Research Article

Hella Olbertz*

American Spanish *dizque* from a Functional Discourse Grammar perspective

Abstract: This article discusses the diachronic development and the different uses of the reportative word *dizque* (diachronically based on *diz que* 'she/he/it says that') using data from Colombian and Mexican Spanish. The study presents a predominantly qualitative analysis of diachronic, twentieth- and twenty-first-century written data. The theoretical framework applied in this article is Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG), which is particularly useful in this context as it distinguishes between the interpersonal and representational functions of language. The main points made are: (i) *dizque* is an adverb that arose from a process of lexicalization rather than grammaticalization; (ii) in most of its uses, *dizque* has an interpersonal function in the sense that the Speaker instructs the Addressee that she/he is not the source of the information provided; (iii) by means of diachronic, dialectal, and typological data, it is shown that the scope of *dizque* is gradually decreasing; (iv) the only scope decrease that leads to a functional change of *dizque* is its application outside the context of speech-reports. FDG serves to account for each step in the scope decrease of *dizque* by means of its hierarchical approach to the actional and descriptive functions of verbal interaction.

Keywords: reportative, evidentiality, lexicalization, grammaticalization, scope decrease, adverb, particle, Columbian Spanish, Mexican Spanish, Functional Discourse Grammar

1 Introduction

The Spanish reportative word *dizque* has been discussed widely in the recent literature, which will be commented on in some detail in the course of this article. To begin with, consider the following two examples:

(1) −*Dizque la policía hace retenes y hacen bajar a todos*
     dizque the police do.3SG controls and do.3PL get.out DOM all
     del bus −me dice Gerardo en voz baja.
     from-the bus me.DAT say.3SG Gerardo in voice low
     '−Reportedly the police are doing controls and have everybody get out of the bus −Gerardo tells me in a low voice.' (Jorge Franco, *Paraíso Travel*, 2001, Colombia)

* **Corresponding author: Hella Olbertz,** Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication (ACLC), University of Amsterdam, Kloveniersburgwal 48, 1012 CX Amsterdam, The Netherlands, e-mail: H.G.Olbertz@uva.nl
ORCID: Hella Olbertz 0000-0002-9313-0714

(2) | A | Fabio | y | a | las | dos | chicas | les | alteró | la | vida |
     | DOM | Fabio | and | DOM | the | two | girls | them.DAT | changed.3SG | the | life |

el   _dizque_   fracaso;
the   dizque   failure

'The <u>supposed</u> failure changed Fabio's and the girls' lives'
(José Dimayuga, *¿Y qué fue de Bonita Malacón?* 2007, Mexico)

While in (1), *dizque* has a neutral reportative meaning and behaves syntactically as an adverb, the case is somewhat different in example (2), where *dizque*, although still reportative, implicates the inappropriateness of the predicate *fracaso*; moreover, it cannot be an adverb, because *fracaso* is a noun. These two examples form the extremes of the broad applicability of reportative *dizque*.

In the literature, only examples such as (1) are generally considered reportative, whereas it is generally believed that the use of *dizque* illustrated in (2) has no reportative function and serves the expression of negative truth commitment (e.g. Miglio 2010, De la Mora and Maldonado 2015). A complicating factor in this discussion is the fact that most approaches take the grammaticalization of *dizque* for granted (López Izquierdo 2006, Miglio 2010, Alcazar 2014, De la Mora and Maldonado 2015, among others).[1]

The aim of this article is to account for the different uses of *dizque* within Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG), showing that (i) reportative *dizque* is not a grammatical item in most of its uses, that (ii) there is no reason to assume loss of reportativity in cases such as (2), and that (iii) the only productive non-reportative use of *dizque* can be clearly identified as such.

Before going into more detail, it is necessary to give a concise overview of the theory that will serve as a descriptive tool in this article insofar as immediately relevant in the present context. FDG is a functional theory of language structure, which takes the Discourse Act as its basic entity; this means that linguistic action is considered as being primary as compared to the descriptive function of language. The Discourse Act contains a representation of Illocution, variables for Speaker and Addressee, and the Communicated Content, which again harbours the basic linguistic actions of Reference and Predication, identified as such by Searle (1969). These acts are labelled "Subacts of Reference and Ascription" (the latter term avoids confusion with "predication" in the context of linguistic description). Referential Subacts generally contain Ascriptive Subacts, which can be predicated on independently, as in *She is a good dentist*, where the Ascription *dentist* is at issue, rather than the Referent herself. The Discourse Act is central to what is called the Interpersonal Level of verbal interaction, whereas the descriptive function, with the Propositional Content as its basic category, corresponds to the Representational Level, which has the function of describing propositions or events. (The difference between events and propositions is that the former are observable but have no truth value and the latter are not observable but can be evaluated in terms of truth [Vendler 1967].) Together, the Interpersonal and the Representational Levels are responsible for the operation of "Formulation" within the theory of FDG, which is followed by "Encoding". The latter operation covers morphosyntax and phonology, with which we will not be concerned here as Encoding neither adds nor removes any pragmatic or semantic content. At the levels of Formulation, modifiers (lexical items) and operators (grammatical items) can be added to any category. Finally, it should be noted that the Grammatical Component (i.e. Formulation and Encoding) is conceived of as interacting with further components of a wider theory of interaction, most notably the Conceptual and Contextual Components. The latter contains the relevant situational information and stores all aspects of the linguistic context which are relevant for a given verbal interaction. The Conceptual Component, on the other hand, contains the Speaker's intention in uttering some Discourse Act or sequence of Discourse Acts; this entails that speaker intention does not form part of the grammar itself. For a somewhat more detailed overview of the theory, see Keizer et al. (2022) and Keizer and Olbertz (2018), and for a detailed description, see Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008).

---

1 The grammaticalization claim is explicitly put forward by Magaña (2005) for Mexican and Travis (2006, 1275–7) for Colombian *dizque*, and Sousa (2012) for Galician *disque*.

This article is structured as follows. Section 2 briefly deals with the historical development of *dizque* and clarifies why this development is a case of lexicalization rather than grammaticalization. Section 3 is dedicated to the description of the most frequent use of *dizque* in twenty-first-century data and discusses the direction of change in its use. In Section 4, I present some marked cases that are more difficult to account for, some of which turn out to be of a non-reportative nature. Section 5 ties up some loose ends, and Section 6 concludes the article.

The synchronic data are from Colombian and Mexican Spanish, in which the use of *dizque* is most frequent. The data used in this study consist of written texts from the online corpora made available by the Spanish Royal Academy (*Real Academia Española*): the twenty-first-century data are all from CORPES XXI, unless indicated otherwise; older data are taken from CREA (1975–2000) and CORDE (ca. 1200–1974).[2]

2 The diachronic development of *dizque*

In this section, I will first describe the development of the word *dizque* from the oldest available sources until the sixteenth century in Peninsular Spanish (2.1) and then deal with the question whether this development is a process of grammaticalization or one of lexicalization (2.2).

2.1 Peninsular Spanish

The word *dizque* originates from the third person singular present indicative form *dize* '[he/she/it] says' followed by the complementizer *que*. The apocopated form *diz* occurs from the earliest texts onwards. The evidence comes from medieval juridical texts from the period between 1200 and 1400 in the diachronic CORDE corpus, which contains 530 occurrences of *diz* against 2,359 of *dize* (cf. also Eberenz 2004, 142–4). Before going into more details, note that the apocopy in the case of *dize* does not occur in isolation; rather, the elimination of final /e/ seems to have been quite fashionable in medieval times. In fact, the very same set of medieval juridical texts from 1200 to 1400 contains several other forms in which final /e/ is omitted: (i) *noche* 'night' (669 tokens) is reduced to *noch* in 169 cases, (ii) *por ende* 'therefore' (1,587 tokens) occurs without the final /e/ in 86 cases, and (iii) the relative pronoun *donde* 'where' (413 tokens) occurs as *dond* in 31 cases. Torreblanca and Blake (2002) provide a detailed study of apocopated verb forms. Taking this into account, the apocopy of *dize* is less noteworthy than claimed in certain accounts (e.g. Magaña 2005), particularly given the high frequency of this verb.

However, with respect to the combination of *diz* with the complementizer, it is remarkable that the frequency relation between the variants is different: there are 470 cases of *dize que*, against 277 of *diz que*, which constitute more than a third of the total. In the juridical texts, both *dize que* and *diz que* are used with human referents and also to refer to the contents of laws and similar, as illustrated in (3) and (4), respectively:

(3) *e*   *la*   *otra ley*   *en*   *que*   <u>*dize*</u>   <u>*que*</u>   *fasta dos annos sea*
     and   the   other law   in   which   say.3SG   that   until two years COP.SUBJ.3SG
     omme   *tenido*   *de*   *prouar la*   *paga*   *que*   *fiziere*
     man   held.PTCP   to   prove the   payment   which   do.FUT.SUBJ.3SG
     'and the other law in which <u>it says that</u> for the duration of two years a man is held to prove whatever payment he effectuates' (Anonymous notarial document, 1396)

---

(4)
E		la	otra	ley	en	que	<u>diz</u>	<u>que</u>	todo	ome	es	tenudo
and		the	other	law	in	which	say.3SG	that	every	man	COP.3SG	held.PTCP
de	provar	la	paga		que	fiziere		fasta	dos	años		
to	prove	the	payment		which	do.FUT.SUBJ.3SG		until	two	years		

'And the other law in which <u>it says that</u> every man is held to prove the payment he effectuates for the duration of two years'
(Anonymous notarial document, 1301)

In both cases, there is no personal subject, a situation which Miglio (2010, 14) considers a step towards the development of modern *dizque*, although it is not clear which of the two forms is preferred in these contexts.

