel Good About My Hands* is a welcome balm for those of us over 50 who don't need any more reminders that, well, aging kinda sucks.

Say thus appears an unlikely source for emergent discourse markers in informal registers in contemporary English, which favours other pragmaticalisation paths from the vague markers *sort of/kind of*.

#### REFERENCES

- DOSTIE, G. (2004) *Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Duculot.
- FRANCKEL, J.-J. (2015) *Dire*, *Langue française*, vol. 186 n. 2. 87-102.
- GÓMEZ-JORDANA FERARY, S. & ANSCOMBRE, J.-Cl. (2015) Introduction : *Dire et ses marqueurs*. *Langue Française* n°186 « *Dire et ses marqueurs* ». 5-12.
- GOOSSENS, L. (1982) *Say: focus on the message*. In R. Driven, L. Goossens, Y. Putseys & E. Vorlat (eds.). *The Scene of Linguistic Action and its Perspectivization by SPEAK, TALK, SAY and TELL*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 85-132.
- LANSARI, L. (2020) *A Contrastive View of Discourse Markers: Discourse Markers of ‘Saying’ in English and French*. Londres: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MANIEZ, F. (2017) Representation of conversational style in the oral components of the BNC and the COCA: towards the description of a mixed genre. *Recherches Anglaises et Nord Américaines*, Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg, *Discourse, Boundaries and Genres in English Studies*.
- NITA, R. (2006) *Discours rapporté, repérages et organisation textuelle : étude contrastive anglais-français-roumain*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Poitiers.
- ROUANNE, L. & ANSCOMBRE, J.-Cl. (eds.) (2016) *Histoires de dire. Petit glossaire des marqueurs formés sur le verbe dire*. Bern: Peter Lang.

SCHIFFRIN, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

# English 'mind [you]': a diachronic study

Diana Lewis

Aix Marseille University

The English verb 'mind', a Middle English conversion from the noun '[ge]mynd', has evolved into a polysemy network of related usages, as both a transitive and an intransitive verb, as well as spawning a range of idiomatic expressions, some more opaque than others, including 'never mind', 'mind [you]', 'if you don't mind', which are often used as discourse markers. This paper traces the development of 'mind' over the Modern English period from the C17th to present-day English, with the focus on these three idioms and a more detailed analysis of the evolution and usage of 'mind [you]'.

The paper takes a panchronic approach, to identify, in the context of the wider evolution of the verb 'mind', likely syntagmatic pressures, information structure pressures and frequency effects in the evolution of the expressions, and to show the coherence-marking, information structural and interpersonal functions of 'mind [you]'. It argues that a usage-based approach to language change can benefit from including a 'prospective' (or 'downstream') view of morphosyntactic and semantic developments, enabling potential generalizations about change to be identified. This involves focusing on how (older) lexemes or constructions have evolved rather than on where (newer) lexemes or constructions come from. It is further argued that to this end, categories such as 'pragmaticalization' (Erman & Kotsinas 1993, Aijmer 1997, Dostie 2004; see also Diewald 2011, Heine 2013), set up on the basis of the 'outcomes' of language change, and on the perceived status of the emergent linguistic item(s), should be treated with care to ensure they do not obscure interesting generalizations or become taken for a cognitively distinct type of language change.

The study is based on British English: on historical data from the Old Bailey Corpus of court sessions (Huber et al. 2016) and the CLMET corpus (de Smet 2005), and on recent data from the spoken section of the 1994 British National Corpus (BNC Consortium 2001) and from the Spoken BNC2014 corpus (Love et al. 2017).

## REFERENCES

AIJMER, K (1997) 'I think' - an English modal particle. In T. Swan and O. Jansen Westvik (eds.), *Modality in Germanic Languages. Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, 1-47. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- BNC CONSORTIUM (2001) *British National Corpus, v. 2 (BNC World Edition)*. Distributed by Oxford University Computing Services on behalf of the BNC Consortium. <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>
- DE SMET, H. (2005) A corpus of Late Modern English texts. *ICAME Journal* 29, 69-82.
- DIEWALD, G. (2011) Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* 49 (2), 365-390.
- DOSTIE, G. (2004) *Pragmaticalisation et marqueurs discursifs: Analyse sémantique et traitement lexicographique*. Brussels: De Boeck Larcier.
- ERMAN, B. & KOTSINAS, U.-B. (1993) Pragmaticalization: The case of *ba* and *you know*. *Studier i modern sprakvetenskap* 10, 76-92.
- HEINE, B. (2013) On discourse markers: Grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else? *Linguistics* 51 (6), 1205-1247.
- HUBER, M., NISSEL, M. & PUGA, K. (2016) *Old Bailey Corpus 2.0*. [hdl:11858/00-246C-0000-0023-8CFB-2](https://hdl.handle.net/11858/00-246C-0000-0023-8CFB-2).
- LOVE, R., DEMBRY, C., HARDIE, A., BREZINA, V. & MCENERY, T. (2017) The Spoken BNC2014: designing and building a spoken corpus of everyday conversations. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 22(3).

# First person vs. second person: A relevant factor in the pragmaticalization of verbs of speech and thought? A view from four Mainland Scandinavian languages

Pier-Yves Modicom

Université Bordeaux Montaigne

Among the shared properties of verbs denoting speech acts and mental attitudes, the present contribution is mostly interested in the fact that first-person assertions involving these verbs are cases of non-descriptive statements, as opposed to third-person utterances of the same verbs (Anscombe 1957). Recently, linguistic typology has insisted upon the grammatical relevance such asymmetries of person-bound authority, especially for verbs of internal states (egophoricity, Floyd et al. 2018). Egophoricity also has important implications about the second person: Egophoric features of the first person in assertions tend to appear on the second person in questions.

The question to be addressed in the talk is whether asymmetries between the first and the second person can correlate with the following pragmaticalization features:

- illocutionary specialization for assertions vs questions
- position to the left edge vs right edge of the utterance (following the hypothesis of subjective vs intersubjective specialization of these edges (Beeching & Detges 2015, Van Olmen & Šinkūnienė 2021).

The languages to be considered are all four standard written varieties of Mainland Scandinavian: Danish, Swedish, Norwegian Bokmål, New Norwegian (Nynorsk). Since these are V2 languages, a further syntactic feature of pragmaticalization has to be taken into consideration: Subject-Verb (SV) vs Verb-Subject (VS) order. SV constructions can be expected in pragmaticalized non-reactive stereotypized speech acts (or “situation-bound utterances”). For verbs of thought, VS order is found in parenthetical constructions; for verbs of speech, it is typical of reported speech and quotational contexts (“quotative inversion”) but not restricted to it. VS is also typical for interrogative utterances (and thus possibly for pragmaticalized interrogative constructions, e.g. question tags). Most importantly, VS constructions are banned from the left edge of the utterance. Considering the plausible correlation between first vs. second person and assertive vs. interrogative contexts for SV and for VS constructions, Bergqvist (2021) has shown that egophoric regularities

can be spotted on pragmaticalized verbs of thought in spoken Swedish. The present study is the first investigation of this issue across all four Mainland Scandinavian written standards.

The study is corpus-based and draws on data from the largest corpora for all four languages in the SketchEngine database, the TenTen corpora. The following set of verbs were investigated, looking for the profile of their first- and second-person occurrences in the corpus:

- Danish (DaTenTen 14): mene (think, believe), tro (believe), tænke (think), sige (say), påstå (claim), hævde (claim), vide (know).
- Norwegian Bokmål (NoTenTen 17 Bokmål): hevde (claim), påstå (claim), si (say), tro (believe), tenke (think), vite (know).
- New Norwegian (NoTenTen 17 Nynorsk): hevde (claim), påstå (claim), seier (say), tro (believe), tenke (think), vete (know).
- Swedish (SvTenTen 14): hävda (claim), säga (say), tro (believe), tycka (think), tänka (think), veta (know).

The strongest person-bound asymmetry is the specialization for assertive (w. the first person) vs interrogative (w. the second person) contexts for VS constructions involving verbs of thought. This holds in all four languages, for pragmaticalized and non-pragmaticalized uses.

In the second person, verbs of speech show at best sporadic pragmaticalized uses in parenthetical constructions or to the right edge, in the VS order. In the first person, VS constructions of verbs of speech tend to occur as parenthetical stance markers (either epistemic or mitigative). The cognates *hævde* / *hävda* / *hevde* ‘claim’ tend to be used as proper verbs of speech (incl. quotative uses) in the second person, but show the properties of verbs of thought in the first person.

Further investigation is needed for the SV order, but at this stage, no clear tendencies emerge for them.

#### REFERENCES

- AIJMER, K. (2011) I think — an English modal particle. In T. Swan & O. Westvik (eds.), *Modality in Germanic languages*, 1-48. De Gruyter.
- ANSCOMBE, G.E. (1957) *Intention*. Harvard UP.
- BEECHING, K. & DETGES, U. (eds.) (2014) *Discourse functions at the left and right periphery: Crosslinguistic investigations of language use and language change*. Brill.