It is only in *diz que* that the apocopated form survives in post-medieval Spanish, whereas final /e/ is restored in all other cases mentioned. This indicates that *diz que* has come to form a petrified unit, as can be seen in the following example, quoted from Eberenz (2004, 149):

(5)
et	otros	omes	que	y	estavan	presentes	dezían
and	other	men	who	there	were.IMPF.3PL	present	said.3PL
que	era	tierra	de	Pero	Rrodríguez	Borni,	de
that	COP.IMPF.3SG	ground	of	Pero	Rrodríguez	Borni	from
Ávila,	la_qual	dicha	tierra	<u>diz</u>	<u>que</u>	tenía	senbrada
Avila	which	said.PTCP	ground	say.3SG	that	had	sown.PTCP
el	dicho	Loys	Gonçález				
the	said.PTCP	Loys	Gonçález				

'and other men who were present said that it was the ground of Pero Rrodíguez Borni from Avila, on which aforementioned ground of the aforementioned Loys Gonçález <u>reportedly</u> had sown.'
(Anonymous notarial document, 1415)

The most probable interpretation of *diz que* in this context is not that of a finite verb followed by a complementizer because *diz* fails to agree in tense and number with the preceding verb *dezían* "they said."

The following example is similar to modern usage, not only with regard to the orthography of *dizque* as a fused form, but also due to its low pragmatic prominence (Olbertz 2007, 154), as it appears in a relative clause which forms a third level embedding in relation to the main clause:

(6)
Pues	como	ellos	viniesen	cansados	una	mañana	de	acompañar
DMRK	as	they	came.SUBJ.3PL	tired	one	morning	from	accompany
a	su	amo	toda	la	noche,	muy	airados	de no sé
DOM	their	master	all	the	night	very	annoyed	of not know.1SG
qué	cuestiones	que	<u>dizque</u>	habían	habido,			
what	problems	which	dizque	AUX.PST.3PL	had.PTCP			

'So when they arrived one morning tired from having been with their master all night, very annoyed about I don't know which troubles they <u>apparently</u> had had,'
(Fernando de Rojas, *La Celestina*, ca. 1499-1502)

Although in this clause *dizque* follows the relative pronoun, its scope is the same as in (5), i.e. the entire clause. This scope relation is less clear in the following case, where the adverb precedes a noun phrase:

(7) [*Envía el capitán susodicho a un grande y señalado tirano* […] *con cierta gente de españoles*]
para	que	castigase	<u>dizque</u>	los	indios	alzados	que
so	that	punish.PST.SBJ.3SG	dizque	the	Indians	rebellious	who
huían	de	tan	grande	pestilencia		y	carnicería
fled.3PL	from	so	big	infectious.disease		and	men.slaughter

'[The captain mentioned earlier sends a nobleman and notorious tyrant [...] together with certain Spanish men]
   a. in order to punish <u>as he puts it</u> the rebellious Indians who were fleeing from such infectious diseases and massive death'
   b. in order to punish the <u>what he calls</u> rebellious Indians who were fleeing from such infectious diseases and massive death'
(Bartolomé de las Casas, *Brevísima relación de la destrucción de las Indias*, 1552)

Both are possible interpretations, although, given the context, (7b) may be a bit more probable; there is no way, however, to be sure, because in sixteenth-century Spanish, *dizque* does not yet occur inside the noun phrase. Irrespective of how one interprets *dizque* in (7), this case exemplifies a general characteristic of the use of *dizque*, i.e. that it tends to go hand in hand with the speaker's dissociating himself or herself from the reported content.

2.2 Grammaticalization or lexicalization?

How should this process be accounted for? The answer from almost all recent studies on this phenomenon is that *dizque* undergoes a process of grammaticalization. Those who argue explicitly in favour of this analysis mention (a) univerbation, which implies the loss of verbal properties of *diz*, (b) semantic change, (c) the loss of the possibility of being negated, and (d) the possibility of being preceded by *que* (as in example (6) above) (e.g. Magaña 2005, 64–6). Considering *dizque* the result of a grammaticalization process is based on the idea that univerbation is necessarily related to grammaticalization, which is, however, a misunderstanding: univerbation is in fact a necessary feature of lexicalization, which consists in the fusion of two or more words, or, as Lehmann (2002, 13) puts it: "Only complex units can be lexicalized". As regards the relation between grammaticalization and lexicalization, Lehmann (2002, 15) explains that the two processes have certain properties in common, as "[b]oth lexicalization and grammaticalization are reductive processes which constrain the freedom of the speaker in selecting and combining the constituents of a complex expression".

If we consider *dizque* to be the result of lexicalization, the four morphosyntactic and semantic properties mentioned above are a consequence of the petrification of two frequently co-occurring words, *diz* and *que*, to form the new word *dizque* (property a). Being a new word, *diz* has undergone a change of word class, i.e. the new word is an adverb, which again entails semantic change (property b). This semantic change is such that negation is indeed excluded (property c), a point to which I will return in Section 4.3. Finally, being an adverb, *dizque* is syntagmatically flexible, i.e. it can occupy various slots in the clause, among which that at the beginning of relative or complement clauses, and as a consequence, it may be immediately preceded by complementizers or relative pronouns, both realized in Spanish as *que* (property d).

There are two additional properties of *dizque* that favour the lexicalization hypothesis. First, being an adverb, the meaning of *dizque* can be expressed by alternative adverbial expressions such as *según dicen* 'as people say' or *supuestamente* 'supposedly' or any other contextually appropriate alternative, and its use is certainly not obligatory, rather, it is a free choice item; in Lehmann's terms, its "paradigmatic variability", i.e. "the freedom with which the language user chooses a sign" (Lehmann 2015, 146), in other words, the ease with which an item can be substituted by another item or just be left out, is not affected as would have been expected in the case of grammaticalization (Lehmann 2015, 147–52). Second, as briefly mentioned above, *dizque* is not bound to a specific slot in the clause or sentence; had this been the case, that could have warranted the claim of grammaticalization. Rather, in Lehmann's terms, *dizque* has not lost its "syntagmatic variability", i.e. "the ease with which it can be shifted around in its context" (Lehmann 2015, 167), a fact that will be the central issue of Section 3.1.

Therefore, I consider *dizque* an adverb, more specifically a reportative adverb in most of its uses. Reportativity is the indication that "the Speaker is relaying the view of others" (Hengeveld and Mackenzie

2008, 103), which may involve second-hand information, hearsay, or folklore (Willet 1988, 57). By marking information for reportativity, the Speaker indicates to the Addressee that she or he is not to be held responsible for the relayed content, which means that reportative marking may serve as a hedge.[3] This is why *dizque* will be treated as a modifier at the Interpersonal Level.

3 American Spanish *dizque* as an interpersonal modifier

In the beginning of the seventeenth century, *dizque* disappears from Peninsular written sources, but apparently continues to be used in popular speech until the nineteenth century (Kany 1944, 168). From the available written primary sources, it is obvious that *dizque* survives in colonial and post-colonial Spanish America. In addition to *dizque*, there are a couple of innovative variants (Kany 1944, 169–71): *quizque* (and sometimes *izque*), for instance, is attested in recent Colombian data, and *quesque* occurs with some frequency in Mexican Spanish, also in written data. However, as De la Mora and Maldonado (2015, 177) convincingly argue, Mexican *quesque* and *dizque* are not entirely equivalent in all contexts. As something similar may hold for the Colombian variants, I will concentrate on the word *dizque* in this article.

This section first describes the most important variation in the use of *dizque* in these two varieties of American Spanish (Section 3.1). This will be followed by a comparison of the Colombian and Mexican language data, both synchronically and diachronically and also in comparison with similar expressions in other Romance languages (Section 3.2).

3.1 Colombian and Mexican Spanish *dizque*

In modern usage, *dizque* scopes over the entities which it immediately precedes. This section describes the variation in scope of *dizque* as an interpersonal modifier. The presentation of the data will proceed from the highest towards the lowest layer of modification. Consider the following example:

(8) *Dizque*   *se*   *llevó*   *sin*   *permiso*   *el*   *Fiat* *y*
     dizque   REFL.3   took.3SG   without   permission   the   Fiat and
     amaneció   *bailando*   *en*   *Piriápolis.*
     passed.the.dawn.3SG   dancing   in   Piriápolis
     '<u>Reportedly</u>, he took the Fiat without permission and at dawn he was dancing in Piriápolis.'
     (Miguel Méndez Camacho, *Malena*, 2003, Colombia).

In (8), the reportative adverb *dizque* modifies the entire Communicated Content. However, this does not always imply that it occurs in clause initial position:

(9) [*Antes de que ella pudiera abrir la boca para decir algo, él ya estaba gritando su no, no y no.*]
     Ella   *dizque*   *se*   *pasó*   *a*   *dormir*   *a*   *otro*   *cuarto* [...]
     she   dizque   REFL.3   moved.3SG   to   sleep   to   other   room
     ['Before she could open her mouth to say something, he was already shouting his no, no and no.]
     <u>Reportedly</u>, she moved to sleep in another room [...]'
     (Jorge Franco, *Paraíso Travel*, 2001, Colombia)

---

3 Although the same holds for English reportative adverbs (Kemp and Hengeveld 2022) and adjectives, García Velasco (2022) proposes to deal with the adjective *alleged* in cases as *an alleged murderer* as a propositional modifier, arguing that *alleged* indicates that the proposition containing the property *murderer* may be true or false. See also VandelaNotte (2006, 368), who observes that *alleged* contains a verdical component, which *so-called* lacks.

The occurrence of *dizque* in second position here is due to the topicality of the personal pronoun *ella* in (9) (cf. e.g. Cruschina and Remberger 2008, 111; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2022, 9).