- BERGQVIST, H. (2021) Egophoricity and Perspective: A View From Spoken Swedish. *Frontiers in Communication* 6:627144. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.627144>
- FLOYD, S., Northcliffe, E. & San Roque, L. (eds.) (2018) *Egophoricity*. Benjamins.
- GÜNTNER, S. & Imo, W. (2003) Die Reanalyse von Matrixsätzen als Diskursmarker: ich mein-Konstruktionen im gesprochenen Deutsch. *Inlist* 37.
- DE HOOP, H., FOOLEN, A., MULDER, G. & VAN MULKEN, V. (2018) I think and I believe: evidential expressions in Dutch, in A.F., H. de H. & G.M. (eds), *Evidence for Evidentiality*, 77-97. Benjamins.
- SCHIFFRIN, D. (1987) Information and participation: Y'know and I mean. In *Discourse Markers*, 267-311. Cambridge UP.
- VAN OLMEN, D. & ŠINKŪNIENĖ, J. (2021) Pragmatic markers and peripheries: An overview, in D.V.O. & J.S. (eds), *Pragmatic Markers and Peripheries*, 1-16. Benjamins.

# The functions of the Czech particle ‘prý’ seen through its English equivalents

Zuzana Nádraská

Charles University, Prague

This paper is concerned with the Czech particle ‘prý’ (i.e. he says, it is said) and its English equivalents. Originating from a *verbum dicendi* (on praví, i.e. he says), ‘prý’ has undergone grammaticalization and is now usually classified as an evidential particle; it signals that the discourse it introduces is reported and, depending on the context, may convey different attitudes such as doubt, disbelief or irony directed at the reported speaker or content (Hoffmanová and Kolářová 2007, Martinková and Janebová 2017).

The research is based on a synchronic quantitative-qualitative analysis of a Czech-English parallel corpus, a part of the multi-lingual Czech-based parallel corpus InterCorp (Rosen et al. 2022). Drawing on the idea of *tertium comparationis* (cf. Gast 2015), the research identifies ‘prý’ and its English translation equivalents (e.g. reporting clauses, evidential adverbs, zero realisation) in order to underline and clarify the functional diversification and semantic nuances of the Czech particle. To some extent the present paper corroborates the results presented in other studies (Hoffmanová and Kolářová 2007, Martinková and Janebová 2017) and develops the current state of research in the following ways. First, it pays closer attention to the distribution and frequency of the individual English structures across different registers, drawing conclusions as to the functional interpretation of ‘prý’. Second, it broadens the repertoire of registers (fiction, journalistic texts, non-fiction, parliamentary debates and film sub-titles). Third, it discusses the role of ‘prý’ in the build-up of reported discourse and raises the possibility to ascribe a textual, discourse signalling role to the particle. Fourth, it examines the potential to interpret ‘prý’ as a marker of subjectivity belonging to the internal rather than an external voice (Traugot 1995, Diewald 2011). The last two aspects are discussed in close relation to the corresponding English structures and the presence/absence of the source.

The preliminary results show functional diversification of ‘prý’ and register specific uses, which find reflection in different structural preferences in the corresponding English texts.

The role of ‘prý’ in the build-up of reported discourse seems twofold. First, it appears with other reporting signals within sentence boundary and has a reinforcing function; in English it often corresponds to zero realisation or a reporting clause, especially in fiction and film subtitles. Second,



'prý' functions as the sole marker of reporting in a sentence and the source has to be retrieved from the (reporting) context across sentence boundary. In such contexts, the textual role of 'prý' suggests itself; the particle has a metalinguistic text-organising function, signals relations within reported discourse and contributes to text cohesion and coherence (Traugot 1995: 39). Depending on the register, in the latter function 'prý' corresponds to an English reporting clause and a variety of structures with a covert but possibly retrievable external source (zero, evidential adverbs or passive reporting clauses).

The possibility to interpret 'prý' as the author's evaluation and a marker of authorial subjectivity offers itself in contexts with an inexplicit external source which seem to display the weakening of the reportative function of the particle. This potential is most marked, though not limited to, instances in which 'prý' corresponds to English structures with a recipient subject (I hear) that do not only background the external source but also foreground the internal voice. The paper considers the possibility that in this function, frequent especially in fiction and film subtitles, the meaning of 'prý' moves closer to the domain of epistemic modality. Indeed, marginally 'prý' corresponds to an English first person subject occurring with epistemic verbs (I believe/gather) (cf. Travis 2006, Olberts 2007).

#### REFERENCES

- DIEWALD, G. (2011) Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* (49)2: 365–390.
- GAST, V. (2015) On the use of translation corpora in contrastive linguistics: A case study of impersonalisation in English and German. *Languages in Contrast* 15(1): 4-33.
- HOFFMANOVÁ, J. & KOLÁŘOVÁ, I. (2007) Slovo prý/prej: možnosti jeho funkční a sémantické diferenciaci. In F. Štícha & J. Šimandl (eds.) *Gramatika a korpus/Grammar and Corpora 2005*. Prague: Ústav pro jazyk český Akademie věd České republiky. 93-102.
- MARTINKOVÁ, M. & JANEBOVÁ, M. (2017). What English translation equivalents can reveal about the Czech “modal” particle prý: A cross-register study. In K. Aijmer and D. Lewis (eds) *Contrastive Analysis of Discourse-pragmatic Aspects of Linguistic Genres*. Cham: Springer. 63-90.
- OLBERTZ, H. (2007) Dizque in Mexican Spanish: the subjectification of reportative meaning. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19(1): 151-172.
- ROSEN, A., VAVŘÍN, M. & ZASINA, A. J. (2022) *Korpus InterCorp – čeština*, version 14 from 31 January, 2022. Prague: Ústav Českého národního korpusu. Available from <http://www.korpus.cz>

TRAUGOTT, E. C. (1995) Subjectification in grammaticalization. In D. Stein and S. Wright (eds.) *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives. Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP. 31-54.

TRAVIS, C. A. (2006) Dizque: a Colombian evidentiality strategy. *Linguistics* 44(6): 1269-1297.

## Las formas *sabr*, *sabe*, *sepa* en la historia del espaol y su emergencia como marcador pragmático discursivo

Rosa María Ortiz Ciscomani

Universidad de Sonora

El verbo saber ha sido abordado en trabajos, pocos hasta hoy, que dan cuenta de la opacidad de su valor léxico básico o pleno y de su empobrecimiento sintáctico. Particular atención ha recibido la expresión *you know* 'sabes' en las lenguas y los nuevos significados que ha asumido. En este trabajo analizo algunas construcciones con el verbo saber en el espaol, menos estudiadas que la mencionada, las cuales, en general, se caracterizan, por el uso de primera o tercera persona y/o por un tiempo distinto al presente de indicativo, propio de *sabes*. Entre estas formas, están las ejemplificadas en (1)-(5), *sabr*, *sabe*, *sepa* Dios, *sepa*:

- 1) Candentes perlas comenzaron a rodar por sus mejillas. Insistió varias veces, pero al ver que no lograba convencerme pidió permiso para abrazarme y para dar un beso a su niño que, hecho hombre, la abandonaba para correr *sabr* Dios por qué rumbos [CORDE, Dalia, Márquez Campos, 1953]
- 2) El muchacho de quien es ese traje... pos... es... ¡no sé qué cosa de una fábrica! Y resulta, ¿sabe usted?..., que le alcanzó una máquina y le hirió en el cuello, y le trajeron..., pero que se moría. Como que aún está en la cama, y la pobre señora María, la madre, ¿sabe usted? Pues... venga lavar el traje..., y venga tenderlo, ¡na!..., que la sangre no sale. Y a lo mejor que como está tan trastorná la pobre, pues que se le habrá olvidao... Yo le diré... [CORDE, El amigo ahorcado, Carbone, 1920]
- 3) - Yo le aconsejaría, paisano, que mejor fuera entonces a la clínica del doctor Charcos. Pues es el único que yo *sepa*, que baje a curar en espíritu. Dionisio se sintió ofendido, pero como no llevaba ánimo de pelear con nadie, bruscamente dio media vuelta [CORDE, La luciérnaga, Azuela, 1932]

Como vemos, tanto *sabr* Dios (1) como *sabe* y yo *sepa* (2-3) al mismo tiempo que conservan su valor esquemático, aportan nuevos significados que reflejan mayor presencia de la perspectiva del hablante, buscando a veces la atención de su interlocutor, esto es, significados modales. En (4) y (5), 'que yo *sepa*' y '*sepa*' en 1ª y 3ª persona PRES SUBJ tienen un significado también subjetivo y más

libre sintácticamente como se refleja en la posición y en la puntuación. Su funcionamiento en estos casos es ya de marcador discursivo.

- 4) Ciudadana Senadora, le ruego con respeto continúe con su intervención. Gracias. Todos los señores panistas no se gastaron las voces, se amontonaron sobre él para felicitarlo. Yo pensé que se trataba de Santa Ana su apellido, pero dicen que no que es Villa. Villa no traicionó al pobre, al miserable, que yo sepa. Tema, por favor. Creo que nos vamos a seguir viendo a la salida. Señores legisladores, aquí no se trata de insultar en lo personal a nadie, yo le estoy diciendo no, lo que quiero es agarrarla del chongo a la salida [CORDE, Oral, Cámara de Senadores, 19xx]
- 5) ¿Dónde anda tu hermano? Sepa [oral, conversación]

El trabajo analiza las ocurrencias de estas formas en un corpus escrito proveniente de datos del CORDE, así como del CREA y orales, y se orienta a mostrar la ganancia de valores pragmáticos de estas construcciones, al mismo tiempo que da cuenta de su origen para plantear la ruta evolutiva que sugiere su documentación. La propuesta sustentada por dicho análisis consiste en que el verbo transita de su significado cognitivo pleno hacia valores modales en su mayoría interpersonales, que remiten en algunos usos a la epistemicidad y en otros a la evidencialidad, pesando mucho en esta ruta el contexto lingüístico.