In the following example, *dizque* takes a Communicated Content in its scope that modifies another Communicated Content:

(10) *Mostraron   la   fosa   donde   lo   habían   encontrado,   pero,*
      showed.3PL   the   ditch   where   him   AUX.PST.IMPF.3PL found   but
      dizque   por   respeto,   no   mostraron   el   cadáver.
      dizque   for   respect   not   showed.3PL   the   body
      'They showed the ditch where they had found him, but, reportedly/allegedly out of respect, they
      didn't show the body.'
      (Jorge Franco, *El cielo a tiros*, 2019, Colombia)

In this example, *dizque* modifies *por respeto*, which, again, modifies the Communicated Content *no mostraron el cadáver*. That *por respeto* is indeed a Communicated Content on its own is indicated by means of the commas separating this phrase from the remainder.

It should be noted that (10), more clearly than (8) and (9), implicates a negative Speaker attitude with regard to the content modified by means of *dizque*. The same holds in (11), where the reportative adverb modifies a noun phrase, i.e. a Referential Subact, which is a relatively infrequent phenomenon (cf. Section 3.2, Table 1).

(11) [*Era don Chepe un erudito en historias de viejas revoluciones y a veces conversaba sobre la Comuna de
      París, el Octubre soviético, la Gran Marcha china, tal vez por estas inclinaciones fue como en un tiempo
      le allanaron la casa,*]
      venían   soldados   a   requisar,   a   buscar   dizque   un   arsenal
      came.3PL   soldiers   to   search   to   look.for   dizque   a   arsenal
      [*y sólo hallaban al sonriente don Chepe y sus libros de ediciones Progreso, revistas Pekín Informa,
      bueno, todo más bien inofensivo,*]
      '[Don Chepe was knowledgeable about foregone revolutions and sometimes he spoke about the Paris
      Comune, about the Soviet October Revolution, the Chinese Long March, and perhaps it was due to
      these leanings that at a certain moment his house was raided,] and soldiers entered in search of what
      they called an arsenal, [and they only found a similing don Chepe and his books published by
      Progreso and issues of the Peking Review, well, all kinds of rather inoffensive stuff,]'
      (Reinaldo Spitaletta, "Las lides de don Chepe", 2011, Colombia)

The scope of *dizque* is further reduced, when *dizque* modifies nominal or adjectival predicates that occur within a noun phrase, which occurs more frequently in Mexican than in Colombian Spanish (Table 1). In (12), *dizque* modifies an attributive adjective, *estable*, i.e. the expression of a modifier of the Ascriptive Subact restricting a Referential Subact (coded as *parejas estables*):

(12) [about homosexual relationships]
      Existen   algunos   casos   casi   exóticos   de   parejas   dizque   estables,
      exist.3PL   some   cases   almost   exotic   of   couples   dizque   stable
      [*pero son matrimonios que tarde o temprano acaban porque siempre hay alguien encargado de meterse
      en la relación.*]
      'There are some almost exotic cases of supposedy stable couples [but those are marriages that sooner
      or later end, because there is always someone who takes care of intruding into the relationship.]'
      (Alonso Sánchez Baute, *Al diablo la maldita primavera*, 2004, Colombia)

In (13a), *dizque* modifies the only Ascriptive Subact heading the Referential Subact, realized as a noun in the plural, *adelantos* 'advances':

(13) a. *pero*   *todos*   *estos*   <u>*dizque*</u>   *adelantos*   *nomás*   *nos*
       but   all.M.PL   this.M.PL   dizque   advance(M).PL   no.more   us.DAT
      han   *servido*   *para*   *maldita*   *la*   *cosa.*
      AUX.3PL   served.PTCP   for   damn   the   thing
      'but all those <u>so-called</u> advances haven't helped us a goddamn bit.'
      (Jorge Kuri, *Delirio en claroscuro. Dos obras de teatro*, 2004, Mexico)

As *dizque* immediately precedes the noun *adelantos* in this example, it is used here as if it were an adjective, which it is not because it cannot be inflected. (13b) is evidence of the fact that true adjectives agree in gender and number with the nominal head:

(13) b. *todos*   *estos*   <u>*supuestos*</u>   *adelantos*
      all.M.PL   this.M.PL   so-called.M.PL   advance(M).PL
      'all those <u>so-called</u> advances'

From a syntactic point of view, having an adverb fulfil an adjectival function is quite a strange situation. A possible explanation of this situation will be dealt with in the next section.

3.2 The gradual scope decrease of *dizque*

In this section, I will argue, on the basis of contrastive and diachronic data, that the application of the modifier *dizque* has generalized from Communicated Contents (C) to modifying Communicated Contents (mod C) and Referential Subacts (R) and only later to Ascriptive Subacts (T). This means that, unlike what would be expected in grammaticalization (Hengeveld 2017), the scope of *dizque* tends to decrease rather than increase.

As I mentioned earlier in passing, there is a difference between Colombian and Mexican Spanish with respect to the applicability of *dizque* to nominal, adjectival, and verbal predicates; this relation is specified in Table 1. In this table, each of these uses is related to a particular interpersonal category, where *mod* should be read as "modifying element of", and the label "main clause" includes all finite clauses with the exception of adverbials.

Table 1: Scope variation of *dizque* in twenty-first-century texts[a]

	Colombia		Mexico	
Main clause (C)	196	50.8%	68	31.5%
Adverbial clause or phrase (mod C)	127	32.9%	44	20.4%
Noun phrase (R)	14	3.6%	1	0.5%
Attributive adjective (mod T)	11	2.9%	32	14.8%
Nominal predicate (T)	7	1.8%	45	20.8%
Other	31	8.0%	26	12.0%
Totals	386	100%	216	100%

[a]The category "other" is heterogeneous. The contents of this category will be dealt with in Section 4.

As this table shows, the use of *dizque* with nominal predicates is much more advanced in Mexican Spanish than in Colombian Spanish; the same holds, to a somewhat lesser degree, for attributive adjectives. This difference becomes clearer when we consider this in terms of FDG: in Mexican Spanish, there is a strong tendency towards applying *dizque* to Ascriptive Subacts (T), whereas the modification of Communicated Contents (C) by means of *dizque* is considerably less frequent than in Colombian Spanish.

That this really is a matter of development becomes more obvious when we consider diachronic data.[4] Table 2 compares written texts from Colombian Spanish from CORPES XXI (2001–2019) with Colombian data from CORDE (1896–1956).[5]

Table 2: Scope variation of *dizque*: Colombian diachronic data

	1896–1956		2001–2019	
Main clause (C)	150	95%	196	50.8%
Adverbial clause or phrase (mod C)	7	4.4%	127	32.9%
Noun phrase (R)	1	0.6%	14	3.6%
Attributive adjective (mod T)	0	0%	11	2.9%
Nominal predicate (T)	0	0%	7	1.8%
Other	0	0%	31	8.0%
Totals	158	100%	386	100%

Whereas in the older texts, *dizque* was almost exclusively used as a modifier of Communicative Contents (C), in the present-day texts it has extended towards the modification of modifiers of Communicative Contents (mod C); it has also come to modify of Referential (R) and Ascriptive Subacts, i.e. (T) or (mod T), albeit to a much lesser extent.

Interestingly, it turns out that none of the cognates of *dizque* in present-day Brazilian Portuguese (*diz que*, cf. Casseb-Galvão 2011) and Galician (*disque*, cf. Sousa 2012) modifies Ascriptive Subacts (cf. also Sanromán Vilas 2020). Similar reportative markers in other Romance languages are constrained in the same way (cf. Cruschina and Remberger 2008 on, among others, Sardinian *nachi* and Sicilian *dicica*, Dumitrescu 2012 on Romanian *cică*, and González Vázquez 2021 on the – etymologically deviant – Galician marker *seica*). This means that, with respect to scope decrease, Spanish *dizque* is more advanced than its Romance cognates.

In sum, it has become clear how the application of *dizque* to Ascriptive Subacts must have come about. This implies for FDG that the development of modifiers is not necessary on a par with the development of grammatical items, such as aspectual and modal operators,[6] which increase their functional scope in the process. Although lexicalization may advance in the same direction, as shown by Fontes (2016, 206–28) for Brazilian Portuguese *ainda bem* 'just as well', the case of *dizque* shows that a development of lexicalized items in the opposite direction is also possible.[7]

4 Intricacies in the use of *dizque*

This section is dedicated to some uses of *dizque* that are more difficult to account for. I will first deal with *dizque* with first-person primary arguments, which occurs in both the Colombian and the Mexican varieties (4.1). I will then discuss some properties of *dizque* that are specific to the individual varieties (most of which

---

4 There is no significant variation between twenty-first-century Mexican data with those from 1976–2000, the period corresponding to the CREA corpus, and there are too few data available (36 tokens) from the period between 1800 and 1975. This is why I refrain from considering Mexican diachronic data.

5 I had to leave out the period between 1975 and 2000 to avoid skewing, as there are only three Colombian texts available in the CREA corpus. The publication year of the last written source in the diachronic corpus is 1956 (CORDE).

6 Cf. e.g. Hengeveld (2011) on aspect and tense, Tena Dávalos (2017) on aspect in Spanish, and Olbertz and Honselaar (2017) on modality in Dutch.

7 In a similar vein, Van de Velde (2009) shows how in the course of the development from Proto-Indo-European to present-day Dutch, a large variety of formerly external modifiers were successively integrated in the noun phrase.

correspond to the category "other" in Table 1) starting with Mexican Spanish (4.2) and then dealing with the Colombian variety (4.3).