#### REFERENCES

- AZOFRA, E. & Enghels, R. (2017) El proceso de gramaticalización del marcador epistémico de verbal *sabes*, *Iberoromania*, 85: 115-129.
- BRINTON, L.J. (1996) *Pragmatic Markers in English. Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- COMPANY COMPANY, C. (2004) Gramaticalización por subjetivización como prescindibilidad de la sintaxis, *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 52 /1:1-28.
- COMPANY COMPANY, C. (2006) Zero in syntax, ten in pragmatics. In A. Athanasiadou, C. Canakis & B. Cornillie (eds.): *Subjectification: various paths to subjectivity*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 75-398.
- CUENCA, M.J. (2013) The fuzzy boundaries between discourse marking and modal marking. In L. Degand, B. Cornillie & P. Pietrandrea (eds.). *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles. Categorization and description*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 181-216, Draft version.

- LÓPEZ SERENA, A. & BORREGUERO ZULOAGA, M. (2010) Los marcadores del discurso y la variación lengua hablada vs. lengua escrita. In Ó. Loureda & E. Acín (eds.), *Los estudios sobre marcadores del discurso en español, hoy*, Madrid: Arco Libros, 415-495.
- POSIO, P. (2014) Subject expression in grammaticalizing constructions. The case of *creo* and *acho* 'I think' in Spanish and Portuguese, *Journal of Pragmatics* 63: 5-18.
- TRAUGOTT, E.C. (2007) Discourse markers, modal particles, and contrastive analysis, synchronic and diachronic. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 6: 139-157.

## Some Observations Concerning the Pragmaticalization Pathway of Speech Act Verbs as Discourse Markers in Romanian

Cecilia Mihaela Popescu & Oana Adriana Duță

University of Craiova

This communication deals with the pragmaticalization of two dicendi verbs, *a zice* ‘to say’(< Lat. *dicere*, apud DLR, s.v. *zice*) and *a spune* ‘to say’(< Lat. *exponere*, apud DLR, s.v. *spune*), which are actually the most frequently used lexemes with this meaning in Romanian.

Our major goal is to provide further evidence for typological studies regarding grammaticalization and pragmaticalization (see, *inter alia*, Traugott 1995: 31–54; Traugott & Dasher 2002; Chappell, 2017: 139–165), stating that the meanings conveying external or internal objective situations evolve into meanings that express highly subjective discursive or metalinguistic situations. In other words, the evolution starts from the external perspective (in our case, the description of objective locutionary processes, i.e. speech acts) and focuses on an internal perspective (the description of discursive or mental/cognitive processes/activities).

Thus, the few studies devoted to these verbs in Romanian linguistics (Golopenția 1991; Popa 2007; Barbu 2008a, b; Prelipcean 2015) agree that there is a different amount of subjectivity in their semantemes. Even though both verbs have the same origin and are equally old (inherited from Latin) and refer to the same extralinguistic reality, i.e. the speech act, some fundamental differences manifest due to the following parameters: the frequency of use – higher for *a zice* (e.g. about 130,000,000 Google hits in 0.37 seconds, with a much lower number for *a spune*, only about 53,200,000 hits in 0.43 seconds); the array of meanings – also wider and more diverse for *a zice*; the propensity to form phrases and idioms – visibly stronger for the first verb. All these differences may be due to the structure of the signifier (*a zice* is shorter, easier to pronounce and more transparent/motivated) and, as mentioned above, to the amount of subjectivity. From this latter perspective, *a spune* has a more objective connotation, while *a zice* is more subjective; this particularity is also highly responsible for the evolution of this word, under the same form (see ex. (1) below) or in other variants, such as the adverb *cică* (<[se zi]ce + că] ‘it is said that’, apheresized (from the 3rd person singular of the present indicative of *a zice*) and agglutinated with the complementizer *că* (see ex. (2) below) or the rephrasing structure *care va să zică* ‘in other words’, etc., towards the status of discursive marker.

- 6) Și totuși, nu au decît, ca să zic așa, replici pe care le-am mai auzit, știi ce zic? (www.) (ca să zic așa – a rephrase marker and știi ce zic – a phatic formula) ‘And still they only have, if I may say so, lines that I’ve already heard before, do you know what I mean?’
- 7) Adică știi tu, ăștia au vrut în Vamă, că cică e mega distracție și se lasă cu chef și multe drinkuri. (CoRoLa – with cică as a non-paraphrase rephrase marker with a polyphonic value). ‘I mean, you know, they wanted to go to Vama Veche, they say it’s so much fun there, and there will be parties and lots of drinks.’

Our approach is both descriptive and analytical and is based on a rich corpus (see the references), configured in two fundamental sequences. More precisely, besides the theoretical preamble (chapter 1) and a section devoted to final considerations (chapter 4), we shall first deal (chapter 2) with the etymology and the semantic-functional behaviour of each analysed word, in order to underline the lexical-semantic and syntactic differences and outline the discursive switch context (Heine 2002: 85) which favoured the pragmaticalization of the verb a zice in various variants. Secondly (chapter 3), we shall analyse the pragmatic uses of a zice in contemporary Romanian, which have not been extensively studied and systematized in scientific literature.

#### REFERENCES

- BARBU, I-X (2008a), Verbe dicendi moștenite din latină – comparație între română și principalele limbi romanice, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice*, 59, p. 307–318.
- BARBU, I-X (2008b), *Verbe dicendi în limba română: aspecte etimologice, semantice și sintactice*, Teză de doctorat nepublicată, Universitatea din București.
- CHAPPELL, H. (2017), From verb of saying to attitudinal discourse marker in Southern Min: (inter)subjectivity and grammaticalization, in C. Hubert, L. Ghesquière & D. Van Olmen (eds.), *Aspects of Grammaticalization: (Inter)Subjectification, Analogy and Unidirectionality* (Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs) Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, p. 139-165.
- GOLOPENȚIA, S. (1991), Verbs for locutionary acts in Romanian, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, XXXVI, 3-4, p. 119-140.
- HEINE, B. (2002) On the role of the context in grammaticalization. In I. Wischer & G. Diewald (ed.), *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*, Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, p. 83-101.
- POPA, I-C (2007) Les "verba dicendi" a spune et a zice, *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, LVIII, 2, p. 349-362.
- PRELIPCEAN A-V (2015), *Verba dicendi în limbile română și spaniolă: privire comparativă*. Teză de doctorat, Cluj-Napoca, Casa Cărții de Știință.
- RUIZ-GONZÁLEZ, N. (2021), Movement Verbs as Discourse Markers in Spanish: The Case of Vamos in the City of Granada, Spain, *Languages*, 6(4), 156, p. 1-24.

TRAUGOTT, E. C. (1995) Subjectification in grammaticalization. In D. Stein and S. Wright (eds.) *Subjectivity and Subjectivisation: Linguistic Perspectives. Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: CUP. 31-54.

TRAUGOTT, E.C. & Dasher, R.B. (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Archeus.ro = Resurse electronice pentru limba română.

<http://www.archeus.ro/lingvistica/CautareTextWikisource?query=MERSI&pageNo=1>

CLRVN = Hoarță Cărăușu, L. (coord.) (2013), *Corpus de limbă română vorbită actuală nedialectală*, Iași, Editura Universității A. I. Cuza.

CoRoLa = *Corpus computational de referință pentru limba română contemporană*, <https://corola.racai.ro/>

CORV = Dascălu Jinga, L. (2002), *Corpus de română vorbită. Eșantioane*, București, Oscar Print.

DA/DLR = Academia Română, (2010) *Dicționarul limbii române (DLR)*, ediție anastatică după *Dicționarul limbii române (DA) și Dicționarul limbii române (DLR)*, 19 vol., București, Editura Academiei Române.

IVRLA = Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L. (ed.) (2002), *Interacțiunea verbală în limba română actuală. Corpus (selectiv). Schiță de tipologie*, București, Editura Universității din București.



# Polifuncionalidad, (inter)subjetividad y gramaticalización del marcador discursivo *digo*

Ana María Ramos Sañudo  
Université Paris Nanterre

En la lengua española, el verbo decir presenta una gran productividad de cara a la creación de marcadores discursivos como consecuencia de procesos de gramaticalización –pragmaticalización, según la terminología utilizada por algunos autores– más o menos finalizados. Es el caso, por ejemplo, de *es decir* (Casado Velarde 1996); *no me digas* (Grande Alija 2012); *lo que yo te diga* (Brenes Peña 2017); *no digamos, no te digo nada, no te digo más* (Brenes Peña 2019); etc. Dentro de este grupo de unidades se encuentra *digo*, forma correspondiente a la primera persona del singular del presente de indicativo del verbo decir, que, más allá de sus usos oracionales, ha desarrollado una serie de usos extraoracionales como marcador discursivo funcionando dentro del nivel macroestructural, incidiendo en los planos enunciativo, informativo, modal y argumentativo.

En esta comunicación, nos proponemos contribuir a la descripción de la macrosintaxis del español mediante el estudio de los valores del marcador *digo* en distintos contextos de uso tanto orales como escritos. Para ello, tomaremos como referencia el modelo de Lingüística pragmática propuesto por Fuentes Rodríguez (2017 [2000]) y llevaremos a cabo un análisis cualitativo de ejemplos de uso reales de este marcador, extraídos de los corpus CREA, COSER, MEsA y PRESEEA.

Nuestro análisis dará cuenta de la polifuncionalidad que presenta en la actualidad el marcador *digo*, tal y como puede observarse en algunos trabajos que ya han tratado esta unidad (Böhm & Hennemann 2018, Fuentes Rodríguez 2009, Santos Río 2003). *Digo* cumple, pues, funciones discursivas muy diversas, tales como la reformulación correctiva, el refuerzo enunciativo-argumentativo o el apoyo enunciativo cuando se retoma algo dicho. Además, nuestro trabajo pondrá de relieve la existencia de otros valores que tienen que ver con la expresión de la confirmación interlocutiva.

Por último, nos apoyaremos principalmente en lo expuesto por Company Company (2004) con relación a la gramaticalización de verbos como marcadores discursivos con el objetivo de reflexionar acerca del proceso de fijación pragmática experimentado por la forma *digo* hasta convertirse en un marcador discursivo capaz de expresar diversos valores en el español actual. Contrariamente a lo

que cabría esperar, veremos cómo en la gramaticalización de digo interviene no solo la noción de subjetividad sino también la de intersubjetividad, pues además de transmitir una serie de instrucciones sobre cómo interpretar el discurso del locutor, cuando figura en contextos de interacción conversacional este marcador permite también expresar su actitud acerca del contenido enunciado por su interlocutor.

#### REFERENCES

- BÖHM, V. & Hennemann, A. (2018) La interacción entre la posición sintáctica y el significado procedimental en el uso de digo, *Boletín de Filología* Tomo LIII, Nº1, pp. 11-34.
- BRENES PEÑA, E. (2017): Lo que yo te diga: funciones discursivas y proceso de gramaticalización, *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación* 71, pp. 63-82
- BRENES PEÑA, E. (2019): De la micro a la macroestructura: una aproximación a las funciones discursivas y procesos de gramaticalización de las construcciones no digamos, no te digo nada y no te digo más, *Revista de Investigación Lingüística* 22, pp. 27-51.
- CASADO VELARDE, M, (1996) Notas sobre la historia de los marcadores textuales de explicación es decir y o sea. In M. Casado Velarde et al. (eds.) *Scripto Philologica in memoriam Manuel Taboada*, La Coruña, Universidade da Coruña, Vol. I, pp. 321-328.
- COMPANY COMPANY, C. (2004): ¿Gramaticalización o desgramaticalización? El reanálisis y subjetivización de verbos como marcadores discursivos en la historia del español, *Revista de Filología Española* 84, pp. 29-66.
- FUENTES RODRÍGUEZ, C. (2009) *Diccionario de Conectores y Operadores del Español*, Madrid, Arco / Libros.
- FUENTES RODRÍGUEZ, C. (2017 [2000]) *Lingüística pragmática y Análisis del Discurso*, Madrid, Arco Libros.
- GRANDE ALIJA, F.J. (2012) Modalidad apelativa y gramaticalización en el discurso: el caso de no me digas, *ELUA* 26, 163-210.
- SANTOS RÍO, L. (2003) *Diccionario de partículas*, Salamanca, Luso-Española de Ediciones.

# SAY and THINK and WANT: Grammaticalisation and pragmaticalisation thought on a cognitive path

Eva Maria Remberger

University of Vienna

In this paper, I would like to investigate two case studies where verbs change their original lexical meaning and develop into a discourse marker or an evidential modal. I first discuss the properties of some propositional attitude verbs such as THINK and BELIEVE, SAY and WANT (cf. Brasoveanu & Farkas 2007). I then will pay particular attention to two dimensions of pragmatics, at-issueness and eventiveness, as they were exemplified by Bary and Maier (2021) for saying reports.

In the first case study, I analyse the development of reportative – or quotative – discourse markers (cf. Willett 1988) like Spanish *dizque*, Sardinian *nachi*, Sicilian *dicica*, which, originally encoding the full verb SAY the complementizer, have undergone a process of univerbation to an evidential adverb (cf. e.g. Travis 2006, Company Company 2004 for Spanish).

In the second case study I apply their tests to the reportative modal WANT, which in German develops from a volitional modal verb + infinitival complement to a reportative modal (cf. e.g. Schenner 2007).

I will describe the main grammatical properties of volitional and reportative WANT-constructions in German, at the levels of both semantics and morphosyntax. Both, the discourse marker as well as the modal, nowadays clearly encode a not-at-issue and non-eventive reportative component. I claim that both developments, that of WANT and that of SAY, are multidimensional, requiring discussion on all grammatical levels, including pragmatics. I will propose a grammaticalisation as well as a pragmaticalisation path for both reportative WANT (+ INFINITIVE) as well as for SAY + THAT

For SAY + THAT the essential observation is that backgrounding to a not-at-issue level – as e.g. in a parenthetical position as an intermediate step – easily leads to the interpretation of the material investigated as a sentential modifier (cf. also Van Linden et al. 2021). The most important finding for WANT is that in WANT-constructions a doxastic conversational background (THINK) is present, connected to volitional modality (sitting in the appropriate functional category). This doxastic

conversational background then takes over and leads, in the final step, to a reportative evidential interpretation.

#### REFERENCES

- BARY, C. & Maier, E. (2021) The landscape of speech reporting. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 14 (8).
- BRASOVEANU, A & FARKAS, D. (2007) Say reports, assertion events and meaning dimensions. In G. Alboiu, A.A. Avram, L. Avram & D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Moș: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 175–196. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- COMPANY COMPANY, C. (2004) ¿Gramaticalización o desgramaticalización? reanálisis y subjetivización de verbos como marcadores discursivos en la historia del español, *Revista de Filología Española* 84/1, 29–66.
- SCHENNER, M. (2007) Double face evidentials in German: Reportative ‘sollen’ and ‘wollen’ in embedded contexts. Abstract.
- TRAVIS, C. (2006) Dizque. A Colombian evidential strategy. *Linguistics* 44/5, 126–1297.
- VAN LINDEN, A., BREMS, L., & VANDELANOTTE, L. (eds.). (2021). *Complement and parenthetical constructions: Theory and description*. Language Sciences).
- WILLETT, T. (1988) A crosslinguistic survey of the grammaticisation of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12 (1). 51–97.

## \*οἶδα in Greek as a “parenthetical” verb

Antonio R. Revuelta Puigdollers  
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

The purpose of this paper is to discuss several collocations of the verb οἶδα which appear classified in dictionaries (LSJ) as ‘parenthetical’. The work will take into account the following parameters among many others:

- A) The properties of the parenthetical clause:
- (a) If the verb operates on the main clause as a pure parenthetical verb with no connector (e.g. εἶ ἴσθι ‘know well’ > ‘be assured of this’) or it is headed by an introductory conjunction (e.g. ὥσπερ/ὡς οἶσθα ‘as you know’).
  - (b) Whether οἶδα refers to the second person or to the first or third persons.
  - (c) Whether the verb οἶδα is in indicative or imperative (the latter always parenthetical without connector).
  - (d) Whether the verb οἶδα exhibits or not any kind of complementation ((εἶ/σάφα) ἴσθι/ἴσθε (ὅτι)).
- B) The properties of the main clause:
- (a) The kind of speech act formulated by the main clause. In some cases the collocation ‘(εἶ/σάφα) ἴσθι/ἴσθε (ὅτι)’ is used with strong assertions or even oaths (see Sommerstein) whereby the speaker commits himself/herself to the truth of his/her statement (‘to promise that something is true’, 1) or to a certain course of action (‘to promise to do a thing’, 2):
    - 1) ΣΥ. Ἄρ’ οὐχ ὕβρις ταῦτ’ ἐστὶ πολλή; Σκώπττετον, / ὅ τι δὲ ποεῖτον ἐνθάδ’ οὐκ εἰρήκατον. / Οὐκ ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ γὰρ ἐνθάδ’ ἐστὸν οὐδενί. / ΚΑ. Μὰ τὸν Δί’ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ τῷ γε σῶ, σάφ’ ἴσθ’ ὅτι. / («INFORMER. The insolent wretches! But, my fine jokers, you have not told me what you are up to here. Nothing good, I’m sure of that. JUST MAN. Nothing of any good for you, be sure of that.», Ar. Pl. 886-889)
    - 2) ΚΙ. Καταγελαῖς μου, δηλὸς εἶ. / Ἄλλ’ οὐβ ἔγωγ’ οὐ πάσομαι, τοῦτ’ ἴσθ’ ὅτι, / πρὶν ἂν πτερωθεὶς διαδράμω τὸν ἀέρα. / («CINESIAS. You are making game of me, that’s clear; but know that I shall never leave you in peace if I do not have wings wherewith to traverse the air.», Ar. Av. 1407-1409)
  - (b) The position of the main clause in its interactive context. Many of the expressions under study appear in dialogical contexts where the speaker reacts to his audiences beliefs

explicitly formulated in the previous context or to the speaker's (correct or not) expectations about them (Dik's 'mutual knowledge' 1997: 10-11).