4.1 First person contexts

Consider the following examples, in which *dizque* is used with a first-person referent:

(14) [*Mis sobrinos me dicen tío en público, pero sé que entre ellos se ríen de mí y me dicen "la tía Toña",*]

porque	<u>*dizque*</u>	*soy*	*amanerado,*	*aunque*	*no*	*me*	*doy*	*cuenta.*
because	dizque	COP.1SG	effeminate	although	not	me.DAT	give.1SG	account

'[My nephews and nieces call me uncle in public, but I know that among themselves they laugh about me and call me "auntie Toña"] because <u>supposedly</u> I am effeminate, though I'm unaware of it.'
(Héctor Abad Faciolince, *La Oculta*, 2014, Colombia)

(15) [Trial against some officials and police officers for stabbing Arnulfo Arroyo to death after he had allegedly attacked president Porfirio Díaz. The witness Cándido Cuellar is speaking: "I bought the knives, because my boss had told me so."]

Nomás	*que*	*no*	*me*	*vengan*	*a*	*decir*	*'ora*	*que*	<u>*dizque*</u>
just	that	not	me.DAT	come.SUBJ.3PL	to	say	now	that	dizque
yo	*se*	*los*	*di*	*a*		*los*	*gendarmes.*	*No*	*'s*	*cierto.*
I	them.DAT	them.ACC	gave.1SG	DOM		the	policemen	not	COP.3SG	true
Se	*los*	*di*	*al*	*inspector*	*Villavicencio*	*y*	*él*	*fue*
him.DAT	them.ACC	gave.1SG	DOM.the	inspector	Villavicencio	and	he	was
el_que	*los*	*repartió.*
who	them.ACC	distributed

'I just won't let them say now that it was <u>supposedy</u> me who gave them to the policemen. That's not true. I gave them to inspector Villavicencio, and he was the one who distributed them.'
(Álvaro Uribe, *Expediente del atentado*, 2007, Mexico)

(16)

¿Y	*yo?*	*Yo*	*en*	*Roma*	<u>*dizque*</u>	*estudiando*	*cine*	*pero*	*en*
and	I	I	in	Rome	dizque	studying	film	but	in
realidad	*comprando*	*bellecitas*	*con*	*soldi*	*spiccioli*	*en*		*el*	*Coliseo*	*de_noche.*
reality	buying	beauty.DIM.PL	with	soldi	spiccioli	in		the	Colloseum	by.night

'And me? I'm in Rome <u>supposedly</u> studying film but in fact buying little beauties with *soldi spiccioli* [small change] at the Colosseum in the evenings.'
(Fernando Vallejo, *¡Llegaron!*, 2015, Colombia)

In examples (14) and (15), the source of the reported Communicated Content is external to the first-person narrator, with the difference that *dizque* is used redundantly in (15) as it occurs in a speech act complement. In (14), there is no implicature with respect to the evaluation by the Speaker of the Communicated Content, and in (15), there is no implicature either; rather, the truth of the possible claim is explicitly rejected. In (16), however, the case is different since the first-person narrator himself is the source of the reportative. More concretely, he is commenting on his own behaviour, thus implicating that the proposition presented within the Communicated Content is a lie. The disparity of these examples indicates that the use of first-person subjects with *dizque* is not necessarily related to an implicature of doubt as several authors claim (e.g. Travis 2006, 1290; Demonte and Fernández-Soriano 2013, 218; De la Mora and Maldonado 2015, 171). Such a relation exclusively exists when the first person is the source of the report and the context is such that he/she describes his/her actions.

Despite the fact that there is no systematic relation between first-person reference and the use of *dizque*, the examples in (14)–(16) have something else in common, which is unrelated to first-person reference: in each case, *dizque* modifies a full Communicated Content. Therefore, I take this opportunity to provide a general FDG representation that holds for these cases, i.e. the combination of first-person reference with *dizque* as a modifier of the Communicated Content:

(17) $(A_i: [(F_i: ILL (F_i)) (P_i)_S (P_j)_A (C_i: [(T_i) (+id R_i: [+S, -A] (R_1))] (C_i): dizque_{Adv} (C_i))] (A_i))$

This representation should be read as follows: (A) corresponds to the Discourse Act. As the elements of the Discourse Act form a non-hierarchical, i.e. equipollent, configuration, they are enclosed between square brackets. (F) represents some illocution, which would be declarative in the cases of *dizque* we have seen so far. The two variables (P) represent the participants of the interaction, whose functions are indicated by means of the subscripts "S" for Speaker and "A" for Addressee. The Communicated Content (C) contains the Subacts of Ascription (T) and Reference (R), which, again, form an equipollent configuration. The latter contains the operator + *id* indicating identifiability, and the content of the Reference variable is the feature [+S, −A] indicating first-person reference. In order to avoid massive sequences of closing brackets, each entity (also called "layer") contains a closing variable. The first closing variable of (C_i) is followed by a colon, which introduces the modifier; in this case *dizque*, the subscript *Adv* indicates that it is an adverbial modifier.

4.2 Properties of *dizque* specific to Mexican Spanish

In this section, I come back to the Mexican bundle of "others" mentioned in Table 1. More specifically, there are a number of non-reportative tokens in the Mexican sample, which will be discussed here, and their semantics will be contrasted with the reportative usage of *dizque*.

Example (18) is a further case in which the Speaker is the source of *dizque*. Nevertheless, this case is entirely different from those presented in the previous section, in the sense that there is no Communicated Content involved.

(18)   [*Mira lo que me robé. ¡La cartera!*]

Cuando	*lo*	*subieron*	*a*	*la*	*ambulancia*	*yo*	<u>*dizque*</u>	*ayudé*	*y*	*que*
when	him	lifted.3PL	to	the	ambulance	I	dizque	helped.1SG	and	that

me	*la*	*robo.*
me.DAT	it	steal.1SG

'[Look, what I pinched. His purse!] When they lifted him into the ambulance I <u>did as if</u> I helped, and I got it.'

(José Juan Aboytia, *Contiene escenas de ficción explícita*, 2006, México)

This case crucially differs from those we have seen so far, in that *dizque* is not related to communication but just means 'pretend' or, in adverbial terms, 'seemingly', i.e. it is used beyond its originally reportative meaning. As is to be expected, this use of *dizque* is not restricted to first-person subjects, as the following examples illustrate.

(19)

Acuérdate	*de*	*cuando*	*Ana,*	*mi*	*prima,*	*te*	*dio*	*un*	*bolsazo*
remember.IMP.REFL.2SG	of	when	Ana	my	cousin	you.DAT	gave.3SG	a	bag.hit

porque,	<u>*dizque*</u>	*ayudándola*	*a*	*cruzar*	*la*		*calle,*	*la*	*tomaste*	*hasta*
because	dizque	helping.her	to	cross	the		street	her	took.2SG	up.to

arriba	*del*	*brazo*	*para*	*irle*	*manoseando*	*su*	*pecho*	*izquierdo*
above	of.the	arm	to	go.her	touching	her	breast	left

'Remember how Ana, my cousin, hit you with her bag because, while <u>pretending</u>
that you helped her cross the road, you took her by her upper arm so that you
could touch her left breast.'
(Rafael Tovar y de Teresa, *Paraíso es tu memoria*, 2009, Mexico)

(20) [*Bueno, mire, usted debe saber que hay mucho laboratorio clandestino perfectamente disfrazado en
donde se procesa la coca. Lugares en la serranía, completamente ocultos; o bien, en aparentes ranchos*]

en	*donde*	*usted*	*ve*	*a*	*la*	*gente*	*campirana...,*		*dizque*
in	where	you.POL	see.2SG.POL	DOM	the	people	rural		dizque

dando	*de*	*comer*	*a*	*los*	*puercos*	*o*	*dizque*	*llevando*	*un*	*arado,*
giving	to	eat	to	the	pigs	or	dizque	carrying	a	plough

'[Well, look, you need to know that there are many secret perfectly disguised laboratories,
where coca is being processed. Places in the mountains, completely hidden; or rather, in
apparent farms'] where you see farmworkers..., <u>pretending</u> to be feeding pigs or <u>pretending</u> to
be ploughing the land,'
(Rafael Hernández Rodríguez, *La muerte de un cardenal*, 2001, México)

Since (19) and (20) do not involve speech reports, *dizque* has no longer an interactional function but is
used in the description of events. In these cases, *dizque* serves as what could be called a 'pretence marker',
indicating that the event described serves an unexpected purpose. Therefore, in FDG, the use of *dizque* in
these three examples should be accounted for as a modifier of an event (aka "state-of-affairs"):

(21) $(e_1: [(f_1)...] (e_1): (f_2: dizque_{Adv} (f_2)) (e_1))$

The system of this structure at the Representational Level is the same as in the Interpersonal Level
representation in (17) above. As the content of the event is different in each case, the event variable (e_1) is
given just a numeral subscript instead of an identifying letter. The same holds for the other variables. In this
case, *dizque* is marked as descriptive lexical predicate represented by means of the variable (f).[8] This
formula should be read as "any state-of-affairs such that it is modified by means of the pretence marker
dizque".

De la Mora and Maldonado (2015, 176) claim that "[i]n current Mexican Spanish the pure [*sic*] evidential
reportative is practically lost", but that this is being recovered by the innovative complex marker *que
dizque*. Indeed, *que dizque* does occur in my corpus, of which the following example is representative:

(22) [from a popularizing description of mangrove shrub]

Al	*botoncillo*	*le*	*dicen*	*"falso"*	*que*	*dizque*	*porque*	*no*	*se*
to-the	buttonwood	it.DAT	say.3PL	false	que	dizque	because	not	REFL.3

parece	*a*	*los*	*mangles,*	*pero*	*eso*	*ya*	*es*	*bronca*	*de*	*los*
resemble.3SG	to	the	mangroves	but	this	already	COP.3SG	problem	of	the

biólogos.
biologists

'Buttonwood is called "false" <u>supposedy</u> because it is not like true mangroves, but this is just a
problem for biologists.'
(Josefa M.C Gómez Lara and Roberto Flores Rodríguez, *El fascinante mundo del manglar*, 2003,
Mexico)

---

8 The representation of the pretence marker at the layer of the state-of-affairs has been chosen because pretending is related to
events that can be located in time, rather than to truth-commitment, i.e. to the layer of the proposition. On the other hand,
pretence cannot be freely located in time but implies dependent time reference, mostly simultaneity with the immediate context.
I am grateful to Lachlan Mackenzie for drawing my attention to the eventive nature of this marker.