- 3) ΚΗ. Πῶς μοι παραινεῖς; Δεξιῶς μέντοι λέγεις. / Οὐ φῆς σὺ χρῆναί μ' οὔτ' ἀκούειν οὔθ' ὄραῖν; / ΕΥ. Χωρὶς γὰρ αὐτοῖν ἑκατέρου ἔστιν ἡ φύσις. / ΚΗ. Τοῦ μήτ' ἀκούειν μήθ' ὄραῖν; ΕΥ. Εὔ ἴσθ' ὅτι. / («MNESILOCHUS-. What is this wiseacre stuff you are telling me? [10] I must neither see nor hear? EURIPIDES-. Ah! but you have two things there that are essentially distinct. MNESILOCHUS-. Seeing and hearing? EURIPIDES-. Undoubtedly.»), Ar. Th. 9-12)

The different combinations of the above mentioned factors provide us with a typology of 'parenthetical' expressions of the verb οἶδα. The purpose of my paper is not only to formally classify these expressions, but to analyze how they operate regulating the interactions between the speaker and his/her interlocutors. These constructions, particularly those more 'pragmaticalized' will be analyzed as interactive discourse markers (Kroon 1995), pragmatic markers (Fedriani 2019) or metadiscursive markers (Traugott 2014). The Greek data will be compared with those of other languages, mainly Latin, English and Spanish.

The study is a corpus-based research. The data are mainly taken from a corpus with more than two million tokens made up by authors of the 5th and 4th centuries BC: Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Demosthenes, Euripides, Herodotus, Lysias, Plato, Sophocles, Thucydides and Xenophon. Additional information has been taken from other authors and periods (TLG) and from the data available in grammars (Kühner-Gerth 1898-1904, Rijksbaron 2002, Van Emde Boas 2019, Jiménez López 2020). The data of other languages than Greek have been mainly taken from Sketchengine and PHI.

#### REFERENCES

- FEDRIANI, C. (2019) The embodied basis of discourse and pragmatic markers in Greek and Latin. In Mocciano & Short.
- DIK, S. C., & HENGEVELD, K. (1997). *The theory of functional grammar. 1: The structure of the clause*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- BREMS, L., GHESQUIÈRE, L., & VAN DE VELDE, F. (2014) *Intersubjectivity and intersubjectification in grammar and discourse: theoretical and descriptive advances*.
- JIMÉNEZ LÓPEZ, M.D. (coord. ed.) (2020) *Sintaxis del griego antiguo*. 2 volumes. CSIC: Madrid.
- KROON, C. (1995) *Discourse Particles in Latin. A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at*, Amsterdam: Gieben.
- KÜHNER, R. & GERTH, B.1(1898-1904) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. II: Satzlehre*. 2 vols. Hannover: Hahn [repr. 2015 Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft].

- MOCCIARO, E., & SHORT, W. M. (2019). *Toward a Cognitive Classical Linguistics: The Embodied Basis of Constructions in Greek and Latin*.
- RIJKSBARON, A. (2002) *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction*, Amsterdam: Gieben (repr. 2006, University of Chicago Press).
- SOMMERSTEIN, A. H., BAYLISS, A. J., TORRANCE, I. C., & KOZAK, L. A. (2013) *Oath and state in ancient Greece*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- SOMMERSTEIN, A. H. (2010). *Horkos: The oath in Greek society*. Bristol: Phoenix Press.
- SOMMERSTEIN, A. H., TORRANCE, I., BAYLISS, A. J. (2014) *Oaths and swearing in Ancient Greece*. Netherlands: De Gruyter.
- TRAUGOTT, E. C. (2014). Intersubjectification and clause periphery. In L. Brems et alii (eds.) 7-28.
- VAN EMDE BOAS, E., RIJKSBARON, A., HUITINK, L. & DE BAKKER, M. (2019) *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: CUP.

# What you see is what you get: the pragmatic potential of intentional visual imperatives in Ancient Greek diachrony

Ezra La Roi  
Ghent University

It is well-known that the domains of perception (aural and visual) are both conceptually and diachronically connected to domains of knowledge. Similarly in Ancient Greek, verbs of visual perception changed into knowledge predicates e.g. γινώσκω ‘perceive’> ‘realize’> ‘think’ (la Roi 2020: 204–205 with references) and verbs of aural perception extended to the cognition domain such as πυνθάνομαι ‘(directly) perceive’> ‘learn’ (Luraghi & Sausa 2019). These patterns are attested cross-linguistically in non-Indo-European languages as well (Evans & Wilkins 2000) and can be viewed as semanticized inferences resulting from the embodied interpretation of perception (Luraghi & Sausa 2019). In other words, the perceptions of external events are internalized by the speaker, resulting in knowledge through embodied interpretation.

There are two important extension patterns of Ancient Greek perception verbs which have received less attention so far: (1) the pragmatic diversity of imperatives of visual perception (cf. Van Olmen 2010 for a contrastive cross-linguistic analysis of “look”) and (2) the complex imperative sentence structures where the imperative embeds the main command as a subordinate clause (e.g. see to it that not X, ὄρα μὴ+subjunctive). As for (1), recent research has focused on ἰδοῦ ‘look!’ and its pragmatic extensions to presentative marker in Classical and Post-Classical Greek (see Julia 2020 and la Roi 2022 with references). With respect to (2), work on Ancient Greek directives has not paid much attention to such complex imperatives (see Denizot 2011 for a recent overview).

Therefore, I assess both (1) the interactional functions of visual perception imperatives (i.e. ὄρα/ὄρατε, βλέπε/τε, σκόπει/σκοπεῖτε) from Archaic Greek (Homer), to Classical Greek (Euripides, Plato) and Post-Classical Greek (papyri, Menander, Septuagint, New Testament and Epictetus) and (2) detail how these complex imperative structures have originated and changed over time in both Classical and Post-Classical Greek. Embodied interpretation may have been instrumental for the usage extensions of these imperatives (cf. Fedriani 2019) in two directions: (1) visual perception imperatives are increasingly used to signal to the addressee that something ought to be known (cf. Van Olmen 2010) coordinating stance and knowledge intersubjectively, and (2) the complex



imperatives signal to the addressee to know and exercise control over what is ‘seen’ communicatively. What you *see* is what you *get*.

#### REFERENCES

- DENIZOT, C. (2011) *Donner des Ordres en Grec Ancien: Etude linguistique des formes de l’injonction*. Rouen: Presses universitaires de Rouen et du Havre.
- EVANS, N. & WILKINS, D. (2000) In the Mind’s Ear: The Semantic Extensions of Perception Verbs in Australian Languages. *Language* 76(3), 546-592.
- FEDRIANI, C. (2019) The embodied basis of discourse and pragmatic markers in Greek and Latin. *Toward a Cognitive Classical Linguistics*, 69–92. De Gruyter Open.
- JULIA, M. (2020) About Latin Ecce ‘Behold! Lo! See! There!’ and Some Ancient Languages Presentatives. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 8(1), 17-23.
- LURAGHI, S. & SAUSA, E. (2019) Aspects of aural perception in Homeric Greek. *Toward a Cognitive Classical Linguistics*, 149–175. De Gruyter Open.
- LA ROI, E. (2020) The Development of εὕρισκω ‘find’ as Evidence towards a Diachronic Solution of the Matching-Problem in Ancient Greek Complementation. *Philologia Classica* 15(2), 191–207.
- LA ROI, E. (2022) Weaving together the diverse threads of category change. Intersubjective ἀμέλει ‘of course’ and imperative particles in Ancient Greek. *Diachronica* 39 (2), 159-192.
- VAN OLMEN, D. (2010) The imperative of intentional visual perception as a pragmatic marker: A contrastive study of Dutch, English and Romance. *Languages in Contrast* 10(2), 223–244.

# A case study, so to speak – on some syntactic, functional, and phonetic properties of German *sozusagen*

Christiane Ruhrmann  
Universität Heidelberg

Fixed expressions like English *so to speak / so to say* (Claridge 2013), Spanish *por decirlo así* (Limerick 2020) or German *sozusagen* (Schmale 2021) have been identified as “pragmatic markers with a hedging function” (Claridge 2013, p. 161), discourse markers or “metapragmatic expression[s] with an attenuating function” (Limerick 2020, p. 71). In contrast to its English and Spanish counterparts, German *sozusagen*, however, is listed as an independent lexeme in German monolingual dictionaries like the *Duden Deutsches Universalwörterbuch* (Dudenredaktion 2019, p. 1668). Even though expressions that appear similar to *sozusagen* do exist in many languages, they have not typically undergone a process of univerbation, making the German *sozusagen* an interesting example for closer examination.