However, my sample only contains five such cases, excluding those in which *que* is a complementizer or a relative pronoun.[9]

Despite De la Mora and Maldonado's (2015) claim concerning the gradual loss of the reportative meaning of *dizque*, there are quite a number of cases that presuppose a verbal act by some source, be it external or internal to the speaker. Consider the following two examples:

(23) [*el cabrón le había inventado que trabajaba de velador en Villa, para poder seguir en su desmadre con los rucos panzones de siempre:*]

los	*choferes*	*y*		*los*	*operadores*	*y*		*los*		<u>*dizque*</u>	*ingenieros*
the	drivers	and		the	technicans	and		the		dizque	engineers
esos	*que*	*ni*		*la*	*prepa*		*habían*	*terminado* [...]			
those	who	not.even		the	pre-university		AUX.PST.3PL	finished			

'[the bastard had told her that he worked as a guard by night in Villa, so that he could continue his abuse with the same useless fat guys as always:] drivers, technicans and the <u>supposed</u> engineers of the sort that had not even finished the pre-university course [...]'
(Fernanda Melchor, *Temporada de huracanes*, 2017, Mexico)

(24)
La	*matrona*	*no*	*abrió*	*hasta_que*	*impuso*	*el*	*precio*	<u>*dizque*</u>
the	madam	not	opened.3SG	until	imposed.3SG	the	price	dizque
exorbitante:	*¡un*	*peso*	*con*	*cincuenta*	*centavos!,*	*que*	*en*	
excesssive	one	peso	with	fifty	cents	which	in	
comparación	*con*	*los*	*precios*	*de Oaxaca...*	*risible*	*baratura.*		
comparison	with	the	prices	of Oaxaca	laughable	cheapness		

'The brothel-keeper didn't open until she had imposed the <u>reportedly</u> excessive price: one peso and fifty centavos!... which in comparison to the prices in Oaxaca is ridiculously cheap...'
(Daniel Sada, *Casi nunca*, 2008, Mexico)

In (23) *dizque* precedes a bare noun and in (24) an attributive adjective, which according to De la Mora and Maldonado (2015, 175) corresponds to what they call the "disqualifying function" of *dizque*, and for Martínez Levy (2019, 167–9) such expressions have an 'ironic meaning'.[10] However, in both cases, *dizque* reflects a claim that has been made explicitly by someone in (23): either the individuals in question themselves or the referent of *el cabrón* (an individual named Luismi); in (24), the attribution of *exorbitante* was probably made by the men who asked for the prices of the brothel.

In the following example, *dizque* precedes an adverbial purpose clause, which, as such, also belongs to the expressions of the "disqualifying function" identified by De la Mora and Maldonado (2015, 173).

(25) [*El general Juan Morales huyó en un bote acompañado del mayor de la guardia nacional, y*]

abandonó	*Veracruz*	*a*	*su*	*suerte,*	<u>*dizque*</u>	*para*	*no*	*firmar*	*la*
left.3SG	Veracruz	to	its	fate	dizque	to	not	sign	the
capitulación	*y*	*saludar*	*la*	*Bandera*	*norteamericana,*	*cuando*	*en*		
capitulation	and	greet	the	flag	North-American	when	in		
realidad,	*dicen,*	*estaba*	*cagado*	*del*	*miedo.*				
reality	say.3PL	was.3SG	shit.PTCP	from.the	fear				

'[General Juan Morales fled in a boat accompanied by the major of the national guard, and] left Veracruz to its fate, <u>allegedly</u> in order to avoid signing the capitulation and greeting the North-

---

9 In two out of the three cases quoted by De la Mora and Maldonado (2015, 176) *que* is a complementizer.
10 A notable exception is Grajales (2017, 217), who emphasizes the reportative function of *dizque* with bare nouns. Similarly, Travis (2006, 1289) does not exclude a 'hearsay' value for such cases.

American flag, while in fact, they say, they just scared the shit out of him.'
(Ignacio Solares, *La invasión*, 2005, Mexico)

If the meaning of *dizque* really were "disqualifying", then the contrastive clause starting with *cuando en realidad* 'while in fact' would make no sense, because *dizque* itself would already express falsity. Rather, what is marked linguistically in these examples is just reportativity, nothing more. 'Disqualification' and 'pretence' are conversational implicatures, inviting the Addressee to infer that either the Ascription is inappropriate, as in (23) and (24), or that the propositional contents evoked by the modifier of the Communicated Content is false, as in (25).

It is probable that the frequent use of *dizque* with a relatively low scope, i.e. as a modifier of Ascriptive Subacts and as a modifier of Communicative Contents, in Mexican Spanish has led to a reinterpretation of the conversational implicature of 'pretending' or 'deceit' as part of its meaning, which, again, will have led to the use of *dizque* outside reportative contexts, where it expresses these very lexical meanings: pretence and deceit (cf. also Travis 2006, Olbertz 2007, Sanromán Vilas 2020).

4.3 Properties of *dizque* specific to Colombian Spanish

This section is dedicated to two kinds of deviant uses of *dizque*: (i) the occurrence of *dizque* in negated rhetorical questions and (ii) the use of *dizque* in a non-reportative mirative function. Both form the Colombian group of "others" in Table 1.

4.3.1 Rhetorical questions

In the discussion of the supposed grammaticalization of *dizque* in Section 2.2, I confirmed that *dizque* can indeed not be negated. However, rather than being evidence of grammaticalization, the incompatibility of *dizque* with negation is a property which it shares with other adverbs which are generally not considered to be grammaticalized.

(26) a. <u>*Dizque*</u>   *no*   *come*   *carne.*
dizque   not   eat.3SG   meat
'<u>Reportedly</u> he doesn't eat meat.'
(Jorge Franco, *Paraíso Travel*, 2001, Colombia)

b. **No*   <u>*dizque*</u>   /   <u>*supuestamente*</u>   *come*   *carne.*
not   dizque   supposedy   eat.3SG   meat
'Not <u>reportedly</u> / <u>supposedly</u> he eats meat.'

c. **No*   <u>*dizque*</u>   /   <u>*supuestamente*</u>   *no*   *come*   *carne.*
not   dizque   supposedly   not   eat.3SG   meat
'Not <u>reportedly</u> / <u>supposedly</u> he doesn't eat meat.'

In addition to the fact that the impossibility of negation is not specific to *dizque* but a property of interpersonal adverbs in general, this property is not language specific either because the English translations in the variants (26b) and (26c) are also deviant.[11]

Given this property of *dizque*, it seems strange that in the Colombian sample there are cases in which it is in fact preceded by a negation, as in (27) below.

---

11 Moreover, the negation of modal adverbs (at the Representational Level) is impossible as well; only derivational negation is (marginally) acceptable (Olbertz and Dall'Aglio Hattnher 2018, 135–7).

(27)   [*¡Qué horrorosa es la pobreza! ¿Por qué habrá hecho Dios a los pobres?*]

    ¿No   <u>*dizque*</u>   *es*   *tan*   *bueno?*

    not   dizque   COP.3SG   so   good

    [*Eh ave María, si a esa cosa llaman "bueno", ¡cómo será Satanás!*]

    '[How horrible is poverty! Why has God made the poor?] Isn't he <u>supposed</u> to be so good? [Oh dear, if this is what they call "good," how will the Devil be?]'

    (Fernando Vallejo, *¡Llegaron!* 2015, Colombia)

The negation of the adverb *dizque* is possible here because (27) is a rhetorical question. Rhetorical questions are interactionally equivalent to declaratives with the opposite polarity value (Sadock 1971). The specific effect of rhetorical questions in verbal interaction is that they "convey a message that would not be as memorable and persuasive had it been expressed as a straightforward statement" (Špago 2016, 103).

(28) is a simplified representation of (27) and other rhetorical questions with *dizque*:

(28) $(A_1: [(F_1: inter (F_1)) (P_1)_S (P_1)_A (C_1 [...] (C_1): no\ dizque\ (C_1))] (A_1))$

In this representation, it is the combination with the interrogative illocution that warrants the negation of *dizque*.

My Colombian sample contains 29 cases of *dizque* in negative rhetorical questions. Whereas in (27), the source of the report is not specified, as in most reportatives, most of those that occur in rhetorical questions behave somewhat differently, evidence of which are the following two examples.

(29)   [*La maleta se abrió y muchos fajos de billetes quedaron desparramados en el piso. Twiggy se incorporó un poco para verlos, luego miró asustada al muchacho.*]

    ¿No   <u>*dizque*</u>   *eran*   *papeles?,*   *le*   *preguntó*   *él.*

    not   dizque   COP.PST.3PL   papers   3SG.DAT   asked.3SG   he

    Pues   *eso*   *me*   *dijo*   *el*   *Mono,*   *le*   *respondió*   *ella,* [...]

    DMRK   that   me.DAT   said.3SG   the   ape   3SG.DAT   answered.3SG   she

    '[The suitcase fell open and many bundles of banknotes spread all over the floor. Twiggy streched a little so that she could see them, and then looked terrified at the boy.] Weren't these <u>supposed</u> to be papers?, he asked her. Yes, this is what the Ape told me, she answered, [...].'