The talk is based on my master's thesis, in which I took a closer look at a sample of 500 instances of *sozusagen* taken from the Research and Teaching Corpus of Spoken German “FOLK” (Schmidt 2014). The investigated instances show considerable differences. In terms of syntactic scope, *sozusagen* has been found to refer to single words, phrases, or even whole propositions. With regard to the pragmatic functions of *sozusagen*, which were investigated by means of Conversation Analysis, it is noticeable that *sozusagen* is frequently used in order to adapt a formulation to a concrete interactive situation (in the sense of recipient design) or to coordinate the negotiation about an intersubjectively “adequate” label. Phonetic analysis revealed considerable variation in terms of the realization of *sozusagen* with pronunciation ranging from an expanded [zotsu'za:ɡŋ] to a reduced [zaŋ]. In addition, there seems to be an influence of idiosyncratic speaking styles and specific communicative situations such as exams or panel discussions.

By describing the syntactic, functional, and phonetic variability of *sozusagen*, the study presents an integrated perspective on different, but interrelated usage properties of a formerly complex construction that has undergone both lexicalization and pragmaticalization.

## REFERENCES

- CLARIDGE, C. (2013) The evolution of three pragmatic markers. As it were, so to speak/say and if you like. *JHP* 14 (2), pp. 161–184. DOI: 10.1075/jhp.14.2.01cla.
- DUDENREDAKTION (2019) *Duden - Deutsches Universalwörterbuch. Das umfassende Bedeutungswörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. 9th ed. Berlin: Bibliographisches Institut. Available online at <https://www.onleihe.de/goethe-institut/frontend/mediaInfo,51-0-1122073350-100-0-0-0-0-0-0.html>.
- LIMERICK, P. (2020) An Analysis of por decirlo así: A Discourse Marker of Attenuation. *Linguistics Journal* 14 (2), pp. 71–86.
- SCHMALE, G. (2021) Eine sogenannte carte blanche (sozusagen eine Freikarte zum Drucken). Formen und Funktionen von sogenannt und sozusagen in mündlichen Texten. In A.F. Macris-Ehrhard & G. Magnus (Eds.) *Text und Kommentieren im Deutschen*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag (Eurogermanistik, 40), pp. 69–90.
- SCHMIDT, T. (2014) The Research and Teaching Corpus of Spoken German — FOLK. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'14)*, pp. 383–387. Available online at [http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2014/pdf/290\\_Paper.pdf](http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2014/pdf/290_Paper.pdf).

## The speaker and her utterance: links between modality and propositional attitude verbs in a French-Italian contrastive perspective

Linda Sanvido

Université de Neuchâtel

Our research focuses on French verbs that traditionally belong to two disjoint semantic categories: verbs of thought or personal opinion (*verba putandi*) and verbs of speech or communication (*verba dicendi*). We postulate that these verbs have a certain number of common properties and for this reason they will be treated under the more general term of “propositional attitude verbs (PAV). More specifically, we study the constructions in which the speaker comments on her speech act through the use of a PAV in the first person singular: with the pronoun “I” she voluntarily highlights a mechanism that is at the very origin of her enunciation. But why does the speaker explicit a mental process before the information she wishes to communicate? What leads her to choose a predicate that will make her thinking explicit and not her saying, or vice versa? And why, in these very paradigms, does she choose to introduce the content of her enunciation with “Je pense que” (I think that) rather than “Je crois que” (I believe that) or “Je dis que” (I say that) rather than “J’affirme que” (I affirm that)? Despite the abundant studies on PAVs, this type of procedure has not yet been investigated.

The aim of our study is to verify to what extent these forms are linked to the argumentative dimension of the discourse. To do this, a qualitative analysis will be accompanied by a corpus-based approach. The latter will permit to highlight - thanks to statistical calculations - trends that would not be possible to be seen to the naked eye. The interest of such an approach is justified by the principle according to which “many uses of words and phrases show a tendency to occur in a certain semantic environment” (Sinclair 1991: 112). For this reason, we will focus on the combinatorial properties of the selected expressions by studying their lexical environment in written corpora of different genres (political discourse and press). We will extract the “co-occurents” (Blumenthal 2008), forms for which the encounter with the pivot (the PAV) is not random. The CA method - which describes statistical relationships between data through a graphical representation - will also be used to see if new trends emerge. CAs will offer a different view on the PAVs, permitting to analyze them in relation to the clusters of words in which they are grouped. The dialogue between different quantitative methods will thus make it possible to propose fine and complementary analyses. Moreover, in order to have a comparative view between related languages, these results will be put

in perspective with the corresponding forms in Italian. Thanks to this comparative approach, it will be possible not only to verify whether the two verb paradigms have the same properties, but also to highlight differences in modalisation, or even grammaticalization, of these forms in two Romance languages.

#### REFERENCES

- BALLY, C. (1942) Syntaxe de la modalité explicite. *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure*, 2, 3-13.
- BLANCHE BENVENISTE, C. (1989). Constructions verbales « en incise » et réaction faible des verbes. *Recherches sur le français parlé*, 9, 53-73.
- BLUMENTHAL, P. (2008). Combinatoire des prépositions : approche quantitative. *Langue française*, 157, 37-51.
- BORILLO, A. (1982). Deux aspects de la modalisation assertive : croire et savoir. *Langages*, 67, 33-53.
- GOSSELIN, L. (2010). *Les modalités en français. La validation des représentations*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.
- GOSSELIN, L. (2015). L'expression de l'opinion personnelle : « Je crois/pense/trouve/considère/estime que p ». *L'information grammaticale*, 144, 34-40.
- SCHNEIDER, S. (2007). *Reduced Parenthetical Clauses as Mitigators: a Corpus Study of Spoken French, Italian and Spanish*. Amsterdam : J. Benjamins.
- SINCLAIR, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, and collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TUCHAIS, S. (2012). Les verbes d'opinion et la variabilité des jugements : le cas de je considère que p et j'estime que p. *Bulletin d'études de linguistique française*, 46, 35-50.
- URMSON, J. O. (1952). Parenthetical verbs. *Mind*, 61(244), 480-496.

French *imaginer* and Spanish *imaginar*.  
Similarities and differences in their pragmatic development

Stefan Schneider  
Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz

The paper deals with French *imaginer* and Spanish *imaginar* and presents a comparative analysis of their pragmatic development. While the verbs display a parallel evolution from the 13th century onward, their recent development reveals some differences.

Both verbs are medieval borrowings from Latin *imaginari* and/or *imaginare* (FEW; DEAF; Corominas & Pascual 1980) and start to appear in the 13th century. Initially they remain semantically related to the corresponding nouns “image” and “imagen”. Their prevailing meaning is 'form a picture':

- 1) como si alguno imaginasse cuerpo de omne (Spanish, 1275, Alfonso X, General Estoria. Primera parte, CDH)
- 2) avoit cellui sur son heaume ymaginé le Dieu d'Amors (French, 1400, Anonymous, Ysaÿe le Triste, Frantext)

The picture can be mental, as in (1), or, more rarely, physical, as in (2). The physical sense eventually gets lost in the following centuries.

During the 14th century, both verbs start to appear with cognitive meanings that background or even delete the mental picture aspect. In practice, the described state of affairs does not necessarily invoke a mental picture. The cognitive meanings without picture aspect display considerable variation. We find, for instance, 'bear in mind', 'conclude', 'consider', 'devise', 'invent', 'know', 'machinate', 'plan', 'ponder', 'realize', 'reason', 'reflect', 'suppose' and 'understand'. None of these meanings predominates during the 14th century. The following examples show 'machinate' or 'plan' and 'conclude' or 'reason':

- 3) imaginar algunas cosas contra personas baxas (Spanish, 1350, Anonymous, Traducción de la Historia de Jerusalem abreviada de Jacobo de Vitriaco, CDH)
- 4) si pensa sus ung petit et ymagina que il ne sejourneroit pas là longuement (French, 1390, Jean Froissart, Chroniques. Troisième livre, Frantext)

After the 14th century, the 'suppose' meaning gradually begins to stand out from the cognitive meanings without picture aspect. In the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, the 'suppose' meaning is well established in both languages, although the 'form a mental picture' meaning continues to be fundamental. The conventionalization of the 'suppose' meaning favors the appearance of detached constructs, i.e., “parenthetical verbs” (Urmson 1952) or “deverbal discourse markers” (Schneider 2020a, 2020b). As discourse markers, the two verbs express subjectivity and reduced speaker commitment:

- 5) /Porque al fin con este enredo/gozar segura imagino/del amor de Bandalino./ (1594, Lope de Vega Carpio, El maestro de danzar, CDH)
- 6) Cela se fait, je m'imagine, si le mouvement que ces petits corps reçoivent rencontre dedans nous d'autres petits corps (French, 1655, Savinien Cyrano de Bergerac, Les Etats et empires de la lune, Frantext)

In these initial detached constructs, Spanish *imagino* occurs without pronouns, whereas French *imagine* is preceded by a subject pronoun and a reflexive pronoun.

In the late 18th century and in the 19th century, the first occurrences of the French deverbal discourse marker without reflexive pronoun can be found:

- 7) – pardon, mon lieutenant ; répondez-moi, je vous prie. Vous voulez, j'imagine, devenir capitaine. – oui – (French, 1824, Paul-Louis Courier, Pamphlets politiques, Frantext)

During the 20th century, the French deverbal discourse marker without reflexive supplants the one with reflexive (Schneider 2007). Interestingly, the recent development of Peninsular Spanish *imaginar* goes in the opposite direction. In the first half of the 20th century, the first cases of the Spanish deverbal discourse marker with reflexive pronoun appear:

- 8) Ya es tarde. Vamos a recogernos, me imagino, todos nosotros. (Spanish, 1926, Ramiro de Maeztu, Don Quijote, Don Juan y la Celestina. Ensayos en simpatía, CDH)

Nowadays, the deverbal discourse marker *me imagino* is about to supplant the one without reflexive (Schneider 2007).

## REFERENCES

- CDH = INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIÓN RAFAEL LAPESA DE LA REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA (ed.). *Corpus del Nuevo diccionario histórico del español*. <http://web.frl.es/CNDHE>.
- COROMINAS, J. & PASCUAL, J.A. (1980) *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano y hispánico*. Madrid: Gredos.
- DEAF = HEIDELBERGER AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN (ed.). *Dictionnaire étymologique de l'ancien français*. <http://www.deaf-page.de>.
- FEW = WALTHER VON WARTBURG ET AL. (eds.). *Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch: eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*. Bonn, Basel, Leipzig: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, Klopp, Teubner, Zbinden. 1928-2002.
- Frantext = LABORATOIRE ANALYSE ET TRAITEMENT INFORMATIQUE DE LA LANGUE FRANÇAISE (ATILF) (ed.). *Base textuelle Frantext*. <http://www.frantext.fr>.
- SCHNEIDER, S. (2007) *Reduced parenthetical clauses as mitigators. A corpus study of spoken French, Italian and Spanish*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- SCHNEIDER, S. (2020a) L'évolution des marqueurs déverbaux cognitifs de l'ancien français au français classique. In M. Saiz-Sánchez, A. Rodríguez Somolinos, S. Gómez-Jordana Ferary (eds.). *Marques d'oralité et représentation de l'oral en français*. Chambéry: Presses universitaires Savoie Mont Blanc, 335-355.
- SCHNEIDER, S. (2020b) « J'imagine » comme verbe et marqueur pragmatique : une analyse diachronique. In F. Neveu et al. (eds.). *7e Congrès mondial de linguistique française*, Université de Montpellier 3, France, 6-10 juillet 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20207803001>.
- URMSON, J.O. (1952) Parenthetical verbs. *Mind* 61, 480-496.



## Hedging strategies: on the pragmaticalization of Hebrew ‘say’ expressions

Hagit Shefer

Beit Berl Academic College

Some Hebrew ‘say’ expressions allow speakers to convey different degrees of confidence regarding various aspects of the speech event, ranging from full confidence in the truthfulness of the content to hesitation and reservation. Specifically, three infinitival ‘say’ expressions function as theticals (Heine et al. 2017, Kaltenböck 2011) or comment clauses (Brinton 2008, 2017), to express instructions to the hearer and as a result serve as a hedging device: *efshar lomar* (lit. it is possible to say ‘one might say’), *eix lomar* (lit. how to say ‘how shall I put it’) and *im lomar* (lit. if to say ‘to put it...’).

- 1) ha’eseq sheli avar tahapuxot nifla’ot, ve’efshar lomar, sheyatsati lederex xadasha.  
‘My business has undergone wonderful ups and downs and one might say that I have undertaken a new way.’
- 2) tguvotav hayu, eix lomar, lo mamash mesapkot.  
‘His responses were, how shall I put it, not really satisfactory.’
- 3) akavti bedaykanut axar hora’ot hashimush, ve’im lomar zot be’adinut, ze lo avad.  
‘I followed the instructions accurately, and to put it mildly, it didn’t work.’

In (1), the phrase signals to the hearers that the following proposition is a subjective opinion and should thus be considered with caution. In (2) the speaker seems to be searching for the right words in order to escape a ‘true’ description of the situation and to distance himself from potentially unpleasant statements which might offend the hearer. In (3), the phrase provides procedural emotional instructions by warning the hearer about the upcoming information, its implications and interpretation, thereby serving to defend the speaker’s position and limit his responsibility for the proposition. The phrase in (3) appears with a variety of adverbs, such as *im lomar et ha’emet* (lit. if to tell the truth ‘to tell the truth’). This variant serves to notify the hearer that the upcoming truthful description may not be appreciated, thereby providing instruction to adjust the interpretation. In *im lomar zot betsura bota* (lit. if to say bluntly ‘to say it bluntly’), the phrase functions both to warn the addressee but also to suggest that the speaker may in fact be exaggerating. It seems then that all three comment clauses serve a pragmatic function of an apologetic defense strategy by conveying hedging and reduced commitment to the message, all with an intersubjective orientation and out of a consideration of the addressee’s perspective.

The purpose of this paper is to account for the pragmaticalization process which these three hedging devices have undergone along the history of the Hebrew language. Despite the challenge of the discontinuity of Hebrew, evidence from online corpora from different periods indicates that the emergence of the pragmatic functions of these phrases is consistent with characteristic other pragmaticalization processes. Preliminary investigation suggests that the phrases have undergone pragmatic expansion in new contexts as particularly observed in the shift from texts of religion and authoritative ruling to secular, casual contexts. This shift resulted in a change from the deontic ‘what to say’ to the epistemic ‘how to say’.

Framed in tendencies of (inter)subjectivity (Traugott 2010, Narrog 2017), the analysis will follow the history of these phrases as they developed from a loose sequence integrated in the sentence grammar to independent clauses which carry intersubjective pragmatic functions of conveying speakers’ comment. The analysis will show that while retaining some of their original meanings (Hopper 1991), these comment clauses display features characteristics of pragmatic markers: they are interpreted in the interpersonal realm, they display syntactic and prosodic independence as well as internal restrictions and they express considerable procedural meaning which assists in the interpretation of the speakers’ message (Brinton 2017).

#### REFERENCES

- BRINTON, L. J. (2008) *The Comment Clause in English: Syntactic Origins and Pragmatic Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BRINTON, L.J. (2017) *The evolution of pragmatic markers in English. Pathways of change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HEINE, B., KALTENBÖCK, G., KUTEVA, T. & LONG, H. (2017) “Cooptation as a Discourse Strategy.” *Linguistics* 55(4): 813-855.
- HOPPER, P. (1991) On Some Principles of Grammaticalization. In E. C. Traugott and Bernard H. (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, Vol. 1, 17-35.
- KALTENBÖCK, G. HEINE, B. & KUTEVA, T. (2011) On Thetical Grammar. *Studies in Language* 35:4. 848–893.
- NARROG, H. 2017. Three Types of Subjectivity, Three Types of Intersubjectivity, Their Dynamicization and a Synthesis. In D. Van Olmen, H. Cuyckens and L. Ghesquière, (eds.) *Aspects of Grammaticalization*, Berlin/Boston: Mouton De Gruyter, 19-46.
- TRAUOGOTT, E.C. 2010. (Inter)subjectivity and (inter)subjectification: A reassessment. In K. Davidse, L. Vandelothe and H. Cuyckens, eds. *Subjectification, intersubjectification and grammaticalization*, (pp. 29-71). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

A contrastive analysis of pragmaticalized “speech verb + adverb” constructions in Japanese,  
Spanish and English from a pedagogical perspective

Tsutahara Ryo & Nomura May  
Kyushu University

This research is a contrastive study of pragmaticalized speech verbs in Japanese, English, and Spanish for foreign language education. As has been demonstrated in several studies, linguistic activities are highly dependent on a limited number of the most frequent words (Nation 2001 and Davies & Face 2006). Therefore, such words are highly polysemous and multifunctional. For this reason, the polysemy and multifunctionality of those words has been emphasized in recent foreign language education, and lexical studies on their actual usage and their teaching methods have been actively conducted. The phenomenon of pragmaticalization occurs in many of the most frequent words and it has been reported that mastery of such delexicalized usage improves fluency (Scheepers 2017). Therefore, for language teachers, it is important to deepen our knowledge of the pragmaticalization of the most frequent words and to contrast learners' native language with the target language. The author currently teaches Spanish at a Japanese university, and the students have an intermediate level of English. As English possesses many similarities to Spanish, it is used as a learning resource in the classroom. It is this context that provided the impetus for the contrastive analysis of the three languages in this research.

This study deals with discourse markers of the form “speech verb (言う (iu)/speak/hablar) + adverb” in the three languages (ie. はつきり言って/“generally speaking”/“estrictamente hablando”) that function as an adverb modifying the entire sentence. All languages have discourse markers of this construction but are all these constructions used as well? Or are there any differences or peculiarities among them? The goal of this study is to answer these questions and to provide basic knowledge for more accurate and efficient instruction of speech verbs.