    (Jorge Franco, *El mundo para afuera*, 2014, Colombia)

Whereas in (29), the addressee, Twiggy, is the most probable source of the information, in (30), the interlocutor is the only possible source:

(30)   [*¿Qué haces tú con ese asesino de Don Corcho?*]

    ¿No   <u>*dizque*</u>   *no*   *querías*   *volver*   *a*   *trabajar*   *para*   *él?*

    not   dizque   not   wanted.2SG   return   to   work   for   him

    '[What are you doing with that assassin of a Don Corcho?] Weren't you supposed not to work for him again?' (Patricia Lara, *Amor enemigo*, 2005, Colombia)

In this example, as in quite a few of the remaining rhetorical questions in my sample, *dizque* could also be interpreted as a speech act verb equivalent to *dijiste* 'you said'. In that case, the translation of the rhetorical question in (30) would read: 'Didn't you say that wouldn't work for him again?'

In sum, in rhetorical questions, which also occur with Galician *disque* (Sanromán Vilas 2020, 22), *dizque* is closer to its verbal source than in other contexts (cf. Travis 2006, 1281). The fact that the adverb does not occur in such contexts in Mexican Spanish confirms the relatively conservative use of *dizque* in Colombian Spanish, mentioned in Section 3.2.

4.3.2 Mirative

There are two clear cases in my Colombian sample which cannot be accounted for in terms of either reportativity or pretence.[12] Example (31) has been quoted by Travis (2006, 1292), who attributes "mirative overtones" to this case:

(31) [the speaker is an immigrant, who has to accept a cleaning job in order to survive]
[*yo, que incluso algunas veces limpié la taza que otro había chapoteado para que quien usara el baño*
después de mí no fuera a pensar que el descarado había sido yo;]

yo,	*por*	*Dios,*	*dizque*	*a*	*limpiar*	*baños.*
I	by	god	dizque	to	clean	toilets

['me, who even sometimes wiped the bowl that someone else had splattered so that whoever used the toilet after me wouldn't think that the shameless one had been me;] I, for god's sake, am <u>supposed to</u> clean toilets.'
(Jorge Franco, *Paraíso Travel*, 2001, Colombia)

Sanromán Vilas (2020, 19) quotes, among others, the following example from Dominican Spanish:

(32) [A waitress about being offered a bottle of whisky as a compensation for additional work instead of being paid]

¡Dizque	*una*	*botella*	*de*	*Whisky!*	*Yo*	*no*	*puedo*	*beber*	*cosas*	*finas;*
dizque	a	bottle	of	whisky	I	not	can.1SG	drink	things	fine

me	*dan*	*dolores*	*de*	*cabeza.*
me.DAT	give.3PL	pains	of	head

'A bottle of whisky <u>of all things</u>! I can't drink such fine things, they give me a headache.'
(Iván García Guerra, *Memorias de abril*, 2002, Dominican Republic)

Like in (31), in this example, all other interpretations of *dizque* are blocked by the context; therefore, mirativity is the only possible reading. Mirativity is to be defined as the systematic expression of unexpected, surprising, or at least newsworthy Communicative Contents (Hengeveld and Olbertz 2018, 325; Fang 2021, 28–32). Again, there seems to be no exclusively mirative use in Mexican Spanish, which is being confirmed by De la Mora and Maldonado, who found no case of "mirative proper" (2015, 175). However, as regards Columbian Spanish, there are too few examples to draw any real conclusions with respect to this subject.

5 Discussion

I have shown that *dizque* is an interpersonal adverb in most of its uses. In its most conservative use, it modifies a Communicated Content, but it gradually narrows its scope over time, and at its most advanced stage, it even comes to operate at the Representational Level. Schematically, and in a somewhat simplified way, this development is represented in (33).

(33) IL   RL
$(C_1) > (C_1: \text{mod } (C_1)) > (R_1) > (T_1) >$ (e_1)

---

12 Somewhat more impressionistically, Miglio (2010, 19–20) considers *dizque* a mirative expression in instances that describe unexpected facts or events, while a reportative interpretation is warranted as well.

As regards the FDG account of *dizque*, there are still four issues pending. First, which instruments does FDG offer in order to distinguish *dizque* from a grammatical formative (5.1)? Secondly, how to account for the morphosyntactic problem of the application of *dizque* to Ascriptions realized by nominal predicates (5.2)? Thirdly, in which way can we account for the fact that *dizque* applies to modifying Communicated Contents and to modifying Ascriptive Subacts that correspond to attributive adjectives (5.3)? Finally, how to relate the different frames[13] to the lexical fund in FDG (5.4)?

5.1 Distinguishing lexical items from grammatical formatives

In FDG literature, it has been claimed that grammatical formatives can be identified by their lack of modifiability (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008, 59). In their discussion of the lexicon, the authors are more specific: "Only those elements that are susceptible to modification can be fully lexical. This clearly applies to full verbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs." (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2016, 1157).

I believe to have made clear that *dizque* is a lexical item. However, it shares with other so-called "sentence adverbs" not only the impossibility of negation (cf. example (26) in Section 4.3), but also the property of not allowing for modification, which again is not specific to *dizque* but also applies to clearly lexical adverbs such as *supuestamente* 'supposedly'. For evidence, I reuse example (26a) here, renumbered as (34a) for convenience. As both adverbs are of an interpersonal nature, only interpersonal modifiers, based on Keizer (2018a, 75), have been tested.

(34) a. *Dizque* / *Supuestamente* *no* *come* *carne*.
      dizque   supposedly   not   eat.3SG   meat
      '<u>Reportedly</u> / <u>Supposedly</u> he doesn't eat meat.'
   b. *bastante / *muy / *simplemente *dizque* *no* *come* *carne*
      quite   very   just   dizque   not eat.3SG meat
   c. *bastante / *muy / *simplemente *supuestamente* *no* *come* *carne*
      quite   very   just   supposedly   not eat.3SG meat

This means that, although as a general rule, the claim that modifiability serves as a criterion for the identification of lexical items may hold, it is certainly not watertight, particularly not for interpersonal adverbs.[14] Rather, I believe that in cases of doubt purely morphosyntactic criteria, such as the ones discussed in Section 2.2 (based on Lehmann 2015, among others), are a reliable alternative.

5.2 *Dizque* with nominal predicates

As mentioned earlier, there is a morphosyntactic problem when *dizque* modifies the head of a Referential Subact, i.e. the Ascriptive Subact, because such Ascriptive Subacts are by default realized as nominals. As *dizque* does not have adjectival properties (cf. Section 3.1), and in this case, cannot be an adverb either, it must be a particle in this context. As opposed to adverbs, particles belong to a (relatively) closed class, and therefore are, in a way, closer to grammatical formatives than to lexical items. But, on the other hand, they do allow for focalization, as illustrated in this example, quoted from Olbertz (2007, 168):

---

13 Frames are language-specific primitives that define the possible combinations in which a given item can occur at the Interpersonal and Representational Levels (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008, 19).

14 Keizer (2018a, 75–6) draws attention to the fact that interpersonal adverbs behave differently from representational adverbs in that the former tend to be "pragmaticized, bleached elements". From this, it follows that their modifiability is restricted.

(35) [*–La pieza debe quedar vacía y con candado–*]

Mandonea	*fanfarrón*	*el*		*dizque*	*actuario,*	*ahuecando*	*la*	*voz*
command.3sg	ostentatious	the		dizque	clerk	deepening	the	voice
para	*que*	*suene*	*solemne.*					
so	that	sound.subj.3sg	solemn					
–Esta	*señora*	*tiene_que*	*salirse,*	*remacha*	*el*	*también*	*dizque*	*escribano*
this	lady	has.to.3sg	leave.refl3	finish.3sg	the	also	dizque	scribe

[*levantando momentáneamente los ojos del librote donde ha estado garabatee y garabatee.*]

'[–The room must be evacuated and locked–] the <u>so-called</u> clerk of the court bossed around loudmouthed.

–This lady must leave, the <u>also so-called</u> notary finishes off [looking up for a moment from the big book in which he has been scrawling all the time.]'

(Jenny E. Hayen, *Por la calle de los anhelos*, 1993, Mexico)

In this example, *también* 'also' focalizes *dizque*, which means that even if it is grammaticalized to a certain extent, it is certainly not a true grammatical formative. Because, in general, grammatical formatives cannot be focalized, I consider it an intermediate case.[15] A possible solution offered by FDG is to account for *dizque* as a lexical operator (Keizer 2007), which would correspond to the following representation, in which *dizque* takes the position of an operator of the Ascriptive Subact within the Referential Subact, but at the same time retains lexical properties:

(36) $(R_1: (dizque\ T_1)\ (R_1))$

5.3 *Dizque* scoping over modifying elements

There are two cases in which *dizque* has scope over modifying items at the Interpersonal Level: (i) within Referential Subacts, it scopes over the modifying ascriptions (encoded as attributive adjectives and similar), and (ii) as regards Communicated Contents, it scopes over modifying Communicated Contents (encoded as adverbial phrases or clauses). For ease of exposition, I will begin with the former.