The characteristics of each discourse marker are thought to appear in adverbs co-occurring with the speech verb. Therefore, using the TenTen corpora and their analytic function “Word Sketch”, I collected adverbs that co-occur with speech verbs with high frequency, as well as their co-occurrence frequency and logDice scores. By contrasting these data, I examined the characteristics of the “speech verb + adverb” constructions in each language. The results showed that in Japanese there are many more types of the structure than in English and Spanish, and

Spanish, in particular, has much less. In addition, some of the Japanese discourse markers showed high collocational strength that was not observed in English and Spanish. This suggests that it is important for native speakers of Japanese to keep in mind not to overuse this structure like they do when they speak in Japanese. In this presentation, I will also show that in each language there are some specific semantic types of adverbs that occur in this construction. For example, in Japanese, the adverbs that occur in this construction most frequently are those that denote clearness: はっきり, 率直に, 正直に ‘clearly’. On the other hand, these types of adverbs rarely co-occur with speech verbs in English and Spanish: ?speaking clearly/?hablando claramente. By presenting the semantic types of adverbs that frequently appear in the structure of each language, I would like to show that the construction is used in a different way in each language. I will also mention the Japanese speech verb’s high degree of delexicalization and suggest that this is the main reason of the high productivity of the Japanese speech verb construction.

#### REFERENCES

- DAVIES, M., & FACE, T. (2006). Vocabulary coverage in Spanish textbooks: how representative is it?. *Selected Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, 132–143.
- NATION, I. S. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- SCHEEPERS, R. (2017). South African students’ use of delexical multiword units: The trouble with high-frequency verbs. *African Journals Online*, 47, 89–114.

#### CORPUS

- Lexical Computing (s.f.). Sketch Engine. English Web 2020.
- Lexical Computing (s.f.). Sketch Engine. Japanese Web 2011.
- Lexical Computing (s.f.). Sketch Engine. Spanish Web 2018.

## Pragmaticalization and intersubjectivity with *verba dicendi* in diachrony: the cases of λέγω/εἶπον and φημί in a corpus of postclassical Greek dialogues.

Alfonso Vives Cuesta & Lucía Madrigal Acero  
Universidad de Valladolid

This study proposes a diachronic overview of two prototypical Greek *verba dicendi*, λέγω/εἶπον and φημί/ἔφην, in order to identify their main contexts of use and their evolution over time in a corpus of postclassical literary dialogues. As a distinctive feature in pragmatic terms, these verbs allow the speaker to present information through his or her (inter)subjectivity. In fact, verbs of speech are a common resource in processes of pragmaticalization, i.e. the development of lexical items into discursive or pragmatic marks (Company 2004; Diewald 2011). This paper intends to study some of the pragmatic functions fulfilled by these verbs and to propose a comparative analysis of their functional distribution.

For this purpose, we start from the evidence provided by the use of these verbs in four postclassical works of the "dialogic" genre, all of them of different types and concerned with different subjects, and also from different periods, which allows us to cover the wide chronological range of the so-called Byzantine millennium: Plutarch's *De Sollertia animalium* for Roman period; the anonymous *Dialogus Athanasii et Zacchaei adversus Iudaeos* (c. 380-420) for Late Antiquity; the *Lógos* of Soterichus Panteugenos (12th c.), an interesting rewriting in the style of a Platonic dialogue, and most recently *On Marriage* by Manuel II Palaiologos (15th c.). The choice of this corpus is due, among other things, to the marked dialogical character of these works in which the presence of an interlocutor is generally guaranteed. Considerable attention has been devoted in recent years to the study of dialogue in Ancient Greek texts. In the field of Linguistics, a growing research interest in pragmatics has yielded many significant contributions on discourse particles and other phenomena whose meaning and function can only be properly defined in the context of conversation, as it is reproduced in Ancient Greek literature—tragedy, comedy, philosophical dialogue and other text types. Conventionally, the Platonic dialogues have often been analyzed from a pragmatic, discursive and metadiscursive perspectives (Verano 2014; 2017), however, the diachronic development of these operators in terms of pragmaticalization in postclassical dialogic literature has not been explored in depth and its research possibilities are still far from exhausted.

For this reason, on the basis of these principles and using the methodological framework of historical Pragmatics (pragmaticalization) and Conversation Analysis applied to our corpus, we intend to account for two types of universal patterns that affect these processes of intersubjectivization inherent to *verba dicendi* as sources for pragmatic meaning:

(1) *Verba dicendi* as metadiscursive operators. In this topic, our main aim is to make a first attempt to analyze and/or classify the different ways of marking metadiscursive commentary, specifically from the (meta)linguistic domain of these verbs as parentheticals (Verano 2016; López Romero 2021). In particular, one of the aims is to test to what extent the opposition between first and second person is a relevant factor in the pragmaticalization of *verba dicendi* in diachronic terms.

(2) The study of the use of the imperative forms of λέγειν (λέγε and εἰπέ), already used as discourse markers since Classical Greek, and a contribution to the discussion on their values in discourse. In contrast to other approaches (López Romero 2020), we will focus on the role played by imperatives within turns of speech, in the manner of Rijksbaron (2018) and Zakowski (2014).

## References

- COMPANY COMPANY, C. (2004) ¿Gramaticalización o desgramaticalización?: el reanálisis y subjetivización de verbos como marcadores discursivos en la historia del español, *Revista de Filología Española*; Vol LXXXIV, No 1., 29-66.
- DIEWALD, G. (2011) Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discours functions, *Linguistics* 49-2, 365-90.
- LÓPEZ ROMERO, M. (2020) El parentético εἰπέ μοι en griego clásico. In L. Conti, R. Fornieles Sánchez, M.D. Jiménez López, L.M. Macía Aparicio & J. de la Villa Polo (eds.) *Δῶρα τά οἱ δίδομεν φιλέοντες. Homenaje al profesor Emilio Crespo*, Madrid: UAM..
- LÓPEZ ROMERO, M. (2021) Parentéticos en Sófocles: el caso de los verbos de lengua en imperativo, *Forum Classicorum: Actas del XV Congreso Internacional de Estudios Clásicos*, 347-354.
- RIJKSBARON, A. (2018) «Sur les emplois de λέγε et εἰπέ chez Platon», in Rijksbaron, A., Allan, R.J., van Emde Boas, E. & Huitink, L. (eds.) *Form and Function in Greek Grammar*, Amsterdam: Brill, 80-98.
- VERANO LIAÑO, R. (2014): «La hetero-reformalación en los diálogos platónicos». *Ardua cernebant iuuenes. Estudios Clásicos. Anejo 2*, 153-160.
- VERANO LIAÑO, R. (2016): «El comentario metadiscursivo en griego antiguo: aproximación desde la lengua de Platón», *Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* 46/1, 123-142.

- VERANO LIAÑO, R. (2017): «Linguistic Paraphrase and Platonic Dialogue: A First Approach», in P. Poccetti & F. Logozzo (eds.) *Ancient Greek Linguistics: New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, 475-487.
- ZAKOWSKI, S. (2014) εἰπέ μοι as a Parenthetical: A Structural and Functional Analysis, from Homer to Menander, *GRBS* 54, 157-191

## German formulas with *sagen* “say”

Arne Zeschel

Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim

The verb *sagen* “say” is the most frequent lexical verb in spoken German. As in other languages (cf. e.g. Lansari 2020), many of its occurrences are part of a broad variety of more or less formulaic expressions with special conversational properties. Some of these are widely recognised examples of discourse markers (e.g. *sagen wir* “let’s say”), others less so (e.g. *das musst DU gerade sagen* “you’re a fine one to talk”). In fact, relevant expressions vary considerably in terms of both lexicogrammatical fixedness (as indicated by e.g. word order variability, regular verbal tense/person/number inflection, susceptibility to modification etc.) and, once fixed, degree of phonetic reduction.

The paper introduces a project that takes stock of the full range of such (emerging) units in contemporary spoken German (as attested in the spoken reference corpus FOLK; cf. Schmidt 2014) and then takes a closer look at selected items that are located at different points of the cline from compositional syntagm to lexicalised particle (Zeschel, Brackhane & Knöbl 2019). Formulaicity is operationalised as the ratio of (maximally) fixed and structurally compacted realisations of a given candidate expression to the number of its total variants in the sample at large (usually the whole corpus of ~3m tokens). Fixed realisations of a given target structure are investigated further for phonetic reduction and prosodic specialisation effects that could be interpreted as indications of a possible “split” (Heine & Reh 1984) from their non-specialised source structures and evidence for their independent storage as separate constructions. Functionally, interactional analyses are carried out in order to uncover associations of the expressions under scrutiny with particular sequential contexts and specific interactional practices performed therein. Special attention is paid to manifestations of subjectivity and intersubjectivity in the development of conversational functions relating to e.g. stance marking, facework, the negotiation of epistemic authority and the management of common ground.

The talk gives an overview of the project and presents the main findings attained so far, with special attention to the overall map of “functional niches” that German formulas with *sagen* exhibit as exponents of (inter-)subjectivity.



## REFERENCES

- HEINE, B. & REH, M. (1984) *Grammatical Categories in African Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske.
- LANSARI, L. (2020) *A Contrastive View of Discourse Markers. Discourse Markers of Saying in English and French*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- SCHMIDT, T. (2014) The Research and Teaching Corpus of Spoken German – FOLK. In: *Proceedings of the Ninth conference on International Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'14)*. European Language Resources Association (ELRA), pp. 383-387.
- ZESCHEL, A., BRACKHANE, F. & KNÖBL, R. (2019) Reanalyse und phonetische Reduktion pragmatischer Marker mit sagen. In: L. Eichinger & A. Plewnia (eds.) *Neues vom heutigen Deutsch. Empirisch - methodisch - theoretisch. Jahrbuch des Instituts für Deutsche Sprache 2018*. Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter. pp. 81-98.