Examples of the use of *dizque* in modifying ascriptions embedded in Referential Subacts have been quoted in (12) and (24). A further example is the following:

(37)

a	*Galindo,*	*mi*	*supuesto*	*analista,*	*se*	*le*	*ocurre*	*convocar*
DOM	Galindo	my	so-called	analyst	REFL.3	him.DAT	occur	call.on
gente	*para*	*organizar*	*un*	*movimiento*	*dizque*	*de*	*concienciación*	*nacional,*
people	to	organize	a	movement	dizque	of	awareness	national

'Galindo, my so-called analyst, comes up with the idea to call on people to organize a movement <u>allegedly</u> of national awareness,'

(Helena Araújo, *Las cuitas de Carlota*, 2003, Colombia)

Example (37) differs from slightly those quoted in (12) and (24) in that the modifying Subact is not realized as an adjective but as the prepositional phrase *de concienciación nacional*. As regards the Interpersonal function, there is no difference. The appropriate way of representing such cases consists of having the reportative modifier apply to the second Ascriptive Subact embedded within the Referential Subact. Therefore, the following representation corresponds to the use of *dizque* illustrated in (37):

---

15 The only way of emphasizing grammatical formatives is contrastive emphasis in "messages about the code" regarding morphological and phonological details (cf. Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008, 5). Contrastive emphasis is unrelated to grammaticalization and should, therefore, not be confused with "focalization".

(37)   a. $(R_i: [(T_i - \text{movimiento} - (T_i)$
              $(T_j: - \text{de concienciación nacional} - (T_j): \text{dizque}_{Adv} (T_j))] (R_i))$

As this representation is specific of (37), I have added the lexical content for clarification purposes. Obviously, this lexical content does not form part of the Interpersonal Level. This fact is indicated in (37a) by means of the n-dashes, which indicate that all relevant steps pertaining to the Representation and to Encoding have been skipped here.

With regard to the second case, I propose to introduce a general modifying function to Communicated Contents into the theory. Indeed, FDG allows for assigning functions to all entities at the Interpersonal and Representational Levels, but function assignment to Communicated Contents has not yet been explored systematically.[16] On the other hand, based on empirical evidence, FDG does distinguish between independent and dependent entities at the layer of the Discourse Act. In my view, the distribution of *dizque* is evidence in favour of distinguishing between independent and dependent Communicated Contents as well, the latter would then correspond to additional content that modifies in some way the primary Communicated Content.

Cases in which *dizque* modifies a modifying, i.e. dependent, Communicated Content quoted so far are (10) and (25). Example (38) is similar:

(38) | *En* | *la* | *agencia* | *nos* | *prohíben* | *decir* | *cómo* | *nos* | *llamamos.* |
       |------|------|-----------|-------|------------|---------|--------|-------|-------------|
       | in | the | agency | us.DAT | forbid.3PL | say | how | REFL.1PL | call.1PL |
       | Dizque | *por* | *seguridad.* | | | | | | |
       | dizque | for | safety | | | | | | |

'In the agency we are forbidden to tell our names. <u>Supposedly</u> for security reasons.'
(Gabriela Fonseca, *Los diablos de Teresa y otros relatos*, 2008, Mexico)

In this case, it is tempting to assume that the function of the modifying Communicated Contents is "Reason", which would also apply for example (10), whereas in the case of (25) it would be "Purpose". However, such functions form part of the semantics of these examples and therefore correspond to the Representational Level. What we need in the present case is a general non-semantic function, which at the same time avoids making use of highly general concepts, as would be "modification". An appropriate label could be "Elaboration", to be abbreviated as "E". The assignment of this function would mark the dependent Communicated Content as such, thus distinguishing it from independent Communicated Contents, which bare no such function. A simplified interpersonal representation of (38) would have to look as follows:

(38)   a. $(C_i: - \text{en la agencia nos prohíben decir cómo nos llamamos} - (C_i))$
              $(C_j: - \text{por seguridad} - (C_j): \text{dizque}_{Adv} (C_j))_E$

Note that the dependent Communicated Content is not embedded in the independent one, but, as the following more general representation will show, both form part of one and the same Discourse Act:

(39) $(A_1: [(F_1: \text{ILL} (F_1)) (P_1)_S (P_2)_A (C_1: [(T_1) (R_1)] (C_1)) (C_2: [\ldots] (C_2): \text{dizque}_{Adv} (C_2))_E] (A_1))$

This representation is meant to account for all cases in which *dizque* scopes over a modifying Communicated Content, independently of the mutual ordering of the two types of Commicated Contents, which is a matter of morphosyntactic encoding.[17]

Summing up, accounting for the use of *dizque* to modifying Ascriptive Subacts does not require any adaptation of the tools FDG offers. Concering the application of *dizque* to modifying Communicated

---

16 An exception is Keizer (2018b), who advocates in favour of pragmatic function assignment to the Communicated Content.
17 Note that in (10) the dependent Communicated Content precedes the independent one, whereas this order is reversed in (25) and (38).

Contents, I have introduced the concept of dependent Communicated Contents marked by a general function "Elaboration" (E), thus distinguishing it from independent Communicated Contents.

5.4 How to link the lexical item *dizque* to its interpersonal frame?

Although *dizque* as an adverbial modifier is quite flexible, there are some restrictions. In order to illustrate the available options, I will reuse four of the examples provided in this article, renumbered for convenience and each followed by the corresponding frame.

(40) | *Dizque* | *se* | *llevó* | *sin* | *permiso* | *el* | *Fiat* | [= (8)] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| dizque | REFL.3 | took.3SG | without | permission | the | Fiat | |

'<u>Reportedly</u>, he took the Fiat without permission

Frame 1:

dizque modifies a Communicated Content

$(C_1: [...] (C_1): dizque_{Adv} (C_1))$

(41) | *dizque* | *por* | *respeto,* | *no* | *mostraron* | *el* | *cadáver.* | [= (10)] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| dizque | for | respect | not | showed.3PL | the | body | |

"<u>reportedly/allegedly</u> out of respect, they didn't show the body".

Frame 2:

dizque modifies a modifying, i.e. dependent, Communicated Content

$(C_1: [...] (C_1)) (C_2: [...] (C_2): dizque_{Adv} (C_2))_E$

(42) | *Existen* | *algunos* | *casos* | *casi* | *exóticos* | *de* | *parejas* | *dizque* | *estables,* | [= (12)] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| exist.3PL | some | cases | almost | exotic | of | couples | dizque | stable | |

'There are some almost exotic cases of <u>supposedly</u> stable couples

Frame 3:

dizque modifies the second Ascriptive Subact within a Referential Subact

$(R_1: (T_1) (T_2: [...] (T_2): dizque_{Adv} (T_2)) (R_1))$

(43) | *dizque* | *dando* | *de* | *comer* | *a* | *los* | *puercos* | [= (20)] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| dizque | giving | to | eat | to | the | pigs | |

"<u>pretending</u> to be feeding pigs"

Frame 4:

dizque modifies an Event

$(e_1: [...] (e_1): dizque_{Adv} (e_1))$

These representations correspond to the most frequent uses in my sample. Therefore, I refrain from including the infrequent modification of Referential Subacts and the mirative use, which, at least for the time being, can be considered the result of coercion.

The association of lexical items with the frames into which they are to be inserted is a matter of discussion in FDG. Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2016, 1143) propose the following procedure: "The restrictions on the compatibility between lexemes and frames need to be represented somehow in the lexicon. This can most simply be done by numbering the finite set of frames and indexing each lexeme with the numbers of the compatible frames. All the lexemes that share index n will then be insertable into frame n". Applying the simple example of the above-mentioned four frames to *dizque* yields a lexical entry of *dizque* in the Interpersonal and Representational lexicon, as something like: *dizque*[1,2,3,4]. This open-ended approach leaves room for the addition of further frames when some innovative use of *dizque* becomes part of common usage.

6 Conclusion

I have shown in this article that *dizque* is a reportative adverb in most of its uses. This implies, first, that its development is a process of lexicalization rather than grammaticalization, and, second, that it has an interactional function rather than a semantic one. A closer look at comparative dialectal, diachronic, and typological variation shows that reportative *dizque* gradually develops from a wide scope to a narrow scope. The gradual scope decrease of the impersonal adverb *dizque* is the contrary of what happens in the process of grammaticalization, which goes hand in hand with scope increase (Hengeveld 2011, 2017, Narrog 2017).

This scope decrease has two different effects for the use of *dizque*. Firstly, *dizque* comes to be used with Ascriptive Subacts, which are realized as nominal predicates. I have shown that in such cases, *dizque* is neither an adverb nor an adjective. The only way to account for these uses is considering *dizque* as a form that has both lexical and grammatical properties, i.e. in terms of FDG, a "lexical operator". Secondly, probably as a consequence of this scope decrease, which, as a general rule, implicates a negative speaker attitude the lower the scope becomes, there are cases in which *dizque* is used outside speech act contexts. This means that it loses its interactional function and should be read as a descriptive adverb, which expresses that a given event is carried out with the intention of deceit on the part of the Actor.

In the account of the different functions of *dizque*, FDG has turned out to be a useful instrument for the description of the complex problem of *dizque*.

Uncommon abbreviations in glosses

DMRK	discourse marker (*pues*)
DOM	differential object marking
POL	polite

Abbreviations in representations

Interpersonal Level:

A	Discourse Act; Addressee (function and operator)
C	Communicated Content
E	Elaboration function
F	Illocutionary predicate
id	identifiability operator
P	Participant
R	Subact of Reference
S	Speaker function and operator
T	Subact of Ascription

Representational Level:

e	event (=state-of-affairs)
f	lexical predicate

Data availability statement: The data are freely available from the corpora indicated in the references. All examples have been supplied with exact sources.

References

Alcazar, Asier. 2014. "On the grammaticalization of *dizque*." In *Perspectives in the study of Spanish language variation: Papers in honor of Carmen Silva-Corvalán*, edited by Andrés Enrique-Arias, Manuel J. Gutiérrez, Alazne Landa, and Francisco Ocampo, p. 19–42. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (*Verba*, Anexo 72). doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198759515.013.35

Casseb-Galvão, Vânia C. 2011. "Gramática discursivo-funcional e teoria da gramaticalização: revisitando os usos de [diski] no português brasileiro." *Filologia e Linguística Portuguesa* 13(2), 305–35. doi: 10.11606/issn.2176-9419.v13i2p305-335

Cruschina, Silvio and Eva-Maria Remberger. 2008. "Hearsay and reported speech: Evidentiality in Romance." *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 33, 95–116.

De la Mora, Juliana and Ricardo Maldonado. 2015. "*Dizque*: Epistemics blurring evidentials in Mexican Spanish." *Journal of Pragmatics* 85, 168–80. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2015.03.019.

Demonte, Violeta and Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2013. "Evidentials *dizque* and *que* in Spanish: Grammaticalization, parameters and the (fine) structure of Comp." *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto* 8, 211–34.

Demonte, Violeta and Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2022. "A multidimensional analysis of the Spanish reportative epistemic evidential *dizque*." *Lingua* 266, 103168, 29 pp. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103168.

Dumitrescu, Domniţa. 2012. "Rum. *cică* vs. esp. *dizque*: polifonía e intertextualidad." In *Polifonía e intertextualidad en el diálogo*, edited by Clara Ubaldina Lorda Mur, p. 317–38. Madrid: Arco Libros. doi: 10.31819/9783954872985-007.

Eberenz, Rolf. 2004. "*Dizque*: antecedentes medievales de un arcaísmo afortunado." *Lexis* 28(1–2), 139–56. doi: 10.18800/lexis.20040102.005.

Fang, Hongmei. 2021. *Sentence-final particles in Mandarin*. Utrecht: LOT.

Fontes, Michel Gustavo. 2016. *A distinção léxico–gramática na Gramática Discursivo-Funcional: uma proposta de implementação*. PhD thesis. São José do Rio Preto, SP: Universidade Estadual Paulista. doi: 10.1590/s1981-57942013000200007.

García Velasco, Daniel. 2022. "Modification and context." *Open Linguistics* 8(1), 524–44. doi: 10.1515/opli-2022-0206.

González Vázquez, Mercedes. 2021. "The evidentiality system in Galician and the *seica* marker." *Journal of Pragmatics* 178, 83–92. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2021.03.009.

Grajales, Róbinson. 2017. "La estrategia evidencial *dizque* en el español de Medellín, Colombia." *Onomázein: Revista de lingüística, filología y traducción* 37, 244–78. doi: 10.7764//onomazein.37.02.

Hengeveld, Kees. 2011. "The grammaticalization of tense and aspect." In *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*, edited by Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog, p. 580–94. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1163/22105832-00402004.

Hengeveld, Kees. 2017. "A hierarchical approach to grammaticalization." In *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality: A functional perspective*, edited by Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog, and Hella Olbertz, p. 13–37. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: 10.1515/9783110519389-001.

Hengeveld, Kees and J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2008. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A typologically-oriented theory of language structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.14198/elua2009.23.18.

Hengeveld, Kees and J. Lachlan Mackenzie. 2016. "Reflections on the lexicon in Functional Discourse Grammar." *Linguistics* 54(5), 1135–61. doi: 10.1515/ling-2016-0025.

Hengeveld, Kees and Hella Olbertz. 2018. "Systems of TMA and related categories in Functional Discourse Grammar: A brief overview." *Open Linguistics* 4, 323–7. doi: 10.1515/opli-2018-0017.

Kany, Charles. 1944. "Impersonal *dizque* and its variants in American Spanish." *Hispanic Review* 12(2), 168–77. doi: 10.2307/469712.

Keizer, Evelien. 2007. "The lexical-grammatical dichotomy in Functional Discourse Grammar." *Alfa: Revista de Linguística* 51(2), 35–56.

Keizer, Evelien. 2018a. "Interpersonal adverbs in FDG: The case of *frankly*." In *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*, edited by Evelien Keizer and Hella Olbertz, p. 47–88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/slcs.205.03kei.

Keizer, Evelien. 2018b. "Pragmatic function assignment and grammatical expression in FDG." In *Linguistique et discours: description, typologie et théorisation*, edited by Mohammed Jadir, p. 59–84. Berlin: Peter Lang.

Keizer, Evelien and Hella Olbertz. 2018. "Functional Discourse Grammar: A brief outline." In *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*, edited by Evelien Keizer and Hella Olbertz, p. 1–15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/slcs.205.01kei.

Keizer, Evelien, Thomas Schwaiger, and Elnora ten Wolde. 2022. "Modification in Functional Discourse Grammar: State of the art and issues to address." *Open Linguistics* 8(1), 512–23. doi: 10.1515/opli-2022-0216.

Kemp, Lois and Kees Hengeveld. 2022. "English evidential *-ly* adverbs in the noun phrase from a functional perspective." *Open Linguistics* 8(1), 573–92. doi: 10.1515/opli-2022-0208.

Lehmann, Christian. 2002. "New reflections on grammaticalization and lexicalization." In *New reflections on grammaticalization*, edited by Ilse Wischer and Gabriele Diewald, p. 1–18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/tsl.49.03leh.

Lehmann, Christian. 2015. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*, 3rd edn. Berlin: Language Science Press.

López Izquierdo, Marta. 2006. "L'émergence de *dizque* comme stratégie médiative en espagnol médiéval." *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales* 29, 483–95. doi: 10.3406/cehm.2006.1980.

Magaña, Elsie. 2005. "El paso de *dice que* a *dizque*, de la referencia a la evidencialidad." *Contribuciones desde Coatepec* 8, 59–70.

Martínez Levy, Adrián Rodrigo. 2019. "Acerca de los significados del marcador adverbial *dizque* en el español de México: una aproximación desde el Enfoque dialógico de la argumentación y la polofonía." *Pragmalingüística* 27, 155–74. doi: 10.25267/pragmalinguistica.2019.i27.08.

Miglio, Viola G. 2010. "Online databases and language change: The case of Spanish *dizque*." In *Corpus-linguistic applications: current studies, new directions*, edited by Stefan Th. Gries, Stefanie Wulff, and Mark Davies, p. 7–28. Amsterdam: Rodopi. doi: 10.1163/9789042028012_003.

Narrog, Heiko. 2017. "Relationship of form and function in grammaticalization – the case of modality." In *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality: A functional perspective*, edited by Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog, and Hella Olbertz, p. 75–110. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: 10.1515/9783110519389-004.

Olbertz, Hella. 2007. "*Dizque* in Mexican Spanish: The subjectification of reportative meaning." *Rivista di Linguistica* 19(1), 151–72.

Olbertz, Hella and Wim Honselaar. 2017. "The grammaticalization of Dutch *moeten*: modal and post-modal meanings." In *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality: A functional perspective*, edited by Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog, and Hella Olbertz, p. 273–300. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: 10.1515/9783110519389-011.

Olbertz, Hella and Marize Dall'Aglio Hattnher. 2018. "On objective and subjective modality again: Evidence from Portuguese and Spanish modal auxiliaries." In *Recent developments in Functional Discourse Grammar*, edited by Evelien Keizer and Hella Olbertz, p. 131–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/slcs.205.05olb.

Sadock, Jerrold M. 1971. "Queclaratives." *Chicago Linguistic Society* 7, 223–32.

Sanromán Vilas, Begoña. 2020. "Do evidential markers always convey epistemic values? A look into three Ibero-Romance reportatives." *Lingua* 238, 102832, 26 pp. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2020.102832

Searle, John. 1969. *Speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sousa, Xulio. 2012. "Estrategias evidenciales y expresión de la fuente de información en gallego: los marcadores gramaticalizados." In *Estudios sobre variación sintáctica peninsular*, edited by Xulio Viejo Fernández, p. 75–98. Uviéu: Universidá d'Uviéu. doi: 10.31819/9783964564740-005.

Špago, Džemal. 2016. "Rhetorical questions or rhetorical uses of questions?" *Explorations in English Language and Linguistics* 4, 102–115. doi: 10.1515/exell-2017-0009.

Tena Dávalos, Jimena. 2017. "The end of a cycle: Grammaticalization of the future tense in Mexican Spanish." In *The grammaticalization of tense, aspect, modality, and evidentiality: A functional perspective*, edited by Kees Hengeveld, Heiko Narrog, and Hella Olbertz, p. 215–39. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: 10.1515/9783110519389-009.

Torreblanca, Máximo and Robert Blake. 2002. "De morfofonología histórica española: la apócope de *-e* en la época medieval." In *Actas del V Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española (2000)*, edited by María Teresa Echenique Elizondo and Juan Sánchez Méndez, p. 431–43. Madrid: Gredos. doi: 10.54166/rhle.2007.02.10.

Travis, Catherine E. 2006. "*Dizque*: A Colombian evidentiality strategy." *Linguistics* 44(6), 1269–97. doi: 10.1515/ling.2006.041.

VandelaNotte, Lieven. 2006. "Mister so-called X: Discourse functions and subjectification of *so-called*." In *Functional perspectives on grammar and discourse: In honour of Angela Dowing*, edited by Christopher S. Buttler, Raquel Hidalgo Downing, and Julia Lavid, p. 359–94. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/slcs.85.20van.

Van de Velde, Freek. 2009. "The emergence of modification patterns in the Dutch noun phrase." *Linguistics* 47(4), 1021–49. doi: 10.1515/ling.2009.036

Vendler, Zeno. 1967. "Facts and events." In *Linguistics in philosophy*. 122–46. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Willet, Thomas. 1988. "A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality." *Studies in Language* 12(1), 51–97.

Corpora

CORDE: Real Academia Española [online]. *Corpus diacrónico del español.* < http://www.rae.es > [6 May 2021].
CORPES XXI: Real Academia Española [online]. *Corpus del español del siglo XXI.* < http://www.rae.es > [6 May 2021].
CREA: Real Academia Española [online]. *Corpus de referencia del español actual.* < http://www.rae.es > [6 May 2021].